

**CITY OF UNION CITY
MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2006, 7:00 P.M.
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF CITY HALL
34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD, UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA**

- I. ROLL CALL: Commissioners Savage, Sison, Sweeney and Chairperson Lew
ABSENT: Commissioner Anderson**

STAFF: Mark Leonard (Director, Economic and Community Development); Carmela Campbell (Senior Planner); Janice Lum (Assistant Planner); Avalon Evans (Assistant Planner); Farooq Azim (Principal Civil Engineer); John Bakker (City Attorney); Kris Fitzgerald (Administrative Assistant).

- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The regular Planning Commission Minutes of August 17, 2006 were approved submitted.**

- III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

- IV. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

- V. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. CONTINUED HEARINGS: None.**

- B. NEW HEARINGS:**

- 1. CITYWIDE, Zoning Text Amendment AT-05-06, the City is proposing to update Title 18, of the Municipal Code to:**

- Establish more specific findings for Administrative Site Development Review and Site Development Review (Chapters 18.72 and 18.76)
- Establish a Variance process for additions of more than 50% of the existing square footage to nonconforming single-family residences (Chapter 18.16)
- Re-establish a senior housing parking standard in the Residential Districts chapter (Chapter 18.32)
- Modify the Planned Unit Development chapter (Chapter 18.44) to include industrial planned unit developments

This project has been determined to be categorically exempt per Section 15061(b 3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Avalon Evans, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to section 18.72.070 and asked if the wording is sufficient to ensure that the requirements are met.

Ms. Evans replied that staff will always review the applicable criteria.

Commissioner Sweeney asked if that includes everything.

Ms. Evans stated that it would include all requirements.

Commissioner Sison referred to 18.16 and asked why 50% was chosen as the target percentage.

Ms. Evans replied that staff feels that 50% is an appropriate threshold to capture significant remodels and it is also consistent with the Fire Department's requirement for fire sprinklers. Ms. Evans explained that if you add more than 50% of the square footage it triggers a requirement for fire sprinklers.

Commissioner Sison asked what the process would be if the remodel or repair is less than 50%.

Ms. Evans replied that if it is a one-story addition then it would be handled through the building permit process and if it is a two-story addition then it would go through the Administrative Site Development Review process.

Commissioner Sison asked what makes the process different for a non-conforming structure if it is less than 50%.

Ms. Evans stated then they would not need a Variance for the non-conforming part, it would be grandfathered in.

Commissioner Sison stated that if they need to get a Variance for the non-conforming feature of the property, they must also conform to section 18.60.060, which would put them in non-conformance and asked how the Planning Commission would be able to approve a Variance because the feature would be non-conforming.

Ms. Evans replied that this doesn't say that the Variance is likely to be granted in most cases it just allows for the process in rare cases where it might be applicable. Ms. Evans stated that it is not adding to the list of things that you can get a Variance for in the code.

Commissioner Sison gave an example situation where the basic home is 990 square foot home, the addition is 500 square feet to the rear, but the side property line is only 2 feet which is non-conforming.

Ms. Evans stated that it would be because of site constraints which would allow the commission to make the finding.

Carmela Campbell, Senior Planner, stated that legal non-conforming also applies to residences that were built before the City had setbacks. Ms. Campbell gave an example of a residence that is 3 feet from the property line and it was placed there due to an obstruction, then the commission could review the Variance findings and make them.

Commissioner Sison stated that the Variance is not for the addition but for the existing condition.

Ms. Campbell replied that is correct.

Chairperson Lew opened the public hearing.

Chairperson Lew closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Sweeney made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council Zoning Text Amendment AT-05-06, making findings 1 – 3, and adopting a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Savage seconded.

