



**CITY OF SANTA MARIA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF  
JULY 19, 2006**



Chair John Everett called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Commissioners Lawnae Hunter, Michael W. Moats, Rodger Brown, and Chair John Everett.

**ABSENT:** Vice-Chair Etta Waterfield

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Division Manager  
Senior Deputy City Attorney, Wendy Stockton  
Senior Civil Engineer, Rodger Olds  
Recording Secretary, Donna Mathews  
Planner III, Bill Shipsey

**By motion, approved the Planning Commission minutes of May 3, 2006, as written.**

---

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** James Campbell, formerly of Chester County, PA, presented several suggestions for city and county planning such as an open space parks, bond issues to develop farm land into lakes, horse facilities, hiking trails, art museums, aquariums, and low income housing aimed toward young families saving money for first homes. He stated that these measures saved the city from turning into one giant housing tract in his home town in Chester County. He also suggested an open air trolley to bring tourists to visit the area.

---

**ITEM 1 – CONSENT CALENDAR: The consent calendar is approved with one motion.**

**VOTE: 4-0**    **AYES:**        Commissioners Hunter, Moats, Brown and Everett.  
                  **NOES:**         None.  
                  **ABSENT:**      Commissioner Waterfield.  
                  **ABSTAIN:**     None.

**ITEM 1.A. – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PREZONING, SPHERE OF INFLUENCE BOUNDARY AMENDMENT, AND ANNEXATION FOR THE 2006 SANTA MARIA WASTE-WATER TREATMENT EXPANSION PROJECT, LOCATED NORTH AND SOUTH OF STOWELL ROAD AND EAST OF BLACK ROAD, GPZ-2005-001, E-2005-025, ANNEXATION #106 (250 ACRES).** Review of recommendation to City Council regarding the certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), E-2005-025, an amendment to the General Plan (Land Use) **to** 240.68 acres of CF (Community Facilities), and rezoning **to** 7.00 acres of PD/M-2 (Planned Development/General Manufacturing), 2.13 acres of PD/CM/AG (Planned Development/Commercial Manufacturing/Agricultural Overlay), and 240.68 acres PF (Public Facilities). The Planning Commission will also consider a recommendation on the application to amend the City sphere of influence boundary and annexation of the project site. Assessor's Parcel Nos.117-191-010, -013, 117-082-001, -002, -003, -024, and -025. (Project Planner: Bill Shipsey)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** By motion, continue the project discussion to the meeting of August 16, 2006

**ACTION:** By motion, this item was continued to the August 16, 2006, public hearing.

**ITEM 1.B. - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT/ZONE CHANGE ON 40 ACRES AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF EAST MAIN STREET AND PANTHER DRIVE (FORMERLY FREMONT STREET) FOR INLAND PACIFIC BUILDERS, LA VENTANA II, GPZ-2005-003, and E-2005-027.** Review of a General Plan (Land Use Map) amendment **from** AOS-1 (Primary Agricultural Open Space) **to** LWDR-4 (Lower Density Residential, 4 units/acre), MDR-12 (Medium Density Residential, 12 units/acre), and (CC) Community Commercial; and a zone change **from** OS (Open Space) **to** PD/R-1-6,000, PD/R-2 and PD/C-2; and an Environmental Impact Report. The proposed General Plan amendment and zone change would allow for the development of up to 100 single-family residences, 60 condominiums and a 70,000-square foot commercial center. (Project Planner: John Shoals)

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** By motion, continue the project discussion to the meeting of September 6, 2006.

**ACTION:** By motion, this item was continued to the September 6, 2006, public hearing.

---

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**ITEM 2 – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR CALE-WEST STREET FOR EIGHT NEW DETACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS, 302-308 WEST STREET, PD-2006-002, E-2005-036.** Review of a Planned Development Permit to allow the construction of eight new single family residential units in a PD/R-2 (Planned Development/Medium Density Residential) zoning district, Assessor's Parcel No.117-340-069. This project qualifies as a Class 32 Categorical Exemption. No further environmental review is necessary. (Project Planner: Tina Frank)

**ACTION:** By motion, this item was continued to the August 2, 2006, public hearing. Vote: 4-0.

Chair Everett called for a motion for continuance. Commissioner Hunter made a motion to continue Item 2, PD-2006-002, E-2005-036, Planned Development permit for Cale-West Street for eight new detached residential units, 302-308 West Street, to the August 2, 2006, Planning Commission meeting. Commission Moats seconded the motion and it was carried, 4-0.

