

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
[DRAFT] PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
JULY 28, 2010**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 28th day of July, 2010, at the hour of 6:35 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola
Absent: None
Staff Present: Laurie Jester, Acting Director of Community Development
Angelica Ochoa, Assistant Planner
Recording Secretary, Sarah Boeschen

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 14, 2010

Commissioner Seville-Jones requested that the second sentence of paragraph 8 on page 2 of the July 14 minutes be revised to read: “She commented that Thursday nights during the summer have become more like a typical weekend night.”

Commissioner Andreani requested that the third sentence of paragraph 5 on page 3 of the minutes be revised to read: “She stated that the proposed hours until midnight every night would set a precedent ~~and~~ which is not in keeping with the ambiance that is intended for the ~~City~~ downtown. She said that she is not aware of issues regarding noise at the location, but she has noticed lines of patrons forming outside of the restaurant, which is different from what occurred under the prior restaurant ownership.”

Commissioner Andreani requested that paragraph 7 on page 12 of the minutes be revised to read: “Commissioner Andreani commented that it is possible to place requirements on commercial properties such as permeable surfaces and planting of trees for parking lots that would help address storm water, drainage, and runoff.”

Chairman Fasola requested that the second sentence of paragraph 3 on page 3 of the minutes be revised to read: “He stated that he does not know if he can see any reason to limit the hours.”

Chairman Fasola requested that the last sentence of paragraph 1 on page 8 of the minutes be revised to read: “He indicated that he is concerned with forcing a ~~technical~~ specific technical solution to solve a general problem.”

Chairman Fasola requested that the last paragraph of page 10 of the minutes be revised to read: “Chairman Fasola suggested requiring that a maximum of perhaps 5 percent of the site be permitted to have non-permeable surfaces rather than requiring that 20 percent of the setback area have permeable surfaces, as this would allow the designer more flexibility. He said that allowing something like 5 percent of the site would arrive at the same goal for water ~~retaining~~ retention while allowing more flexibility.”

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Seville-Jones/Lesser) to **APPROVE** the minutes of July 14, 2010, as amended.

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola

NOES: None.
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

C. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

D. BUSINESS ITEMS

07/28/10-2 Consideration of an Appeal of an Administrative Decision Denying a Lower Garage Floor Elevation and Other Garage Modifications for a New Single Family Residence at 626 Rosecrans Avenue

Assistant Planner Ochoa summarized the staff report. She said that the applicant originally submitted plans for a new single family two story residence with an attached two car garage. She stated that a building permit was issued for construction based on the plans that were submitted and approved. She commented that a revised plan that included three stories in the garage area was then presented to staff while construction was occurring on the subject site. She stated that the revised plan was denied, as only two stories are permitted in the zone where the property is located. She indicated that the garage floor was then lowered about 21 inches and additional alterations were done to the garage during construction that was not approved as part of the original plans. She commented that additional work that was done in the garage which was not approved included installation of a large openable window above the garage door, electrical work, installation of a tankless water heater, and the installation of structural blocking in the garage walls. She said that the applicant requested to keep the garage floor lowered, which was denied by staff. She said that staff felt the lowering of the garage floor would allow adequate height to provide three levels. She commented that staff felt that a ceiling height of 15 feet as approved in the original plans is adequate to accommodate two levels while restricting the possibility of incorporating three levels.

Assistant Planner Ochoa indicated that the property owner is asking for approval of a garage floor elevation of 105.70 which is 21 inches below the approved elevation of 107.50. She said that the applicant is also asking for the approval of the window above the garage door, which was installed without staff approval. She indicated that the intent of the owners was to add another floor, and staff feels that the height of the garage ceiling as proposed of 16.8 feet could accommodate an additional floor. She indicated that adding a floor would not comply with the zoning standards since only two stories are permitted in the zone where the subject property is located. She stated that the garage has direct access into the house. She indicated that the garage modifications could provide a potential to accommodate a third floor with the location of the blocking that has been installed on the garage walls. She stated that the work that has been done does not meet the residential standards or the goals of the General Plan to preserve the height limit and low profile image of the neighborhood. She indicated that staff is recommending that the Commission uphold the decision of the Acting Community Development Director to deny the lower garage floor elevation and other garage modifications and deny the subject appeal.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Assistant Planner Ochoa indicated that a 16.8 feet ceiling height for the garage would not have been approved by staff if it had been submitted as part of the original plans, and 15 feet is the most that would be approved for the garage ceiling height.