AYES	4 (Lew, Savage, Sison, Sweeney)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	1 (Anderson)

- MOBILE MEDIA CALIFORNIA, LLC., 34400 MISSION BOULEVARD, Use Permit UP-07-06 and Administrative Site Development Review ASD-38-06;** the applicant is requesting Use Permit (UP-07-06) approval and Administrative Site Development Review (ASD-38-06) approval to install a new omni antenna on an existing 90' monopole and place related ground equipment in an existing enclosure on the Masonic Home property located at 34400 Mission Boulevard (APN: 087-0031-003-03 and 087-0031-003-02). The property is zoned A, Agricultural. The project has been determined to be Categorically Exempt per Section 15301, Existing Facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Avalon Evans, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sison asked if there was a previous application regarding this monopole.

Ms. Evans replied that the previous application was to extend the height of the monopole and it was denied.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #10 and asked if that includes the dish as well as the omni antennas.

Ms. Evans replied that is correct.

Commissioner Sweeney asked if the monopole is going to be painted.

Ms. Evans stated that it is only for the new equipment to be painted.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that based on the size of the little antenna it probably will not be very visible regardless what color it is painted.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #20 and asked why it only refers to the 800 mhz frequency. Commissioner Sweeney noted that in the future if police and fire should change to a different spectrum we would still not want the cell equipment to interfere. Commissioner Sweeney asked to remove the specific frequency (800 mhz) and add Fire Department to the condition.

Commissioner Savage stated her concern that if the trees that are currently around the pole are removed it will be difficult to conceal a pole standing all by itself. Commissioner Savage noted that it will take a long time for new trees to grow that tall. Commissioner Savage asked if staff had any ideas on camouflage for the pole.

Ms. Evans stated that she does not know of anything that could camouflage the pole. Ms. Evans stated that eucalyptus trees are a threat for fire hazards and we would prefer to consider the life safety issues above the visibility issue. Ms. Evans stated that there are no plans to remove the trees in the near future.

Chairperson Lew opened the public hearing.

Chairperson Lew closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Savage made a motion to approve Use Permit UP-07-06 and Administrative Site Development Review ASD-38-06, making findings 1 – 6, with modified conditions of approval and adopting a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Sweeney seconded

AYES	4 (Lew, Savage, Sison, Sweeney)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	1 (Anderson)

- THU-NGUYET MOON PHAM, 4191 HORNER ST., Tentative Parcel Map TPM 9004 and Variance V-01-06;** the applicant is requesting approval of a Tentative Parcel Map, TPM 9004, to subdivide a 18,612 square foot property located at 4191 Horner St. (APN: 482-0010-019) into three (3) parcels. The applicant is also requesting approval of a Variance, V-01-06, to allow for substandard lot widths for all three (3) parcels and substandard lot areas for Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. A Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project has been prepared and has determined that with incorporation of mitigation measures, the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Janice Lum, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sweeney asked how staff will ensure that the new home on lot #3 will be similar in character to the existing homes.

Ms. Lum replied that staff is working with the applicant and have seen some proposed drawings for lot #3 and they are very similar to the existing homes.

Mark Leonard, Director, Economic and Community Development, stated that a condition could be included to that effect.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that her preference would be to add something that would state what the expectation is.

Commissioner Sweeney asked about the street improvements along the rear of the parcels and noted that there is gravel and dirt portion of road. Commissioner Sweeney asked how much of the road is going to be paved by the current applicant and also by the owner of the parcel adjacent to this property that was recently approved.

Ms. Campbell replied that typically when Public Works requires improvements, it is usually the improvements that are directly adjacent to the parcel that is going to be subdivided. Ms. Campbell stated that the goal is that when the property owners on the other side of the street come in for development will put in similar improvements on their 30 foot half of the street.

Commissioner Sweeney pointed out that directly behind parcel #2 there is an existing carport and paved driveway. Commissioner Sweeney asked if that property is not included in the proposed improvements to connect to Coventry Way.

Farooq Azim, Principal Civil Engineer, replied that the proposed tract will conform to some limit at Maiden Lane. Mr. Azim stated the applicant will only have to make improvements to a certain point and Public Works has not determined that point. Mr. Azim stated that the point may be 5 to 10 feet into the existing Maiden Lane. Mr. Azim stated that there will be some future project that will improve the rest of Maiden Lane, especially along the north side and add sidewalk, curb and gutter.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that she wants to make sure that the pavement meets. Commissioner Sweeney stated that it should be pavement that is at least two lanes wide.