**ITEM 3 – AN AMENDMENT TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR SANTA MARIA COMMONS, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF BROADWAY AND MCCOY LANE, PD-2005-016, E-2005-014.** Review of an amendment to a previously approved Planned Development Permit amending a condition of approval relating to the maximum allowable sign area. Assessor's Parcel No. 111-560-042. This project has been previously reviewed in a Mitigated Negative Declaration (E-2005-014). No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

**ACTION:** By motion, approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the Amended Preliminary Draft of the Planned Development Permit. Vote: 4-0.

Mr. Bill Shipsey presented the staff report, stating that this project is by the Regency Realty Group, who received an approval for the Santa Maria Commons shopping center, with approximately 118,000 square feet of building space on 10.21 acres located at the southwest corner of McCoy Lane and South Broadway. The applicant is requesting an amendment to one condition of the approved Planned Development permit, which was approved on October 19, 2005. The applicant requests to amend the limitation on the sign area. The Commission limited the project of 600 square feet of total sign area, and the applicant is requesting 1,092 square feet, in conformance with the existing Santa Maria Municipal Code. Staff is supporting this action. Mr. Shipsey concluded his report and was available for questions.

The Commissioners had no questions for staff at this time.

The applicant was not present to speak to the Commission and no other speakers, for or against, came forward to speak on this action.

Chair Everett closed the public hearing and requested a motion to approve the amended condition. Commission Moats made a motion to approve an amendment to a previously approved Planned Development permit for Santa Maria Commons, located at the southwest corner of Broadway and McCoy Lane, PD-2005-016, E-2005-014, subject to the conditions outlined in the amended preliminary draft of the Planned Development permit. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion and it was carried, 4-0.

**ITEM 4 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR KING’S BALLROOM AND DANCE STUDIO, 2601 SKYWAY DRIVE, UNIT C, U-2006-021.** Review of a conditional use permit to allow the establishment of a ballroom dance studio in an existing building located in a PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Industrial) zoning district, Assessor’s Parcel No. 111-730-002. This project qualifies for a Class I categorical exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: Brian Halvorson)

**ACTION:** By motion, approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the Preliminary Draft of the Conditional Use Permit as amended. Vote: 4-0.

Ms. Peggy Woods presented the staff report, for a conditional use permit for King’s Ballroom Dance Studio, to occupy an existing tenant space in a multi-tenant building located at 2601 Skyway Drive, Unit C. This is the Fairsky Industrial complex. There are currently seven tenant industrial buildings located on approximately 10.1 acres. The site of the proposed dance studio is located on the southwest corner of Fairway Drive and Skyway Drive. This site is approximately 1.61 acres in size. The zoning is PD/M-1 (Planned Development/Light Manufacturing). The dance studio would occupy 2,835 square feet of the 19,710 square foot building. No exterior changes to the building are proposed. There are 61 existing parking spaces on the project property.

Ms. Woods stated that the proposed dance studio would include a reception area, one office, four bathrooms, and the dance area. A small water/coffee area bar would also be located adjacent to the dance floor with eight tables and chairs for patron seating.

No employees are proposed at this time, since the business is to be owner operated. However, there may be a need in the future to hire one employee.

The dance studio hours of operation would be from 1:00 p.m. through 10:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The applicant’s suspected client age group would range from 35 to 60 years of age.