Acting Director Jester indicated that she is not aware of any ceiling heights in Area Districts I or II being approved over 15 feet.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Assistant Planner Ochoa indicated that there is a concern that the current property owner or a subsequent owner could add an unapproved level to the structure without the knowledge of the City. She pointed out that the property owner did originally intend to add another floor. She said that staff felt the additional level proposed by the applicant was not simply intended for storage but rather to provide additional living area, since there was a full floor and bathroom.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester commented that Code enforcement is done once a complaint is received regarding a potential violation. She said that staff does not want to continually monitor structures to ensure that additional stories are not added without approval. She pointed out that the reasons there are height restrictions placed on interior spaces is so that they cannot be easily converted to add a floor. She indicated that staff has never approved ceiling heights greater than 15 feet in such situations.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, Acting Director Jester indicated that the building inspectors have indicated that the horizontal blocking in the garage is lined up appropriately in order to lay floor joists evenly across to accommodate another level that would line up with the floor level of the rest of the house. She also commented that the large window above the garage door would be very difficult to open from the ground level.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Acting Director Jester stated that the tankless water heater is at a height that would be easily accessible from an additional level but would need to be accessed from a ladder from garage the floor level.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Acting Director Jester indicated that the lower elevation of the garage floor would decrease the slope of the back yard.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, Acting Director Jester indicated that she is not aware of any illegal conversions in other houses to add a floor.

Steve Kirby, the appellant, stated that they have included pictures with their exhibits of homes in the adjacent area to the subject property that appear to accommodate three stories. He commented that their daughter, who is planning to live in the subject home, wanted a level backyard for her future children to be able to have an area to play. He indicated that their intent was to build a structure that was not built out to the maximum. He commented that while they were framing the garage, they talked to staff about what could possibly be done above the garage level. He indicated that staff informed them that they could not build a third level but could include a 6 foot high storage area. He indicated that they then submitted plans to staff to include a storage area. He stated that they then later decided that they did not want for the storage area to be included. He pointed out that the plywood on the outside of the home meets at the exact point where the blocking in the inside of the garage has been placed, and the bottom and top sheets of plywood are nailed into the blocking. He commented that the window above the garage door had already been framed, the electrical had been installed, and the blocking had been installed when they decided not to include the storage area. He pointed out that there are no electrical outlets installed at a height that could be accessed from an additional floor.

Mr. Kirby indicated that they have no desire or intent to build an additional level. He stated that they did not continue construction work after their meetings with staff. He said that staff did not indicate to them that adding a window above the garage door was a big concern. He stated that sprinklers have been installed on the ceiling that would be inconsistent with building a third story. He indicated that the floor for the garage has not been poured. He said that the level of the garage floor as proposed would make a 2 degree slope which would provide a level

area for children to play. He stated that they have asked staff to provide any documentation regarding their policy limiting tall ceilings, and they were told that there are no such documents which address the policy. He pointed out that they were told that nothing they have done violates any zoning regulations. He indicated that the staff report states that the reason their construction was denied by staff is because they would have an opportunity to break the law and not because they have violated any laws. He pointed out that simply because there is an opportunity does not mean that the laws will be violated. He said that the City has the right to inspect the property at any time. He stated that their intent is to place drywall around the garage and leave the electrical as in the original plans.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Mr. Kirby** indicated that the overall height of the structure is the same as specified in the original plans and it does not violate the height limit.