Mr. Azim stated that if there is a gap the City will make sure that it is completed.

Mr. Leonard stated that the applicant of this subdivision was required to pave a full width street to connect to Maiden Lane. Mr. Leonard stated that the applicant of this parcel was required to pave a portion of Maiden Lane adjacent to their land.

John Bakker, City Attorney, stated that the other property that has already been approved is required to make the connection if they subdivide. Mr. Bakker stated they need to have public street access as a thoroughfare so they will have to complete all of the improvements.

Mr. Leonard stated that there will be an area that will be unimproved because legally the owner of the other property can be required to pave a full width street but the property owner of this subdivision cannot be required to do an off-site improvement because it is not part of their land. Mr. Leonard stated that they will only have to pave to the middle of the street and then the responsibility to pave the rest will fall on either the other property owners or the City.

Mr. Bakker agreed with that.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that she is concerned that there is going to be a portion of the street that is not paved.

Mr. Bakker stated that they will be required to pave the street but not provide the curb, gutter and sidewalk.

Mr. Azim stated that is correct.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that she understands that the curb, gutter and sidewalk on the other side will be the responsibility of the other property owner.

Mr. Leonard stated that we need to properly condition this application so that there is no misunderstanding with regards to the pavement of the entire width of the street excluding on the north side the cure, gutter and sidewalk.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that whatever combination gets the entire street paved will be fine.

Mr. Bakker stated that typically in a parcel map improvements off-site cannot be required. Mr. Bakker stated that the City can only require improvements that are directly adjacent to the property, so the requirement will only be to the center of the street. Mr. Bakker stated that he was referring to the

previously approved subdivision map and their connection and they can be required to fully improve Maiden Lane and make the connection off-site.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that this parcel map cannot achieve that goal.

Mr. Bakker stated that is correct.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #5 and asked if the applicants could build a larger garage than is specified in the condition.

Mr. Leonard stated that it should read a “minimum” size of garage.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #9 and asked what buildings will be used for the valuation for the general plan cost recovery fee.

Mr. Leonard stated that it would be based on the garage for the existing home and on the vacant lot it will be based on the new home and garage.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #18 and asked which street will have the addresses painted on the curb.

Ms. Lum replied that it would be just on the frontage at Horner Street.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #22 and noted that it should also include the new home to be built on the new empty lot.

Commissioner Sweeney asked if the freestanding detached garages will require fire sprinklers.

Ms. Campbell replied that the garages will be subject to Administrative Site Development Review and it would be determined if they need fire sprinklers at that time.

Commissioner Sweeney asked if the usual condition about debris boxes would also be included in the later conditions.

Chairperson Lew referred to condition #22 and asked if there is overhead service to the existing home.

Ms. Lum replied that is correct.

Chairperson Lew noted that generally the condition is for new service and not the existing buildings.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that this condition had been changed at the last commission meeting.

Chairperson Lew stated that it should be looked at on a case-by-case basis and for this project it would be more appropriate to state “no new overhead service”.

Chairperson Lew referred to conditions #14, 15, and 17 and asked if these conditions apply to the existing homes.

Ms. Lum replied that they would only be applicable to any new structures to be built.

Chairperson Lew asked to clarify that they are only applicable to any new buildings.

Mr. Leonard suggested wording of “each new building, including garages” for condition #14.

Chairperson Lew suggested wording of “new building pads, including garages” for condition #15.

Chairperson Lew suggested “prior to final inspection for the new buildings and garages” for condition #17.

Chairperson Lew noted that Maiden Lane is currently not a standard width roadway and asked when the road is improved with sidewalks will the City require an easement from these property owners to make the roadway the standard width.