The parking requirement for the dance studio is based on the similar use provision that is identified in the Zoning Ordinance, and that is for vocational training schools, which is one space for each faculty member or employee and one space for each two students, based on the busiest time of the day. The parking requirement for the group classes would be 22 spaces. The parking requirement for the Friday or Saturday night dance parties and the once-a-year special events would be one space for each 32 square feet of dance space, plus one space for each 260 square feet of gross floor area. Based on this ratio, a total of 59 parking spaces would be required for the dance parties. The once-a-year special event is expected to generate a maximum attendance of 96 people. Due to the limited parking on-site, staff is recommending that the applicant obtain written approval from the Community Development Department for each special event, and that the approval is reviewed by all pertinent departments, such as Police and Fire.

Ms. Woods concluded the staff report and was available for questions.

Commissioner Hunter clarified that there would only be one special event per year. She also stated that, rather than have the applicant apply every year for the special event, that they only review the application if a complaint is filed.

Mr. David King, 1107 South Miller, applicant, stated that the special events would be during times when the other tenants were unlikely to be there, such as Saturday afternoons or evenings. The events would consist of several dance studios meeting to have dance competitions or exhibitions. Mr. King explained that while they did request one special event per year, he would eventually like two or three per year. These are "well dressed" events and would draw people from other cities, as well as locals. He stated that he would indeed appreciate not having to go through the Planning Commission for each of these events.

Commissioner Hunter stated that she felt that the City should encourage this type of event that doesn't involve alcohol and loud music, and since it is located in an industrial zone, would not disturb local residents.

Commissioner Moats requested more information regarding what demographics Mr. King would target that the dance studio would appeal to with regard to age. He also inquired as to the type of music involved.

Mr. King stated that they have been operating out of the YMCA for years and their normal demographics consists of couples aged 40 and up. As for music, there is no Rap or Hip-Hop played; in fact, his idea of modern music is a few selections from the 80s.

Commissioner Hunter asked Mr. King exactly how many special events he would like. He responded by stating that the maximum would be five a year.

Chair Everett opened the floor to public comments and questions. No one came forward. He then closed the public hearing. Chair Everett asked how the conditional use permit could be reworded to resolve the special event issue.

Attorney Wendy Stockton proposed the following modifications to Special Conditional Use Conditions, Item number 6:

*Special Events: Due to the expected patronage (96 people) of the special events, and the limited parking on-site, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Community Development Department prior to the first special event. A special event permit shall be reviewed and approved by various City Departments. If the City receives complaints, as a result of these special events, the City may schedule a modification or revocation proceeding.*

Following a discussion regarding the rewording, the commissioners and applicant agreed upon the Special Events condition.

Chair Everett called for a motion for approval. Commissioner Hunter made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for King's Ballroom and Dance Studio, 2601 Skyway Drive, Unit C, U-2006-021, with the amendment to Item 6, Page 3, as read into the record by Wendy Stockton, and subject to the conditions and the preliminary draft of the Conditional Use Permit. Commissioner Moats seconded the motion and it was carried, 4-0.

**ITEM 5 – CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR SAHAGUN TOWING STORAGE YARD AT 609 WEST BETTERAVIA, U-2004-048, E-2003-018.** Review of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the establishment of a tow truck storage yard with office, parking and landscaping in the CM (Commercial Manufacturing) zoning district. Assessor's Parcel No. 117-760-04. The project is a class 32 categorical exemption. No further environmental review is required. (Project Planner: John Shoals)

**ACTION:** By motion this item was continued to the August 2, 2006, public hearing. Vote: 4-0.

Bill Shipsey presented the staff report for the Conditional Use Permit application to allow the establishment of tow truck storage yard and vehicle storage facility with office, on-site drainage, landscaping, fencing and screening at 609 West Betteravia Road. The property is located in a CM industrial zoning district on the northeast corner of Betteravia Road and Depot Street (extended). The applicant is proposing to create a storage yard, which will eventually include a parking lot, fenced areas, a basin and a refurbishment of the existing structure on the property.

The applicant is proposing to complete this project in two phases. The first phase involves the location of an API trailer (approximately 10 by 24) located on the project site behind a block wall. It would include a temporary accessible bathroom, fencing, landscaping and parking lot. There would be additional fencing as required. The back portion of the property would be a dirt based cement, which could be quickly and efficiently removed.