Garo Babikian, the project architect, said that the level of the garage slab is different than was originally indicated on the plans. He stated that the owners decided to ask the City whether they could incorporate an additional floor. He commented that since an additional story is not permitted, the applicants would instead like to have a higher garage and a more level back yard. He indicated that they do not feel the construction as they are proposing would cause any harm. He stated that they would not add a third story since it is not allowed by the City. He commented that it is not justifiable for the City to determine that the ceiling is too high in the garage, as the height of the overall structure is 3 inches below the maximum allowed. He pointed out that the City should not dictate the overall design of the structure provided there are no Code violations. He stated that they have not done any work in the garage since the stop work order was issued by the City. He commented that his goal is to build a nice home for the applicants, and he would not jeopardize the project by doing anything illegal. He indicated that he does not feel there would be any harm to the neighbors if the height of the garage ceiling is 16.8 feet rather than 15 feet. He commented that the applicant can submit a report or staff can check every year to ensure that an additional floor is not built.

Margaret Kirby, the applicant, pointed out that they came to the City in good faith regarding the possibility of incorporating an additional level. She said that staff then informed them that it was not permitted in the area where the subject property is located. She stated that they have no plans to incorporate a third story and would like to continue with construction according to their proposed plan which would allow for less slope for the garage and back yard.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lesser, **Ms. Kirby** indicated that they are good citizens and would not break the law; however, they would not have control over the use of the property by future owners. She commented that they offered to include language on the deed to the property to indicate that a third level is not to be constructed on the property.

Acting Director Jester said that the revised plans that were suggested to staff by the applicant included a full story and not a mezzanine area. She indicated that the Building Code defines a mezzanine as having a mid floor that is no larger than 1/3 of the floor below and open to the floor below. She stated that mezzanines have been permitted in similar situations, and the revised proposal for an additional level did not meet the Code definition of mezzanine. She commented that a correction notice was placed on the property on May 21 which indicated that the City needed verification of the floor elevation. She indicated that staff indicated to the applicant that they needed to build according to the originally approved plans, which did not include adding the window above the garage door or lowering the garage floor level. She stated that a 2 degree slope is very flat and is the minimum required for drainage.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that the original plans were approved and accepted by staff and the applicant, and nothing has changed with the staff approval from the original approval. She said that she feels staff had valid reasons to reject the proposed changes to the original plans. She indicated that the Commission needs to rely on the practice and policy of staff in considering building rules, and staff is very open and accessible in discussing the City's rules and policies. She stated that she feels there is a solid foundation as to why the staff has asked for the rules to be applied. She said that she believes the applicant was aware of the rules. She said that she does not feel that it is necessary to determine the intention of the applicants regarding incorporating an additional level, as staff has a reasonable basis for requiring the ceiling height at 15 feet. She indicated that she would support staff's recommendation to deny the appeal.

Commissioner Andreani said that she agrees with the comments of Commissioner Seville-Jones. She indicated that it does sound like the applicant had the intent of creating an additional floor in submitting the revised plans to staff. She commented that it is strange that the applicant decided to include a large window above the garage door and a bathroom for a mezzanine level. She pointed out that the applicant has indicated that they wish to incorporate a large back yard with a grass driveway area; however, the original plans that were approved show a concrete driveway. She commented that the home two doors west of the subject property appears as a two story home and has a single story garage, which is contrary to the applicant's contention that it appears to be three levels. She also indicated that the house located on the corner of Blanche Road and Rosecrans Avenue appears to be two stories of living space above a garage that is below grade, contrary to the contention of the applicants that it appears as three levels. She said that she agrees with staff that construction on the project cannot continue unless it is according to the originally approved plans.

Commissioner Paralusz stated that she agrees with the statements of Commissioners Seville-Jones and Andreani. She stated that agreeing to a Building Permit is basically entering into a contract. She said that both parties must agree in approving the plans and must agree regarding any changes that are made. She stated that the City did not agree to any changes to the original plans that were approved. She indicated that staff has articulated valid reasons for not approving a third level or the higher ceiling height. She commented that she also would support staff's recommendation to deny the applicant's appeal.

Commissioner Lesser said that he also supports the recommendation of staff to deny the appeal. He said that construction has been done which is a variation to the plans that were originally approved. He commented that he would be more receptive to the applicant's argument that there is no written specific policy limiting ceiling heights if it were made when the original plans were submitted rather than after they were approved. He said that he also understands staff's concern regarding the difficulty in addressing an illegal conversion of an additional level after it has been completed. He stated that although the applicants may not intend to build an additional level, there is no control over the actions of future owners of the property. He pointed out that staff must make decisions that consider future owners of the property as well as the applicants.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani/Seville-Jones) to **DENY** an Appeal of an Administrative Decision Denying a Lower Garage Floor Elevation and Other Garage Modifications for a New Single Family Residence at 626 Rosecrans Avenue

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Paralusz, Seville-Jones, Chairman Fasola
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Acting Director Jester explained the appeal process and indicated that the item will be placed on the City Council's Consent Calendar for their meeting of September 7, 2010.

