

**CITY OF UNION CITY
MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OF JUNE 5, 2008, 7:00 P.M.
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF CITY HALL
34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD, UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA**

I. ROLL CALL: Commissioners Lew, Panlilio, Singh, Sweeney and Chairperson Anderson

STAFF: Mark Leonard (Director, Economic and Community Development); Carmela Campbell (Senior Planner); Avalon Schultz (Assistant Planner); Mike Rodriquez (City Attorney); Farooq Azim (Principle Civil Engineer); Kris Fitzgerald (Administrative Assistant).

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The regular Planning Commission Minutes of May 15, 2008 were approved as submitted.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

IV. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. CONTINUED HEARINGS: None.

B. NEW HEARINGS:

- 1. T-MOBILE, 31224 UNION CITY BOULEVARD, Use Permit UP-04-08 and Administrative Site Development Review ASD-07-08; the applicant, T-Mobile, is requesting approval of a Use Permit (UP-04-08) and Administrative Site Development Review (ASD-07-08) to install a 60 foot monopole disguised as a pine tree and related ground equipment at the Union City Sports Center located at 31224 Union City Boulevard (APN: 463-0045-064-002). This project is considered categorically exempt under Section 15303, Class 3, New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.**

Avalon Schultz, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Lew stated that she went to Hayward to look at the monopine and was pleased with the appearance of it. Commissioner Lew noted that the monopine in Hayward is set in a concrete base and surrounded by a chain link fence and asked whether the monopine in Union City would have the same set up.

Ms. Avalon replied that the applicant did not propose a concrete slab or a fence for this project.

Commissioner Lew stated that she would prefer not to have the fence or the slab.

Commissioner Lew noted that section V, findings, needs to be corrected because it does not include the finding on page 6, number 3.

Commissioner Lew noted that on page 9 it should not be a modified Use Permit and the number needs to be corrected and add ASD-07-08.

Commissioner Lew noted that the reference in number 2 should be “Civic Facility” and not “Community Commercial”.

Ms. Schultz suggested that the required findings on page 6 could be referenced in the motion.

Chairperson Anderson noted that the CEQA reference is incorrect and the zoning district referenced is incorrect.

Commissioner Sweeney asked what the correct CEQA section should be.

Chairperson Anderson replied that it should be 15303, Class 3, and the zoning district should be CF.

Commissioner Sweeney noted that the monopine proposed is at the limit required to provide service and what would happen if another company wanted to co-locate on this monopine.

Ms. Schultz stated that it would depend on the demands of a future carrier. Ms. Schultz stated that the design of the monopine would not preclude co-location.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to condition #6 and asked if it should be specified that the socks will have faux needles attached.

Ms. Schultz stated that language can be added.

Commissioner Sweeney also suggested adding to the condition that the applicant maintains the faux needles in a reasonably good condition.

Ms. Schultz suggested adding it to condition #15 that covers tree maintenance.

Commissioner Singh asked if there had been any comments or complaints from the neighbors of this project.

Ms. Schultz replied that a notice was sent to all owners and residents within a 300 foot radius of the Sports Center parcel and no comments were received.

Commissioner Singh asked if there will be more added to the antenna in the future.

Ms. Schultz stated that any new additions would require another review.

Commissioner Singh noted that no on-site landscaping is proposed and asked what will happen.

Ms. Schultz replied that the site has already been landscaped so no further landscaping is needed.

Commissioner Singh asked if there will be a pathway or walkway to get to the cabinet from the Sports Center.

Ms. Schultz replied that there is an existing walkway that goes near the project site and that no new walkway is proposed.

Commissioner Singh stated his concerns that in rainy weather the repairpersons could track mud to the Sports Center or the street.

Commissioner Panlilio asked how heavy the monopine is.

Commissioner Panlilio asked how sturdy is the monopine and if it falls could it hit any nearby structures.

Ms. Schultz deferred to the applicant to answer those questions.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing.