The second phase of the project would involve refurbishing the existing building on the site and continuation of the wall when Depot Street is extended.

Mr. Shipsey stated that there are some revisions to the Conditional Use Permit, Items 5, 6, and 7 as follows:

***Item 5: (Addition)***

*"The wall may be made of substitute materials approved in advance by the Community Development Department. The applicant shall deposit improvement security, in a form and amount acceptable to the City Attorney's Office, to guarantee timely construction of the wall within six months of project approval."*

**Item 6: (Addition)**

*“The wall may be made of substitute materials approved in advance by the Community Development Department. The applicant shall deposit improvement security, in a form and amount acceptable to the City Attorney’s Office, to guarantee timely construction of the wall prior to the completion of Depot Street right-of-way improvements.”*

**Item 6: (Deletion)**

*“The future wall height, materials, designs, and landscaping shall be reviewed at a Planning Commission study session.”*

**Item 7: (Addition)**

*“A. Outdoor repair, storage, display and sales prohibited.*

- 1. No outside vehicle repair is proposed or permitted.*
- 2. No outside storage of inoperable or unregistered vehicles is proposed or permitted.*
- 3. No outside vehicle display or sales are proposed or permitted; provided, however, that towed vehicles may be kept on the premises if totally enclosed by required fencing.”*

**Item 7: (Deletion)**

*“The Planning Commission shall review building elevations, materials and colors at a future study session.”*

Mr. Shipsey concluded stating that this project is a Class 32 exemption, and staff recommends approval of the project. Staff and Roger Olds were then available for questions.

Commissioner Moats asked if curbs and gutters would be installed on Betteravia Road. Mr. Olds stated that all improvements were included in the proposal. That would include widening Betteravia Road to its ultimate width, with curbs, gutters, sidewalks and street lights. Mr. Olds further stated that no improvements were being required for the frontage of the extended Depot Street, but that they must dedicate the land to the City for the extension of Depot Street.

Commissioner Hunter requested clarification regarding the existing building. Mr. Shipsey stated that the building would be remaining; it would be landscaped and within a year of approval, would be refurbished to serve as the office.

Commissioner Brown mentioned a memo initiated by Attorney Wendy Stockton, regarding the applicant, Mr. John Sahagun, and prior problems with code enforcement.

Attorney Stockton stated that Mr. Sahagun and his property at 609 West Betteravia was the subject of a long standing special investigation from Code Compliance and Code Compliance Officer Zeke Moreno. She further stated that, according to Office Moreno, in the past there have been problems regarding Mr. Sahagun meeting code compliance, especially where it involves expensive repairs or modification. Therefore, the revisions to Items 5, 6 and 7 of the Conditional Use Permit were added so that the Planning Commission would have more flexibility in enforcing the use permit.

Mr. Brown asked Attorney Stockton how she intended to make the applicant comply with the conditions in the Conditional Use Permit. He asked how they would force the applicant to stay on track.

Attorney Stockton stated that in the past, "force" has not been a successful strategy with Mr. Sahagun. He has been a leisurely sort of applicant. The compliance board asked Mr. Sahagun to attend every meeting and give report updates and they imposed large fines over his head. She suggests that they schedule regular hearings with the applicant, they can conduct code compliance proceedings, but the best way is for the applicant simply to do what he's supposed to do when he's supposed to do it.

Senior Civil Engineer, Roger Olds' only comment at this time was to mention that he had spoken with Mr. Sahagun prior to the meeting. Mr. Sahagun told Mr. Olds that he is in agreement with the conditions.

Mr. John Sahagun, 311 S. Bradley Road, the applicant, addressed Number 8, Section A, Subsection (1) of the Conditional Use Permit. He claims that this was a last minute addition, which concerns him, but he agrees to everything in the "etc.", as he doesn't want to be thrown a curve with additions such as traffic lights. He stated that he has set aside funds sufficient to complete the project as proposed, but is concerned with additional "etc." costs.

Chair Everett said that he felt confident that they could remove the "etc." from this item. He stated that as construction progresses there may be additional things requested by the Planning Commission, but they will work with the applicant.