07/28/10-3 Adoption of a Resolution Approving a Master Use Permit Amendment for Modifications to the Hours of Operation, Notification for Special Events, and Restaurant Operations and Denying a Height Variance at the Shade Hotel, Metlox Site, 1221 North Valley Drive (Manhattan Inn Operating Company LLC)

Chairman Fasola commented that he has previously recused himself from consideration of the issue and will not participate in the discussion.

In response to a comment from Acting Director Jester, Commissioner Andreani said that although she was not present at the last hearing regarding the issue, she has reviewed the minutes and the video from that meeting.

Acting Director Jester stated that her understanding is that the Commission did not specify that functions could only in only certain areas of the hotel, and such a restriction has not been included in Condition 3 of the draft Resolution. She commented that language was also added to Condition 11 regarding the terrace enclosure to clarify that the enclosure would need to meet the standards of the City noise consultant's noise studies for a fully enclosed terrace.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that staff has deleted the word "entirely" from the first sentence of Condition 11. She said that her understanding is that it was agreed the terrace would be entirely enclosed, and she is not sure why the word is being deleted.

Acting Director Jester said that it does not appear that the intention was to strike the word "entirely" from the first sentence of Condition 11, and staff will keep it in the language.

Acting Director Jester said that the words "Happy Hour" was changed to "Bar and Functions" in the heading of Condition 38.

Commissioner Lesser asked about the extent to which the Commissioners can make any additional changes to the draft Resolution without renoticing the hearing.

Acting Director Jester indicated that some of the additional comments that have been received by the neighbors and the applicant are substantive and would require renoticing in order to be incorporated. She stated, however, that minor changes can be made for clarification without it being necessary to renote the item. She said that the Commission was very clear on their direction at the last meeting. She indicated that staff feels the Commission should vote on the draft Resolution as presented, and the applicant would have the ability to appeal the decision to the City Council if they desire.

Michael Zislis, the applicant, indicated that they would like for the Commission to vote on the proposed Resolution. He said that it would be appropriate for any additional changes to be addressed before the City Council.

Nate Hubbard said that he would also like for a vote to be taken on the draft Resolution at this hearing.

Commissioner Lesser said that he is eager for the Resolution to move to the City Council. He said that he is not certain of the extent of changes that can be made without renoticing. He

indicated that he feels the Commission should help the parties come to closure rather than further complicating any issues.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that it is important to recognize that the draft Resolution is a package that has developed from a compromise between the parties. She said that continuing to make changes to individual items makes the package less attractive.

Commissioner Andreani said that her understanding from reviewing the last meeting was that an agreement had been reached. She commented that she is not sure if making any changes sends the wrong message to the Council, as a great deal of work has gone into the draft Resolution as written.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that she does not believe it is necessary to add the language as suggested by the neighbors to Condition 22 to read: "All conditions other than Condition 23, hours for alcohol service shall become immediately effective upon approval by the City Council of PC Resolution 10-05."

Acting Director Jester indicated that the language suggested by the neighbors to Condition 22 is stating that the privileges given to the applicant as part of the Use Permit for extension of hours of operation shall only be granted after installation of the mitigation measures, which is already included in the draft Resolution. She said she does not feel it is necessary for the language to be included.

Commissioner Seville-Jones indicated that she supports allowing the neighbors' suggested language to Condition 28, as it is an administrative change that clarifies the condition.

The Commissioners agreed to change Condition 28 to read: ". . . after 9:00 p.m. for special events and functions any day of the week."

Vice-Chairperson Paralusz commented that **Mr. Zislis** has also suggested a similar modification as the neighbors regarding changing Conditions 28 and 29.