Farooq Azim, Principal Civil Engineer, replied that they are requiring enough dedication on the south side frontage so that in the future if there needs to be an upgrade to the width of the street the City will be ready. Mr. Azim stated that in the future they will have to deal with the property owners on the north side.

Chairperson Lew asked if this will line up with the Coventry project.

Mr. Azim stated that it will.

Chairperson Lew asked if they are going to eventually require a standard width for Maiden Lane.

Mr. Azim stated that the City will have to have a proposal to widen and upgrade the street.

Chairperson Lew asked if there is anything in the budget or redevelopment plans for this street.

Mr. Azim replied not that he is aware of.

Chairperson Lew asked if the existing fences are on the proposed property lines.

Ms. Lum stated that they are close but may have to be adjusted.

Mr. Leonard stated that the fences have been put with the agreement of the owners and may have to be moved.

Chairperson Lew asked if staff is going to require a survey.

Ms. Lum stated that the parcel map shows the new property lines and the existing fences are just a little off.

Chairperson Lew asked if the commission should condition the map to require the fences to be replaced when the survey is done.

Mr. Leonard stated that we could add a condition specifying this.

Chairperson Lew agreed to add a condition to cover this.

Chairperson Lew asked the status of the other project on Coventry.

Ms. Campbell stated that the commission approved an extension of time about 3 months ago.

Chuck Ludwig, Fremont Engineers, Fremont, CA, stated that the applicant agrees with the conditions as stated in the staff report. Mr. Ludwig stated that this is a good project and the applicant doesn't want to have to deal with anything past the centerline of the street. Mr. Ludwig stated that the applicant does not want to build the new house as small as the other two houses.

Commissioner Sweeney noted that the only change the commission made is to relocate the fence between the two existing homes.

Mr. Leonard stated a new condition that reads "the applicant shall design the new home on lot #3 in the historic architectural character of the adjacent homes".

Mr. Ludwig stated that the applicant would agree to that.

Chairperson Lew asked if the owner is planning on selling the other two lots after the map is approved.

Moon Pham, applicant, thanked the commissioners. Ms. Pham stated that she may sell at least one of the parcels.

Chairperson Lew closed the public hearing.

Mr. Leonard reviewed the changes to the conditions of approval:

- Add a new condition "the side yard fences shall be relocated onto the newly established property lines.
- Add a new condition "the applicant shall design the new home on lot #3 in the historic architectural character of the adjacent homes".
- Change condition #14 "soils report shall be provided for each new building, including the garages".
- Change condition #15 "the new building pads, including the garages. . ."
- Change condition #17 "prior to final inspection for the building and garages . . ."
- Change condition #18 "the applicant shall provide painted addressing on Horner Street curbs".
- Change condition #22 "the applicant shall underground all utility lines providing service to the garages and the new house on parcel #3. No new overhead services to the property shall be permitted."
- Change condition #5 "minimum of 20' x 20' interior clearance".

Commissioner Sison made a motion to adopt the mitigated Negative Declaration and associated Mitigation monitoring program and made a motion to recommend to the City Council approval of Tentative Parcel Map TPM 9004 and approve Variance V-01-06, making findings 1 – 10, with modified conditions of approval and adopting a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Savage seconded

AYES	4 (Lew, Savage, Sison, Sweeney)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	1 (Anderson)

4. **PAUL BUNTON, 4312 DYER ST., Modification to Tentative Tract Map 7668 and Site Development Review SD-04-05**; the applicant is requesting a modification to Tentative Tract Map No. 7668 to create a 16 unit residential

condominium project with common area and a modification to Site Development Review, SD-04-05, approval for the architectural design and site layout of five (5) separate building which will contain a total of 16 residential condominiums, where 15 units were approved on November 22, 2005. The project site is located at 4312 Dyer Street (APN: 483-0073-002-02). The property is zoned RM 2500, Multi-Family Residential. This project is considered Categorically Exempt per Section 15332, Class 32, In-Fill Development of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Avalon Evans, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #21 and asked why the community facility fee has the landscaping requirement when there will be a homeowners association that should cover the landscaping maintenance.