Mr. Sahagun is also concerned with the Project Description in the Staff Report regarding "Customers picking up their vehicles will not be allowed on the site and must make arrangements to have the vehicles transported to an agreed upon location." He said that it would be difficult to run this kind of a business if customers were not allowed on site.

Mr. Shipsey stated that this was simply a description, not a condition. He stated that, for the record, he was willing to say that the staff report is in error in this description and that staff is not opposed to customers coming onto the site.

Commissioner Hunter asked Attorney Stockton if there was some way to rescind the use of the temporary trailer, if the applicant falls behind on the scheduled improvements, rather than wait for the 19 month trailer use condition to run out.

A discussion followed regarding building costs and projections, and the applicant's concern that the cost of the Betteravia Road street improvement now falls on him. It was decided that this project should be continued to the next Planning Commission hearing, so that Mr. Sahagun, Mr. Olds, Mr. Montoya (agent), and Chair Everett can meet and discuss the street improvement costs.

Commissioner Hunter asked if the City will do the street improvements if the applicant does not do them. Mr. Olds replied that if the property does not become a building site, then the City will wait until somebody does build on the site or there is a public works project to widen Betteravia Road before installing the gutter, sidewalks, and street lights.

Chair Everett then opened the floor for public comments and questions.

Mr. Bob Engel, 745 West Betteravia Road, the adjacent property owner, stated he is concerned about the feasibility of the project. He stated that with all the setbacks and street dedications on the Depot Street extension, the existing building on the property will be cut in half. Mr. Engel also questions whether the property has water and if drainage and sewage are available on the

property. He stated that while building on this site will be an improvement, it will be financially prohibitive.

Mr. Olds said that the dedication on this property for Depot Street is only 10 to 15 feet, which would include the road, sidewalk, street lights, and other necessary services. So, while the existing building would be close to the corner, it would still be within compliance. He continued by stating the property does have existing two-inch water and sewer lines. Also, there would be no AB1600 fees at this time, since Mr. Sahagun is not adding square footage to the existing building. If there is new construction on the property in the future, then the owner would be responsible for payment of AB1600 fees.

Mr. Engel was not entirely convinced the project would be feasible with the street extension and requested a meeting with Mr. Olds to go over the maps and drawings.

Chair Everett called for a motion to continue this matter to the next meeting. Commissioner Moats made a motion to continue the Conditional Use Permit for the Sahagun Towing Storage Yard at 609 West Betteravia, U-2004-048, E-2003-018, to the August 2, 2006, meeting. Commissioner Brown seconded and the motion passed, 4-0.

**ITEM 6 – INTERPRETATION FOR TRACT 5629, CANYON PARCEL MAP, SP-2006-016.**

Request for a Planning Commission interpretation that Planned Development Permit Z-85-41 (PD) applies to three additional single family dwellings on three separate lots in the Canyon Homes Subdivision, Tract 5629, located on Canyon Drive, Assessor's Parcel Nos. 128-025-057, 128-025-058, and 128-025-059. (Project Planner: Peggy Woods)

**ACTION:** Adopted Resolution No. 2428, making an interpretation that Planned Development Permit Z-85-41 (PD) applies to three additional single family dwellings on three separate lots in the Canyon Homes Subdivision as amended. Vote: 4-0.

Ms. Peggy Woods presented the staff report stating that the Planning Commission make an interpretation that an existing Planned Development Permit would apply to 3 additional single family dwellings on three separate lots.

She informed the Commissioners that in 1986 the project site initially received a Planned Development Permit for the Canyon Homes Subdivision (Z-85-41, Tract 5466) for 51 "zero side yard style" single family homes and a water basin. In 1991, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the tentative map for the Canyon Parcel Map, Tract 5629, which re-subdivided the water basin (Lot 29) into three small single family residential lots. A deed restriction was placed on each lot which stated that only one unit was allowed per lot, the architectural and site design must be consistent with the Canyon Homes Project, and that prior to any development, a Planned Development Permit should be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Woods stated that staff feels that the existing Planned Development Permit (Z-85-41 PD) for the additional three single family dwellings does not necessitate processing a new Planned Development Permit. The Engineering Division, Fire Department and Recreation and Parks Department have reviewed the conditions of Tract 5629, and agree that it adequately addresses the design of the project. Therefore these departments have no further conditions.