The Commissioners agreed to allow the neighbors' suggested change to Conditions 28 and 29 to add the same language as in Condition 31 to specify that registered hotel guests and disabled may use the east door after 9:00 p.m.

The Commissioners agreed with the applicant's suggestion to change Finding A in the draft Resolution to change the applicant's name from "Manhattan Inn Operations Company" to "Manhattan Inn Operating Company, LLC."

Commissioner Lesser suggested that the language of the first sentence of Finding A be corrected to read: "Manhattan Inn Operating Company LLC is seeking approval of an Amendment to a Master Use Permit, to allow modifications to the ~~previously~~ previous approval.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that food service has always been specified as small plates, and deleting the reference to small plates as suggested by the applicant for Finding A would be a substantive change.

The Commissioners agreed to leave the existing language of clause 3 of Finding A.

Commissioner Seville-Jones commented that the applicant's requested language to the last sentence of Finding A specifies their interpretation of the approved operating hours, and she

does not believe that it is appropriate to include language regarding the applicant's interpretation.

Vice-Chairperson Paralusz said that she agrees with the comments of Commissioner Seville-Jones.

The Commissioners determined to leave the existing language for the last sentence of Finding A and not replace it with the applicant's suggested language.

The Commissioners agreed to the applicant's request to change the name in Finding E to "Manhattan Inn Operating Company LLC."

Commissioner Andreani said that she feels the applicant's proposed change for Finding L is substantive. She indicated that the high quality of service of the applicant has not been questioned, and the issue is regarding the noise being generated from the establishment rather than regarding service.

Commissioner Seville-Jones said that the applicant's suggested change for Finding L is interpreting what was done in prior Resolutions and is not necessary to be included the findings.

The Commissioners agreed to keep the existing language and not include the applicant's suggested additional language for Finding L.

Acting Director Jester pointed out that the Police Department has responded to calls regarding disturbances to the neighbors, and the disturbances are not alleged. She indicated that she also does not feel it is necessary to specify in Finding O that no citations have been issued as requested by the applicant.

The Commissioners agreed to keep the existing language for Finding O and not to include the applicant's recommended changes.

Commissioner Seville-Jones stated that one of the important points is regarding the unique nature of the property with the lobby being open 24 hours. She said that the definition of closing in Condition 1 as written addresses the issues that have been raised regarding closing hours of the hotel.

The Commissioners agreed that the applicant's suggested change to Condition 1 to delete or modify the definition of "closed" is substantive and that they would not support the applicant's proposed change to the existing language.

The Commissioners agreed that the applicant's suggested language to the fourth sentence of Condition 12 is substantive and that they would not support changing the existing language.

The Commissioners agreed that they would not support changing the wording of the last sentence in Condition 12 as suggested by the applicant.

The Commissioners agreed that the applicant's proposed change to Condition 15 is substantive and that they would not support changing the existing language as suggested by the applicant.

In response to a question from Commissioner Seville-Jones, Acting Director Jester indicated that Condition 18 has been eliminated, as dancing will be regulated by the Entertainment Permit.

The Commissioners agreed not to add language to the beginning of Condition 22 as suggested by the applicant.

The Commissioners agreed that the applicant's suggested revision to the table in Condition 23 regarding operating hours for the sky deck is substantive and that they would not support changing the existing language.

The Commissioners agreed that the applicant's proposed change to Condition 28 is substantive and that they would not support changing the existing language.

Vice-Chairperson Paralusz indicated that the applicant's proposed change to Condition 29 to add the words "and disabled" has already been addressed by the Commissioners with the neighbors' comments.

The Commissioners agreed that the proposed change of the applicant to the first sentence of Condition 31 is substantive and that they would not support changing the existing language.

The Commissioners agreed that the proposed change of the applicant to the first sentence of Condition 33 is substantive and that they would not support changing the existing language.

Commissioner Andreani commented that the language of the draft Resolution currently in reads "Friday, Saturday and Sundays" in several places. She indicated that she would like to make the language consistent to read "Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays" throughout the document.