Ms. Evans stated that the words “in the development” could be stricken from the condition and then the CFF fee would just cover the landscaping in the public right of way.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #26 and noted that it also covers landscaping in the public right of way and that another condition also has the stormwater maintenance covered by both fees.

Ms. Evans stated that this application will have to be reviewed by the City Council and staff will clarify which entity is responsible and ensure that there is no overlap.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that conditions #21, #26, #67 and #81 will need to be clarified as to who is responsible for which maintenance.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #23 and asked if that is referring to the chain link fence.

Ms. Evans stated that it would refer to the chain link fence.

Commissioner Sweeney asked why we would allow them to replace the chain link fence as the last time this project came before the commission they did not want the chain link fence at all.

Ms. Evans asked what the commission would prefer.

Commissioner Sweeney stated either wrought iron or wood.

Ms. Evans suggested that the condition could preclude using chain link.

Commissioner Sweeney agreed with that.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #65 and asked which alternative is going to be required.

Mr. Leonard replied that the applicant cannot dedicate parkland so they will pay the in-lieu fee.

Commissioner Sweeney asked why the bedroom tax is included.

Mr. Leonard stated that is not applicable.

Ms. Campbell stated that it only applies to non-subdivided property.

Chairperson Lew asked if staff discussed bay friendly landscaping guidelines with the applicant.

Ms. Evans replied that the condition is included but the applicant has not been given the guidelines. Ms. Evans noted that the landscaping guidelines will be given out with the building permit application.

Chairperson Lew stated that she noted that there is no requirement in the conditions for bay friendly landscaping.

Ms. Evans stated that it is in condition #24.

Chairperson Lew opened the public hearing.

Sandrine Hitchcock, applicant, stated that the only modification made to the project since the last approval was to add a unit so that they can provide the third affordable unit.

Chairperson Lew asked if the applicant is in agreement with all of the conditions of approval.

Ms. Hitchcock replied that they are in agreement.

Chairperson Lew stated that she was sorry to lose the tot lot but she likes the project as it is.

Hugh McNamara, Union City, stated that he was glad to see that the weeds on the lot were mowed down and that the applicant has gotten a permit to demolish the old buildings. Mr. McNamara stated his concerns with parking in the area around the site. Mr. McNamara stated that it should say in the CCR's that the new owners have to use their garages to park their cars due to the lack of street parking in the area. Mr. McNamara stated that the City should go after the abandoned cars in the area.

Chairperson Lew closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Sweeney made a motion to recommend that the City Council approve the modification to Tentative Tract Map 7668 and modification to Site Development Review SD-04-05, making findings 1 – 5, with modified conditions of approval and adopt a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Sison seconded

AYES	4 (Lew, Savage, Sison, Sweeney)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	1 (Anderson)

VI. SUPPLEMENTAL STAFF REPORTS:

A. CONTINUED REPORTS: None.

B. NEW REPORTS:

- 1. RUDY PARRA, 33755 15TH STREET, Administrative Site Development Review ASD-36-06; the applicant, Rudy Parra, is requesting approval of Administrative Site Development Review ASD-36-06 to construct a new one-story 2,817 square foot single family residence located at 33755 15th Street**

(APN: 486-0057-005). This project has been determined to be Categorical Exempt per Section 15303, Class 3(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Janice Ms. Lum, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Savage asked what is meant by three stucco coat.

Ms. Lum replied that it is three coats of the same color to provide more intense and resistant color finish.

Commissioner Sison asked if the existing fence to be replaced is between two properties.

Ms. Lum stated that is correct.

Commissioner Sison asked if the owner of the other property will have to agree to build the new fence.

Mr. Leonard replied that fences on property lines belong to both property owners and the neighbor next door will have to agree to any repairs or upgrades. Mr. Leonard stated that if one party is building a new house that party will build the new fence.

Rudy Parra, Parra Builders, stated that he thinks the fence will have to come down for grading the lot. Mr. Parra stated that he will match the fence in the front. Mr. Parra explained that for three coat stucco the final coat has the color.