Amy Million, T-Mobile, 85 Folsom St, Suite 106, San Francisco, CA, stated that she is unable to answer about the weight of the pole but the poles are structurally calculated and built per the Uniform Building Code. Ms. Million stated that the footing is quite substantial and the branches don't add much weight to the pole and they generally don't fall over. Ms. Million stated that they are designed to withstand winds of up to 150 mph.

Commissioner Panlilio asked how is the pole in the placed in the ground.

Ms. Million replied that it will have a concrete footing and will be deep enough to withstand the 60 feet that is above ground. Ms. Million stated that all of the construction documents and calculations will be submitted to the Building Department for approval.

Mark Leonard, Director, Economic and Community Development, stated that this structure does require a building permit with appropriate structural calculations that will be reviewed by the plan checker prior to the issuance of the building permit.

Ms. Million stated that she has read the conditions of approval including the modifications made this evening and agree to them. Ms. Million stated that she brought in samples of the materials that will be used for the monopole.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public hearing.

Ms. Schultz read back the changes to the conditions of approval:

- Change condition #6 to add to the last sentence "The antenna socks include faux pine needles".
- Change condition #15 adding a sentence "The antenna socks shall be maintained and kept in good repair for the longevity of the lease".

Ms. Schultz stated that the Planning Commission would be approving Use Permit UP-04-08 and Administrative Site Development Review ASD-07-08 and making the following findings:

1. That the project is considered categorically exempt per Section 15303, New Construction or conversion of small structures of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

2. That the proposed location of the conditional use is in accord with the purpose of Title 18 and the purpose of the CF, Civic Facility, Zoning District.
3. That the proposed location of the conditional use and the condition under which it would be operated and maintained would not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.
4. That approval of the project is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable Specific Plan and the purposes of Administrative Site Development Review as outlined in Section 18.72.010.

Chairperson Anderson asked if there is a specific section in the General Plan that could be cited for finding #4.

Ms. Schultz replied the General Plan has specific descriptions of each zoning district including the Civic Facility zone and basically you are finding that it is not in conflict with any General Plan policies.

Chairperson Anderson stated that there is not much listed in the CF zone.

Ms. Schultz replied that the CF zone has very few standards because it is designed for the City to build and develop and staff is not aware of any inconsistencies with the General Plan.

Chairperson Anderson stated that is inconsistent with what was stated for finding #4.

Ms. Schultz replied that it can be done that way.

Chairperson Anderson stated that he wants to make the finding accurate.

Mike Rodriguez, Assistant City Attorney, stated that “not inconsistent” is “consistent” and that is the standard language.

Chairperson Anderson stated that he was hoping to get a specific reference to a title, goal or policy.

Ms. Schultz suggested the land use element.

Chairperson Anderson stated that he did not find anything there that applied.

Mr. Leonard stated that they could say that it is consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan.

Chairperson Anderson would agree to that change.

Commissioner Lew made a motion to approve Use Permit UP-04-08 and Administrative Site Development Review ASD-07-08, making findings 1 - 4, with modified conditions of approval and adopt a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Panlilio seconded.

AYES	5 (Anderson, Lew, Panlilio, Sweeney, Singh)
NOES	0

ABSTAIN 0
ABSENT 0

2. **HUANG’S HEALTH CENTER, 1719 and 1725 DECOTO ROAD, Modification of Use Permit UP-12-05a:** the applicant, Lu Huang, is requesting modification of Use Permit (UP-12-05) approval for Huang’s Health Center, currently located at 1719 Decoto Road, to expand into the adjacent tenant space at 1725 Decoto Road (APN: 486-0051-007-00) and offer additional health related services. This project is considered categorically exempt under Section 15301, Class 1(a), Existing Facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Avalon Schultz, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if the business will be open during the renovation.

Ms. Schultz suggested asking the business owner.

Commissioner Singh asked how often the facilities are checked by the police.

Ms. Schultz stated that annual background checks are performed and they perform intermittent checks.

Commissioner Singh asked if the Chinese herbs are related to the acupuncture and do they need a special permit.

Ms. Schultz replied that she believes that the herbs are ingested like a supplement and that they are not going to be performing acupuncture on site.