Commissioner Seville-Jones stated that there has been a great deal of compromise between the parties in reaching a conclusion to the draft Resolution. She indicated that the draft Resolution has developed as a result of both the neighbors and applicant keeping open minds. She commented **Mr. Hubbard** and **Mr. McPherson** for their work and participation in the discussions. She also commented **Mr. Zislis** on arriving at ideas to attempt to address the problems of the neighbors regarding noise. She said that she hopes that the City Council will consider that promises that were made to the community when the Metlox Plaza was originally developed. She indicated that where the patrons of the hotel exit during the evening hours is very important in regulating the level of noise to the neighbors. She indicated that the noise of patrons outside of the front entrance of the hotel is a significant source of the noise impact to the neighbors. She stated that she feels it is also very important that the definition of closing is included in the draft Resolution. She commented that the reason why the Commission is not approving additional operating hours on the sky deck is because the report from the sound engineer indicated that the applicant's proposed mitigation measures for the sky deck would not be effective in mitigating noise to the adjacent residents. She stated that she feels the sky deck is one of the most sensitive areas with respect to the application.

Commissioner Lesser stated that he gives the applicant tremendous credit for being receptive to the concerns of the neighbors and arriving at different proposals to address the concerns that were raised. He also commended **Mr. Hubbard** and **Mr. McPherson** in putting in the time to present their proposals and relay information to the residents. He commented that he hopes there will be compromise from both sides during further discussions with the City Council. He said that he hopes the applicant can acknowledge that the neighbors have experienced disturbances from noise. He indicated that he also hopes the neighbors can acknowledge that the applicant has agreed to spend a great deal of money and to have certain limitations placed on the operation of the hotel in order to help mitigate noise. He stated that he hopes the neighbors and applicant can build on the progress that was made at the Commission hearings to arrive at a compromise.

Commissioner Andreani said that she echoes the comments of Commissioners Seville-Jones and Lesser. She stated that a great deal of time, diligence and thoughtfulness has gone into the discussions. She indicated that the Commissioners had thought that they had arrived at a compromise after the June 23 hearing. She pointed out that the 2005 Master Use Permit for the Metlox development granted approval for a boutique hotel with ancillary bar and restaurant operations. She commented that she feels it is important to remember that the City is primarily a residential community. She also pointed out that the applicant opened the hotel knowing the property was located adjacent to a residential neighborhood. She indicated that the neighbors have been impacted by noise since the hotel began operating. She commented that she feels the applicant has given up entitlements that he wanted and not that were granted to him in the original Use Permit. She indicated that she feels the e-mail that was sent from Mr. Strain on July 28 is bringing back the original request for additional hours for all venues and particularly the sky deck. She stated that the neighbors have indicated that they want no additional entitlements granted for the sky deck. She indicated that she agrees with Commissioner Seville-Jones that mitigating noise by changing the exit location in the evenings is important. She said that she also feels that adding language regarding the definition of closing is important.

Vice Chairperson Paralusz stated that she also commends staff for the enormous amount of time and effort they have dedicated to the application and in helping to mediate many of the issues. She also thanked her fellow Commissioners for their work on considering the application. She thanked **Mr. Zislis** for working with the neighbors. She also thanked the neighbors for their input and for passionately presenting their positions. She said that the hearings have been conducted with a spirit of compromise and cooperation.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Seville-Jones/Andreani) to **APPROVE** a Resolution Approving a Master Use Permit Amendment for Modifications to the Hours of Operation, Notification for Special Events, and Restaurant Operations and Denying a Height Variance at the Shade Hotel, Metlox Site, 1221 North Valley Drive, as amended.

AYES: Andreani, Lesser, Seville-Jones, Vice-Chairperson Paralusz
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: Chairman Fasola

Acting Director Jester explained the appeal process and indicated that the item will be placed on the City Council's agenda for their meeting of September 7, 2010.

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS None

F. DIRECTORS ITEMS None.

G. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Vice-Chairperson Paralusz said that the Parks and Recreation Department and the Parks and Recreation Commission will host a movie night showing E.T. at the pier at 7:00 p.m. on Saturday August 7, 2010.

H. TENTATIVE AGENDA August 11, 2010

I. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. to Wednesday, August 11, 2010, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

SARAH BOESCHEN
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

LAURIE JESTER
Acting Community Development Director