Commissioner Savage stated that she likes the house because it is not too big and it fits into the neighborhood.

Mr. Parra stated that they are trying something new with the stone.

Commissioner Sweeney thanked him for another well designed project.

Chairperson Lew asked if he has seen the final tract map.

Mr. Parra stated that they have a copy.

Chairperson Lew asked if the fences are in the right places.

Mr. Parra stated that they are not.

Chairperson Lew asked if that was all the fences.

Mr. Parra stated that when they do the grading for the drainage they will relocate the fences.

Chairperson Lew asked when the owner purchased the lot.

Mr. Parra replied about 13 months ago.

Chairperson Lew asked if there was a structure on the property before it was sold.

Mr. Parra replied that he does not remember a house on the lot but there might have been a garage.

Commissioner Sweeney made a motion to approve Administrative Site Development Review ASD-36-06, making findings 1 – 7, with stated conditions of approval and adopting a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Savage seconded.

AYES	4 (Lew, Savage, Sison, Sweeney)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	1 (Anderson)

- ANGELO DELA CRUZ, 5013 ANAHEIM LOOP, Administrative Site Development Review ASD-32-06**; the applicant, Angelo Dela Cruz, is requesting approval of Administrative Site Development Review ASD-32-06 to construct a new two-story 3,478 square foot single family residence located at 5013 Anaheim Loop (APN: 543-0425-007). This project has been determined to be Categorically Exempt per Section 15303, Class 3(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Janice Ms. Lum, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #11 and noted that in the staff report the property already has full front yard landscaping.

Ms. Lum stated that the condition could be deleted.

Commissioner Sweeney stated we should keep the condition and have the applicant submit a plan showing the current landscaping. Commissioner Sweeney wants to make sure that the landscaping is still in good condition after the construction is completed.

Ms. Lum stated that the section that requires bay friendly landscaping should be deleted.

Chairperson Lew asked why are the conditions for the fees not included in the event the property is sold.

Ms. Lum stated that the capital facilities fee is required for a new unit on a vacant lot and the affordable housing in this case doesn't apply because it is a one for one replacement.

Chairperson Lew asked about the park facility fees.

Ms. Campbell replied that the park facility fees come into play when the final subdivision is approved and would not apply to a single site development.

Chairperson Lew asked even if the home is not owner occupied and is sold do any of these fees apply.

Ms. Lum replied that they do not.

Commissioner Savage made a motion to approve Administrative Site Development Review ASD-32-06, making findings 1 – 7, with modified conditions of approval and adopting a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Sison seconded

AYES 4 (Lew, Savage, Sison, Sweeney)
NOES 0
ABSTAIN 0
ABSENT 1 (Anderson)

VII. REDEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REPORTS: None.

VIII. COMMISSION MATTERS:

- A. Follow-up on Planning Commission referrals to the City Council.
- B. Upcoming applications for the Regular Planning Commission meeting of September 21, 2006.

IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER:

Commissioner Sweeney noted in the September/October issue of the Sierra Club Yodeler, there is an article on solar electric permit fees in the North and East Bay. These are the fees that would be charged to install a standard single home photovoltaic system and they range from a low of \$3.00 in Mill Valley to the very high \$1,074.00 in Union City. Commissioner Sweeney asked why this is.

Mr. Leonard stated that we are fully aware of the article and the City Council has directed staff to look at solar photovoltaic fees. Mr. Leonard stated that an amendment to the fee schedule will be presented to the City Council as soon as it is ready. Mr. Leonard stated that he believes that some of the data in the article is inaccurate; taking for example the \$3.00 fee in Mill Valley that probably does not include all the building permit fees.

Chairperson Lew stated that these were some of the best staff reports that she has reviewed and thanked staff for doing a good job.

X. ADJOURNMENT: 8:50 p.m.

APPROVED:

JO ANN LEW, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

MARK LEONARD, SECRETARY