Commissioner Singh noted that there is an acupuncture clinic by the McDonalds that also has Chinese herbs and the smell is very strong and stated that he is concerned about the smell.

Ms. Schultz stated that this site was a retail outlet herb store prior to its vacancy and it is allowed in the commercial zone.

Commissioner Lew referred to condition #3 and asked why the portion concerning building permits was omitted from the standard condition.

Ms. Schultz replied that the use is not contingent upon the building permit as they are not building anything. Ms. Schultz stated that they will receive building permits for the tenant improvements.

Mark Leonard, Director, Economic and Community Development, stated condition #11 also references building permits.

Commissioner Lew stated her concern that about when the Use Permit will expire and it is contingent on “within one year that the use is established or that a building permit is issued and construction is commenced”. Commissioner Lew stated that it is a standard clause and asked why it was left off.

Ms. Schultz stated that it is standard for site development applications to reference building permits but Use Permits it is more the commencement of the use. Ms. Schultz stated that someone could move into a space and start using it without needing any building permits. Ms. Schultz stated that it is more correct to reference the Use rather than a building permit.

Commissioner Lew stated that she doesn't believe that they will be able to commence with the use until they get the building permit and are allowed to refurbish the site.

Ms. Schultz stated that the language could be added back in but the reason it was omitted was because this doesn't include any sort of administrative site development review or site development.

Commissioner Lew stated that she is concerned that the year might expire and they won't have finished the renovation to the space including moving the front door.

Ms. Schultz stated that if they didn't complete the work within one year they would need to apply for an extension of the Use Permit so the way the condition is worded is accurate. Ms. Schultz stated that the use must be commenced within a year regardless of the time it takes to perform tenant improvements.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #10 and asked where the new references came from.

Ms. Schultz replied that in January 2008 the City adopted the International Building Code as the codes that the City reviews building plans by.

Chairperson Anderson asked if the International Building Code, Uniform Code and local ordinances are different.

Mr. Leonard stated that they are different and the City uses a combination of these codes.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #13 and asked if it is a duplicate of condition #10.

Ms. Schultz replied that the fire codes are separate from the building codes and should be left in.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Sweeney referred to the shower facility and asked if there is a place for the user to put their personal items to keep them from getting wet.

Lu Huang, 1719 Decoto Road, Union City, CA, replied there is a place to put them.

Commissioner Sweeney noted that the space is only 3 feet by 4 feet and it is very small.

Ms. Huang stated that there is a locker for them to put their belongings in.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if they would be open during the renovation.

Ms. Huang stated that they would be closed during renovation.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Leonard read back the change to the condition:

- Change condition #3 to read “The modified Use Permit approval shall expire one year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless building permits have been issued and the use has been established and is active.

Commissioner Panlilio made a motion to approve modification of Use Permit UP-12-05a, making findings 1 - 4, with modified conditions of approval and adopt a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Lew seconded.

AYES	5 (Anderson, Lew, Panlilio, Sweeney, Singh)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	0

3. **LUCKY MONEY, 31854 ALVARADO BOULEVARD, Use Permit UP-06-08;** The applicant, Lucky Money, is requesting approval of a Use Permit (UP-06-08) to allow Lucky Check Cashing to operate a check cashing facility at 31854 Alvarado Boulevard together with an existing check remittance business and travel agency that is currently operating at this location. This project is categorically exempt under Section 15301, Class 1(a), Existing Facilities, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Carmela Campbell, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that this particular shopping center already has a check cashing business and that this would allow a second one in close proximity to an existing business. Commissioner Sweeney asked if staff had spoken to anyone at the existing business whether this would have an impact on their business. Commissioner Sweeney stated that we try to be protective of existing business.

Ms. Campbell replied that is true and in that conversation that came up. Ms. Campbell stated that the nature of this business is to augment the existing business and so the customers would most likely be in the facility for other business. Ms. Campbell stated that they may be serving a more specific client.

Commissioner Sweeney asked if they are going to have signage that advertises “check cashing to the general public”.

Ms. Campbell replied that the applicant has not indicated that they want to add any signage.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that she does not have a problem with it in terms of it being an addition to their business however she is concerned about an overconcentration of one particular service.

Commissioner Sweeney proposed adding a condition that prohibits the applicant from changing their signage to include “check cashing” because if it is being offered as part of a service that existing customers will take advantage of then their existing customers will know that when they are inside the building. Commissioner Sweeney stated that she doesn’t want to see this turn into something that creates a problem for an existing business.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if that would be exterior signage.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that is correct.

Commissioner Singh asked if they will have bullet proof windows or glass on the outside.

Ms. Campbell stated that they already have bullet proof glass.

Commissioner Singh asked if they will be installing any surveillance cameras outside the door.

Ms. Campbell stated that they are not. Ms. Campbell stated that the Police Department has indicated that the cameras should be inside the building.

Commissioner Singh asked if they are going to have a window sign that says “check cashing”.

Ms. Campbell stated that based on Commissioner Sweeney’s proposal they would not be able to advertise even on the window signage.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that is her intention. Commissioner Sweeney stated that if this is in addition to the business that they already do and they want to offer additional services to people who are already using their business. Commissioner Sweeney stated that she doesn’t want to see an overconcentration of one particular service and that by changing their exterior signage to include it that might be the perception of the public.

Commissioner Singh asked if they could put a sign in the interior.

Commissioner Sweeney replied that would be fine.

Commissioner Sweeney noted that the sign they have now “Lucky Money” is a fairly generic term and it is not advertising any specific service.

Ms. Campbell stated that it goes back to the name of the overall company that all of these parent companies are under is “Lucky Money”.

Commissioner Panlilio noted that part of their signage also includes “Lucky Tours”.

Commissioner Panlilio stated his concerns about security and the fact that there is no camera pointing out to the area outside. Commissioner Panlilio stated that the clients might be mugged and there is no surveillance. Commissioner Panlilio stated that many of the check cashers would be older people and they would be vulnerable to muggers.

Commissioner Panlilio proposed having a camera that points to the outside of the store.

Mark Leonard, Director, Economic and Community Development, suggested that it could be handled by adding a condition requiring an exterior camera. Mr. Leonard pointed out that this will be the area that will be getting a police substation within the next two years. Mr. Leonard stated that it will be built by the entrance off of Alvarado Boulevard.

Commissioner Singh concurred with adding a camera outside.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing.

Barry Ferrier, 32212 Allison Way, Union City, CA, seconded the requirement for an outside camera for the business noting that this has been a high crime area.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Leonard suggested the following condition “The applicant shall install a camera with recording equipment and other security measures to the front exterior of the building prior to the effectiveness of this Use Permit. The equipment and location shall be approved by the Union City Police Department.

Mr. Leonard read the following additional condition “The applicant shall be prohibited from changing their exterior signage or adding additional signs to advertise “check cashing”.

Commissioner Sweeney made a motion to approve Use Permit UP-06-08, making findings 1 - 4, with modified conditions of approval and adopt a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Lew seconded.

AYES	5 (Anderson, Lew, Panlilio, Sweeney, Singh)
NOES	0
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	0

- NARINDER DEOGUN, 33724 5TH STREET, Extension of Time for Tentative Parcel Map TPM 8812 and Site Development Review SD-03-06;** the applicant, Narinder Deogun, is requesting a 12-month extension of time for Tentative Parcel Map TPM 8812 to subdivide a 10,000 square foot lot located at 33724 5th Street (APN: 486-0009-052) into two (2) 5,000 square foot lots and Site Development Review SD-03-06 to construct two (2) 3,010 square foot single-family residences that include an attached secondary dwelling unit. This project is categorically exempt under Section 15303, Class 3, New Construction, and Section 15315, Class 15, Minor Land Divisions, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Carmela Campbell, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Singh referred to condition #11 and asked why the applicant is being required to provide different window styles on the homes.

Ms. Campbell stated that at the time of the original approval staff was trying to avoid a cookie cutter appearance of the houses.

Commissioner Singh asked if the applicant is going to demolish the existing residence and build two new homes.

Ms. Campbell replied that originally that was the case but now the applicant is considering retaining the existing residence by making modifications to it to meet the current zoning code, which may require further development approvals from the City.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that the Commission is to decide tonight on a time extension for the parcel subdivision and the construction of two new homes. Commissioner Sweeney stated that until the applicant presents a different plan to the commission the fact that he has indicated that he might change his mind has nothing to do with the commission's decision this evening.

Ms. Campbell stated that is correct.

Commissioner Lew asked why is condition #2 being revised if Commissioner Sweeney is correct.

Ms. Campbell replied that the applicant does have the ability for the Site Development Review to expire but we have to move forward with the previous Site Development Review because the way the ordinance is worded it will automatically be extended. Ms. Campbell stated that taking that into consideration staff did slightly modify the Site Development Review to accommodate a future condition that would require additional approval.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that what we have before us is the subdivision and the two houses, however, there is no requirement that an applicant construct both of the houses. Commissioner Sweeney stated that this is permission to construct but the applicant could build just one house and do something different on the other lot but he would have to come back for approval if he did that.

Ms. Campbell stated that originally when we were modifying this condition it started out by saying we were just deleting the wording "the existing house shall be completely demolished". Ms. Campbell stated that we wanted to get rid of that wording because the applicant would not have the flexibility in the future to not demolish the existing residence and then staff went on to add the additional wording, which may be what is causing the confusion.

Commissioner Lew asked whether this approval would also approve the modified conditions.

Ms. Campbell stated that is correct.

Commissioner Lew asked if the City Council approved the last recommendation from the Planning Commission without any changes.

Ms. Campbell stated that she does not believe so.

Commissioner Lew stated that there was not a copy of the previous City Council Resolution in the Planning Commission package.

Commissioner Lew stated that findings 5 and 6 in the June 1st 2006 report were omitted from this report and asked if those findings need to be included.

Ms. Campbell clarified that between the time of the first approval and this action a Municipal Code amendment was enacted that modified the findings which made them a lot cleaner. Ms. Campbell stated that what is in the current staff report is what is required by the ordinance.

Commissioner Sweeney asked if we revised the findings to take out in association with a Site Development Review that the proposed project is attractive, well-designed and will enhance the neighborhood due to good residential design, adequate landscaping and the provision of other amenities. Commissioner Sweeney stated that she finds it hard to imagine that we struck that.

Ms. Campbell clarified that was never a finding. Ms. Campbell stated that sometimes planners added different things in that were not required. Ms. Campbell stated that is one reason that the findings were clarified so they would be consistent. Ms. Campbell stated that the finding could be added back if the Planning Commission wants to .

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #2 and stated that the end of it could have been deleted.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that he could choose to demolish it and build the two houses, which is what the original approval was for.

Mark Leonard, Director, Economic and Community Development, stated that the “or” should stand.

Mike Rodriquez, Assistant City Attorney, stated that it is an “either/or” proposition. Mr. Rodriquez stated that they will either fix up the existing residence or completely demolish the existing residence.

Chairperson Anderson replied that is what he was going to do in the first place.

Mr. Rodriquez stated that is correct.

Chairperson Anderson stated that this is giving him permission to do what he was approved to do.

Mr. Leonard replied that is correct.

Ms. Campbell stated that if he decides to move forward with that. Ms. Campbell stated that we are trying to give him a little flexibility because he has not decided what he is going to do.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing.

Mr. Singh, 3400 Stevenson Blvd., Fremont, CA, stated that he is speaking on behalf of the owner. Mr. Singh stated that they paid approximately \$6500.00 for the first approval. Mr. Singh stated that now they have to pay \$4000.00 and asked if they can get some help there. Mr. Singh wanted to know why they have to pay the fees again.

Mr. Leonard asked which fees he is referring to.

Mr. Singh stated they are the application fees.

Mr. Leonard stated the fees are to cover the costs for the second hearing, post notices for the hearing, pay for time and materials related to the project.

Mr. Singh referred to the underground requirement and stated that if you look at the aerial view he doesn't think that neighborhood is going to have any other new homes and so just one house will have underground and all the rest will have overhead for the next 50 years and he doesn't feel that is right.

Chairperson Anderson asked staff if that was a change from the original approval.

Ms. Campbell stated that the City Council determined, absent of a comprehensive process to underground in the Decoto Neighborhood, that this would be the most effective way to try to get the utilities underground as the majority of the housing stock will turn over at some point.

Chairperson Anderson stated that he interprets the question from the applicant as “what is the authority to make a change just to him and not on anyone else”.

Ms. Campbell stated that the project was originally conditioned to underground the utilities so there is really no change.

Mr. Leonard stated that the way we eventually accomplish undergrounding is to do it on a project by project basis as they come forward for discretionary approvals. Mr. Leonard stated that condition is added to all projects that come before the Planning Commission in accordance with the new policy and sections of the Municipal Code.

Mr. Singh suggested that at some time in the future there will be a requirement to underground everything and he does not think the owners are going to foot the bill to do that after x amount of years.

Chairperson Anderson stated that it won't be done that way.

Mr. Singh asked if they can keep the existing house by making changes to meet the zoning code.

Chairperson Anderson replied that as soon as the Planning Commission makes a decision.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that she is not in support of this application. Commissioner Sweeney stated that she did not support it before and she still does not support it. Commissioner Sweeney stated that she is kind of surprised that the finding having to do with the relationship to the neighborhood is not in fact a finding and is no longer applicable because it is on that basis that she thinks that the project before us, which is for the two homes, is outsized in relationship to its neighbors. Commissioner Sweeney stated they are very large houses, they are identical with very minor changes between the two of them and they don't relate well to the other homes around them. Commissioner Sweeney stated that she will oppose it as she did before on the same basis even though that is not one of the findings.

Commissioner Lew made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of a 12 month extension of time for Tentative Parcel Map 8812 and Site Development Review SD-03-06, subject to the stated conditions and making findings 1 - 6, and adopt a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Singh seconded.

AYES	4 (Anderson, Lew, Panlilio, Singh)
NOES	1 (Sweeney)
ABSTAIN	0
ABSENT	0

VI. SUPPLEMENTAL STAFF REPORTS:

A. CONTINUED REPORTS: None.

B. NEW REPORTS:

1. STUDY SESSION

Review proposed Municipal Code Amendment to Title 5, *Business Licenses and Regulations*, to establish a Green Food Packaging Ordinance (Chapter 5.38) that would prohibit all Union City restaurants and food vendors from using polystyrene foam disposable food service ware.

Carmela Campbell, Senior Planner and Avalon Schultz, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

The planning commissioners provided feedback to staff.

Ryan Kenny, American Chemistry Council, 1121 L Street, #1328, Sacramento, CA, 95835, spoke in opposition to the proposed ordinance.

George Wall, Dart Container, 102 Holstrom Circle, Novato, CA 94947, spoke in opposition to the proposed ordinance.

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 for June 19, 2008.

IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER:

Commissioner Lew stated that she went to Marina Foods and noticed that there is a lot of litter in the parking area and asked what is the policy for shopping centers to keep their sidewalks and parking lots clean.

Mr. Leonard stated that litter is addressed in the property maintenance ordinance and staff will make a request to management to do a better job of keeping the center clean.

Commissioner Sweeney stated that this is her last Planning Commission meeting because she is moving out of Union City and thanked the commissioners and staff. Commissioner Sweeney stated that it has been a great ride for these 14 long years. Commissioner Sweeney gave the following advice "These folks over here are doing their best to give you some good ideas and advice, we represent the City, it's not a contentious situation between the staff and commission. We are all here to move the City forward, so try to work together."

Mr. Leonard thanked Commissioner Sweeney on behalf of the staff for her many years of service to the community.

Chairperson Anderson thanked Commissioner Sweeney for her service.

X. ADJOURNMENT: 9:50 p.m.

APPROVED:


TIKISA ANDERSON, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:


MARK LEONARD, SECRETARY