The applicant acknowledges and agrees to be subject to the conditions of Planned Development Permit, Z-85-41 (PD).

The applicant was not present.

Chair Everett then opened the floor to the public for comments and questions. No one came forward.

Commissioner Hunter stated that her research showed that a Homeowners Association was never formed for the Canyon Homes Project (Tract 5466), probably the only thing the Association would have done was maintain the basin area, and that was transferred to the City. She would like to see that the CC&Rs that rule the original 51 homes be applied to the three homes being built. That would guarantee a consistency throughout the development.

Wendy Stockton stated that she did not have a copy of the CC&Rs for the original development and asked where they would have been listed. Unfortunately, no one knew whether they were written.

Commissioner Hunter suggested that wording should be added to the Resolution that states, "If the area is subject to CC&Rs, that the applicant would agree to incorporate those same CC&Rs recorded against this project."

Chair Everett closed the hearing requested a motion for resolution. Commission Hunter made a motion for Resolution No. 2428, for the interpretation of Tract 5629, Canyon Parcel Map, SP-2006-016, that the Planning Commission interpretation of the Planned Development Permit, Z-85-41 (PD), applies to the three additional single family homes, on separate lots in the Canyon Homes Subdivision, Tract 5629, located on Canyon Drive, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 128-025-057, 128-025-058, and 128-058-059, be approved with an addition that the applicant agrees to create CC&Rs to incorporate the same restriction that are on the existing Canyon Drive homes. Commission Moats seconded the resolution and it passed, 4-0.

**ITEM 7 – LA VENTANA I DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, SP-2006-017.** That the Planning Commission will consider the staff recommendation to adopt a resolution recommending to City Council approval of a Development Agreement for the La Ventana I project and if the City and Developer enter into a Development Agreement, the Developer can efficiently provide additional traffic improvements the community needs now. In turn, the City can reimburse the developer for construction costs that exceed the developer's fair share. The Developer is Inland Pacific Builders. (Project Engineer: David Whitehead)

**ACTION:** By motion, continued this item to the August 2, 2006, public hearing. Vote: 4-0.

The developer requested that this item be continued.

Chair Everett called for a motion. Commission Moats made a motion to continue the La Ventana I Development Agreement, SP-2006-017, to the Planning Commission Meeting of August 2, 2006. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion and it was carried, 4-0.

### **ITEM 8 - REPORTS ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS.**

Ms. Peggy Woods reported on the City Council Meeting of July 18, 2006.

The Cale-West Street Subdivision was continued to the City Council meeting on August 1, 2006, so that the applicant could review the survey of the property in more detail.

The item relating to Alcohol Beverage Control was continued to the City Council meeting on August 1, 2006. This relates to a request from the Community Development Department to not bring ABC Licenses before the City Council which are generally just note and file items that the City Council really has no authority to approve or deny. The other approximately 5% of ABC Licenses that are reviewed and require a finding of public convenience and necessity would still go before the City Council.

---

Mr. Bill Shipsey reported that the City Council approved that Rick Sweet will move from Public Works Engineering to Utilities and they will recruit for a new Public Works Engineering Director.

Attorney Wendy Stockton mentioned that the most recent City Council meeting videos can now be viewed on the City's website.

**ITEM 9 – ORAL REPORTS OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF.**

Chair Everett asked why Seaward could not be extended to Suey Road. He feels that as the City continues developing toward the east, this would help traffic flow. Roger Olds replied that it is not part of the current Circulation Element at this time. Bill Shipsey stated that it could be added when the Planning Department updates the Circulation Element, which will happen sometime after the Housing Element and Land Use Element.

---

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m. to a Study Session on July 20, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. in the Community Development Department conference room, 110 S. Pine Street, Santa Maria.

---

Respectfully submitted,

---

PEGGY WOODS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION