

**CITY OF UNION CITY  
MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
OF APRIL 16, 2009, 7:00 P.M.  
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS OF CITY HALL  
34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD, UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA**

**I. ROLL CALL: Commissioners Raymond Gonzales Jr., Jo Ann Lew, Froilan (Roy) Panlilio, Gurnam (Gary) Singh, and Chairperson Tikisa Anderson**

**STAFF:** Joan Malloy (Economic and Community Development Director); Carmela Campbell (Planning Manager); Kit Faubion (Assistant City Attorney); Kris Fitzgerald (Administrative Assistant).

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The regular Planning Commission Minutes of March 19, 2009 were approved as submitted.**

**III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

**IV. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. CONTINUED HEARINGS: None.**

**B. NEW HEARINGS:**

- 1. CANDLEWOOD SUITES, 31140 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD, Site Development Review SD-01-09, Variance V-01-09; the property owner, Lotus Hotels-Union City, Inc. is seeking Site Development Review (SD-01-09) approval for the construction of an 88-room extended stay hotel and a parking Variance (V-01-09) to reduce the required parking demand for the site. The project site is located at 31140 Alvarado-Niles Road (APN: 463-0060-028) and is developed with an existing hotel. The City has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project.**

Carmela Campbell, Planning Manager, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if the second driveway would still be open after the building is constructed.

Ms. Campbell replied that it would remain.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if there would be signage on the sides of the building.

Joan Malloy, Director, Economic and Community Development replied that the project is limited to two building signs and typically applicants put a sign on the front of the building and one on the side.

Commissioner Panlilio noted that the plans show three signs.

Ms. Malloy replied that there is a condition of approval that limits the project to two signs.

Commissioner Panlilio asked how emergency services would access the rear of the hotel.

Ms. Campbell replied that the emergency services would not be able to access the property from the rear.

Ms. Malloy stated that there would be walkways behind the building.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if the two hotels would be sharing a trash enclosure.

Ms. Campbell replied that each property will have it's own trash enclosure.

Commissioner Panlilio asked where the trash enclosures would be located.

Ms. Campbell pointed out the locations on the site map.

Commissioner Panlilio noted that there is a large metal storage container at the back of the Holiday Inn Express that might be in the way of construction.

Commissioner Panlilio asked how many elevators would the new hotel have.

Ms. Campbell replied that there would be two elevators.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if truck parking would be allowed during construction by the Holiday Inn Express. Commissioner Panlilio noted that when he went by the property today he saw a semi taking up seven or eight spaces.

Ms. Campbell replied that if the construction cannot be accommodated on site along with the truck parking then we cannot allow it. Ms. Campbell stated that the goal is to maintain adequate parking for the hotel.

Commissioner Panlilio stated his concern for the safety of patrons during construction and the big trucks accessing the site.

Ms. Campbell replied that construction safety is a concern and when staff reviews the building permit they ask for staging information to ensure that no one is in danger.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if there would be temporary fencing between the Century theater property and the project site. Commissioner Panlilio stated his concerns about children going onto the construction site if it is not fenced off.

Ms. Malloy replied that typically during construction the site is fenced off and enclosed and locked to deter vandalism and theft. Ms. Malloy stated that there is usually a construction trailer on site that is used as a office during the daytime and when there is construction of the hotel they will still need to maintain fire access and clearance around the existing hotel at all times.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if the site is enclosed in a fence won't that decrease the number of available parking spaces.

Ms. Malloy stated that the applicant has not submitted a staging plan.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if there would be security cameras installed by either property owner.

Ms. Campbell replied that the Police Department did not indicate that it was necessary but the commission can ask for a condition if they desire.

Commissioner Panlilio stated his concerns that the increase in cars parked there will lead to an increase in criminal activity.

Commissioner Singh asked if there would be special parking for commercial trucks after the project is completed.

Ms. Campbell replied that due to the size of the trucks a large number of parking spaces for cars would be taken out. Ms. Campbell stated that if you want to provide truck parking then the Variance would have to be modified to accommodate that.

Commissioner Singh noted that he sees one or two semi-trucks parked in the lot almost every day and feels that it will be a problem in the future.

Ms. Campbell stated that it may be accommodated through the truck parking condition. Ms. Campbell stated that the applicant indicated that truck parking is appropriate during low occupancy times, typically from Friday to Sunday and perhaps the project could be conditioned to allow truck parking only during those times.

Commissioner Singh asked how close is the trash enclosure to the new building.

Ms. Campbell stated it is about thirty feet from the new building.

Commissioner Singh asked if it needs to be sprinklered.

Ms. Malloy replied that since it is more than five feet away from the building it currently does not need to be sprinklered but the Fire Department will review the building plans before construction.

Commissioner Singh asked what size and color the gazebo will be.

Ms. Campbell replied that the applicant has not submitted plans for that part of the project and staff would like to wait for the public art submittal because they are looking at the area as a whole.

Commissioner Singh asked about the window size.

Ms. Campbell replied that they were widened and maybe a little longer.

Commissioner Singh asked where the bicycle parking would be located.

Ms. Campbell replied that it would probably be in front.

Commissioner Lew noted that many of the mitigations from the Initial Study were included in the conditions of approval, however, Measure 9-1 was not included in the report.

Ms. Campbell replied that essentially all the mitigations are included as conditions of approval. Ms. Campbell stated that through the Initial Study there was a conflict with a land use requirement and that could be a potentially significant impact with respect to CEQA. Ms. Campbell stated that to mitigate this potentially significant impact if the Variance is not approved then the project has to be redesigned and that mitigates it to a less than significant impact.

Commissioner Lew stated that she only found that language in the Initial Study and she is concerned that this project can have enough parking at that location if the Variance is not approved. Commissioner Lew stated that the conflict in the language is not clear.

Commissioner Lew asked if the applicant can provide the parking that is required.

Ms. Campbell replied that there are ways to deal with it.

Ms. Malloy stated that the applicant would have to reduce the number of rooms in order to accommodate the parking.

Commissioner Lew stated that she feels there is a conflict between the Variance and the applicant stating that he can meet the parking requirement and if that is true then why is the Variance necessary.

Ms. Campbell stated that if the Variance isn't granted the project likely wouldn't be built.

Kit Faubion, City Attorney, stated that the language states that for the purposes of CEQA that if the Variance isn't adopted then they need to revise the project so that it does meet the standards. Ms. Faubion stated that doesn't approve that revised project, it doesn't mean that the applicant gets a free ride on it, the applicant would have to revise the project and come back to the City to show how it would work with the parking. Ms. Faubion stated that the mitigation measure is not intended to say that there is a project that would meet the parking standards.

Commissioner Lew noted that she found some errors in the Initial Study and asked if it would be revised.

Commissioner Lew referred to page 22, first paragraph, first line and stated there is a reference to Union Sanitary District and on the third line there is a reference to Alameda County Water District. Commissioner Lew believes that the second reference is incorrect.

Ms. Campbell replied that she would correct it.

Commissioner Lew referred to the next paragraph on the same page, and noted that there is a reference is to Atlantic Street and she doesn't believe that is correct.

Ms. Campbell replied that it should read "Alvarado-Niles Road".

Commissioner Lew referred to the same page and noted that there is no mention of recycling services for this project and asked if there will be.

Ms. Campbell replied that this checklist only requires complying with Federal, State and local statutes for solid waste but it would be advantageous to mention Tri-Ced, although Allied Waste does provide recycling services. Ms. Campbell suggested adding "recycling" to the language.

Commissioner Lew asked if there is a four-story limit on this parcel.

Ms. Campbell replied that there is a height limit of 100 feet.

Commissioner Lew asked why the building wasn't designed with another floor in order to meet the parking Variance.

Ms. Malloy referred the question to the applicant.

Commissioner Gonzales asked if this project would impact the Holiday Inn Express and the dental office parking.

Ms. Campbell stated that the Variance would apply to the new hotel. Ms. Campbell stated that parking for the dental office and Holiday Inn Express can be accommodated. Ms. Campbell stated that logistically it appears that the parking supply on-site can accommodate all of these uses.

Commissioner Gonzales asked if there is any issue of putting them out of compliance with emergency services accessing the site.

Ms. Campbell stated that the site will maintain a 26-foot wide access road, which is consistent with the Fire Department requirements.

Commissioner Gonzales asked if there will be a new entrance for the hotel.

Ms. Campbell stated that is correct.

Commissioner Gonzales asked if there is a driveway for the dental office.

Ms. Malloy replied that both of the driveways are existing. Ms. Malloy stated that the one near the new hotel site might shift slightly to accommodate the new hotel.

Commissioner Gonzales stated his concerns for traffic entering and exiting the hotel onto Alvarado-Niles Road, which is a very busy street.

Chairperson Anderson asked if TJKM consultants did a traffic study in 2006.

Ms. Campbell stated that is correct.

Chairperson Anderson asked if that is the most recent study done on this project.

Ms. Campbell replied that it was the most recent traffic counts and intersection analysis and then the updated traffic study relied on those previous counts to determine that there was no change in background conditions and they could use those counts.

Chairperson Anderson asked when the study was done did it include the four story hotel or was it based on some smaller use.

Ms. Campbell stated that it was based on a different use that resulted in more traffic generation and the hotel has a lower traffic generation rate.

Chairperson Anderson asked how will they know what the rates are going to be since they don't have a study.

Ms. Campbell clarified that the trip generation rates are in the current study and they do look at the hotel.

Ms. Malloy stated that the background traffic rates are from 2006 and what is layered on top is the hotel.

Chairperson Anderson asked if that was the Holiday Inn Express.

Ms. Malloy replied that it is the proposed project.

Chairperson Anderson asked if they looked at the proposed hotel use or a retail/office space use.

Ms. Campbell replied they looked at an 89-suite hotel and determined that it would generate 436 daily trips.

Chairperson Anderson asked why the hotel was not mentioned in the study.

Ms. Campbell explained that trip generation was done for the office/retail space and it was determined that it would generate 496 daily trips and have no significant impact. Ms. Campbell stated that since the trip generation for the hotel was only 436 daily trips it was determined to have no significant impact.

Chairperson Anderson asked if the study looked at a residence hotel or a hotel with 86 rooms.

Ms. Campbell replied that they described it as an 89 all-suites hotel.

Chairperson Anderson asked if there is a difference in trip generation for a residence hotel versus a regular hotel.

Ms. Campbell stated that it is possible but the traffic engineer is not here this evening.

Henry Louie, City Engineer, stated that each category is different.

Ms. Campbell noted that on the first page of the report they state they are analyzing the "Holiday Inn Express".

Ms. Malloy stated that it is described as a business hotel and indicates that 560 daily trips are generated. Ms. Malloy stated a trip generation for an all suites hotel is listed in the report and it is slightly different.

Chairperson Anderson asked if there are any studies that gives a comparison between the parking demand impact on a hotel with guests that stay one or two nights compared to a hotel where the guests may stay a month.

Mr. Louie noted that there are different trip generations for business hotels and all-suites hotels.

Ms. Campbell stated that in the parking report there is listing parking demands for hotels versus all-suites.

Chairperson Anderson asked how they know that the peak parking demand for the hotel occurs when the dental office is closed.

Ms. Campbell stated that it was based on the analysis in the parking study.

Mr. Louie referred to page A-4 of the parking study and for a business hotel the rate is 0.71 and for an all-suite hotel the rate is .1.1.

Chairperson Anderson noted that there is a statement in the staff report that says that it is ok to share the parking because when the hotel needs the parking basically is at a time when the other tenants don't and would like to know how staff came to that conclusion.

Mr. Louie stated that trip generation and parking are based on daily statistics.

Chairperson Anderson asked how can the Planning Commission be sure that it can rely on that 2006 traffic study to evaluate the parking demands for the hotel.

Mr. Louie stated that they did a comparative study with the 2006 traffic study, which was very conservative and the trip generations.

Commissioner Singh asked what are the peak hours.

Ms. Malloy replied that for a hotel it would probably between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Singh noted that the dental office is usually open until 7:00 p.m. or 8:00 p.m. Commissioner Singh stated his concern that the study did not include this.

Ms. Campbell replied that it would be better to ask the person who did the study but is not here this evening.

Chairperson Anderson asked if it could create a public safety hazard if there is not enough parking. Chairperson Anderson stated his concerns that there is not enough evidence to support these numbers because the numbers are based on a hotel use.

Ms. Campbell stated that who it will really impact is the hotel owner, if they cannot accommodate parking for all their patrons. Ms. Campbell stated that having a Transportation Demand Program (TDP) in place in case parking problems arise.

Chairperson Anderson stated that if they can't base their decision on the analysis or evidence then it may seem like we are just granting a special privilege and not doing the job.

Chairperson Anderson referred to page 10, second to the last sentence and asked to have the sentence rewritten so that the requirement is not on the agency but on the applicant.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #23 and asked to have the last sentence fixed.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #56 and asked if it might be a duplication of condition #23.

Ms. Malloy replied that there is some overlap but condition #56 identifies the original Site Development Review for this area which established the merchant association and is included to be consistent with all approvals for Union Landing. Ms. Malloy noted that the PIB came along after.

Chairperson Anderson asked if condition #23 could reference condition #56.

Chairperson Anderson asked if a PBID is the same as a merchant's association.

Ms. Malloy replied that they are not the same. Ms. Malloy stated that the merchant's association is an informal group.

Ms. Malloy noted that condition #23 is very specific and conditions #56 and 57 are very general. Ms. Malloy recommended modifying conditions #56 and 57 rather than modifying condition #23.

Ms. Malloy suggested adding "consistent with the certified EIR for Union Landing".

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #38 and #59 and feels that they are duplicates.

Ms. Campbell replied that the difference is that the Police Department did not want all of the plans, just the ones that were necessary for them.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #43 and noted that this is the only condition that refers to a “developer” and perhaps it should be changed to “applicant” to be consistent with the other conditions.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #44 and asked to change it to read “shall” instead of “to”.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #54 and noted “developer” should be changed to “applicant”.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #85 and asked to change it to read “shall be”.

Chairperson Anderson referred to condition #94 and asked if the word “plans” needs to be clarified.

Mr. Louie stated that it is a general term.

Ms. Malloy stated that the approving agencies will make very clear to the applicant what they need for approval.

Chairperson Anderson referred to specific finding #2 and suggested it needed to be clarified.

Ms. Campbell replied that the wording is directly out of the California Environmental Quality Act and it is a finding that has to be made by the decision making body to say that changes to the mitigations are not significant and it does not need to be re-circulated.

Chairperson Anderson referred to specific finding #12 and noted that “since the proposed use is” is in the sentence twice.

Chairperson Anderson referred to Exhibit B, section 4, table on 6-24, and noted that the box was not checked.

Ms. Campbell replied that it should be box “A”.

Chairperson Anderson referred to #15, transportation and traffic and stated that it needed the box checked.

Ms. Campbell stated that it would be changed.

Chairperson Anderson opened the public hearing.

Bhupin Amin, 31140 Alvarado-Niles Rd., Union City, thanked the commission and staff for their help and review. Mr. Amin stated his qualifications and what his family does. Mr. Amin stated that the properties are family owned. Mr. Amin stated that a Candlewood Suites is an upper mid-scale extended stay hotel. Mr. Amin stated that it is designed for corporate travelers who need to stay longer than usual. Mr. Amin stated that the Holiday Inn Express historically had a lot of business from trucking. Mr. Amin stated that for the 77-room hotel they have 174 parking spaces plus the  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre lawn area in the back and have been able to accommodate truck parking. Mr. Amin stated that as demand grows he hopes that they will be able to displace the trucks with regular patrons. Mr. Amin stated that during construction they will make sure the site is very secure. Mr. Amin stated that all their hotels have security cameras and so will the new property. Mr. Amin stated that this hotel will cater to corporate customers and will probably

have lower trip generation and parking demand. Mr. Amin stated that when they updated the parking report the consultants used a worse case scenario. Mr. Amin stated that an all-suites hotel, for example Embassy Suites, has larger rooms but is not necessarily an extended stay hotel. Mr. Amin stated that the report showed that there was sufficient parking. Mr. Amin stated that the dental office does not take appointments after 7:00 p.m. Mr. Amin stated that their peak parking time is around 10:00 p.m. Mr. Amin stated that he had his staff do a parking count every hour every night for rooms occupied and parking spaces occupied. Mr. Amin stated that the traffic study showed that he has plenty of parking spaces.

Chairperson Anderson stated that he cannot rely on the conclusions from the traffic study.

Commissioner Gonzales asked if the applicant had looked into a shuttle program.

Mr. Amin stated that they are not large enough to have a shuttle service on site and available 24 hours a day but they can contract with a shuttle company when needed.

Commissioner Gonzales also suggested the BART station and the bus service. Commissioner Gonzales asked if the Variance is not approved what would they do.

Mr. Amin stated that they couldn't reduce the size of the hotel anymore and still make it work.

Commissioner Gonzales stated that he would like to see additional landscaping around the hotel.

Mr. Amin stated that there is already a lot of mature plants and will add more.

Commissioner Lew asked if the parking Variance is not approved would you consider building higher.

Mr. Amin replied that costs jump up dramatically when you go past four stories and that would not make the project feasible.

Commissioner Lew asked if the subdivision of the parcel was constricting the project.

Mr. Amin replied that the hotel was there before Union Landing was there and so that is one of the few Union Landing properties that doesn't have cross easements. Mr. Amin stated that this means that he cannot share any of the other neighbors parking.

Commissioner Lew asked if the applicant was aware that there is an Extended Stay hotel in Union Landing.

Mr. Amin replied that he is aware of the hotel.

Commissioner Lew asked why they want to compete with them.

Mr. Amin replied that they are targeting a different type of guest than Extended Stay.

Commissioner Lew asked if the applicant had spoken with the Sywest representative regarding the fencing separating the two properties.

Mr. Amin stated that he is in agreement with the fencing and has spoken with Mr. Atkinson, the Sywest representative.

Commissioner Lew stated that she does not like to see a lot of fences. Commissioner Lew stated that her preference would be to not have the fence.

Mr. Amin stated he is comfortable either way.

Commissioner Singh asked if having a shuttle service would be beneficial.

Mr. Amin replied that they have looked at it but the demand is not great enough to cover the costs. Mr. Amin stated that it is easier to contract for a shuttle when they need it.

Commissioner Singh stated that he would also like to see the area left open and not have the fencing.

Commissioner Panlilio stated that the proposed fence is going to be located at the back of the theaters and so would not be in an area where a lot of people would be passing through. Commissioner Panlilio stated that it is mostly employees who park behind the theater. Commissioner Panlilio stated that he would like to see a metal fence for security reasons.

Chairperson Anderson asked why the applicant needs the Variance when there appears to be so much parking available.

Mr. Amin replied that the number of rooms in the hotel require so many spaces and there are not enough spaces.

Commissioner Panlilio asked if they will be full size parking spaces or smaller parking spaces.

Ms. Campbell replied that they will be the standard stall size.

Robert Atkinson, Sywest Development, 150 Pelican Way, San Rafael, stated that they have concern with the parking space Variance. Mr. Atkinson stated that given the proximity of their property and parking to the proposed hotel there might be spillage onto their property. Mr. Atkinson stated that they would like to create some separation between the hotel property and the Sywest property. Mr. Atkinson noted that there is a 350-foot strip of land between the two properties and recommended a wrought iron fence between the two properties.

Frank Boots, API Architects, 1207 13<sup>th</sup> Street, Modesto, CA stated that there is a bicycle rack proposed for the area near the trash enclosure. Mr. Boots stated that the distance between the trash enclosure and the corner of the hotel is about 40 – 45 feet. Mr. Boots stated that the window sizes were changed from a 4 foot by 4 foot to 5 foot by 5 foot. Mr. Boots stated that there is no way to make this project work without the parking Variance. Mr. Boots stated that he tried numerous ways to make it work but it is not feasible. Mr. Boots stated that there are two exits and a walkway in the rear of the hotel. Mr. Boots noted that the City requires a total of 190 spaces for all those uses on the entire site at peak demand.

Commissioner Singh referred to the first driveway into the property and noted that it is not wide enough for a commercial truck to use.

Mr. Boots stated that the driveway is not a part of this project.

Mr. Amin stated that all trucks are instructed to use the second driveway to enter the property.

Hugh McNamara, 32238 Mercury Way, Union City, stated that he stayed at a motel that had a security system where you could view your vehicle in the lot from the room television. Mr. McNamara stated that sometimes parking is scarce even at big hotels.

Chairperson Anderson closed the public hearing.

Ms. Malloy read back changes and corrections to the conditions:

- Change condition #11 – “plans shall be signed by . . .”
- Change condition #23 - add word “year” after fiscal.
- Change condition #43 – change “developer” to “applicant”
- Change condition #44 – add “at least one elevator shall be size...”
- Change condition #54 – change “the applicant”
- Change condition #56 – change to “refer to the certified EIR for Union Landing”
- Change condition #57 – change to “refer to the certified EIR for Union Landing”
- Change condition #85 – change to “the site owner and operator shall be responsible for cleaning the storm drains”
- Change Recommendations #2 - add “mitigation measures are included as conditions of approval and do not require recirculation.”
- Change Recommendation #12 on page 24 – 25 - delete phrase “specified regulations since the surrounding vicinity”.
- Make corrections to the Initial Study.

Ms. Malloy noted that the commission still needs to look at the fence and additional landscaping.

Commissioner Gonzales stated that he thought they had answered the question during the public hearing.

Ms. Malloy replied that the applicant will be required to submit a full landscape plan for the site and if they would like to specify additional or larger plants.

Commissioner Gonzales referred to the elevation of southwest side of the property.

Ms. Malloy stated that this is for illustration of the architecture and the landscaping will not be based on this drawing. Ms. Malloy referred to plan page L-01 to see the landscaping planned.

Commissioner Gonzales stated that he wants to see at least two trees along the southwest elevation of the property.

Commissioner Panlilio stated that he is for the fence because it will provide extra security for the hotel area. Commissioner Panlilio would like it to be metal but would settle for a large hedge.

Mr. Atkinson stated that they very strongly want a decorative wrought iron fence between the two properties. Mr. Atkinson stated that there is a potential for conflict between the hotel patrons and patrons of the theater properties. Mr. Atkinson stated that that they would oppose the parking Variance if there is no fence between the two properties.

Commissioner Lew stated that she believes the philosophy of Union Landing is a unified appearance and fences break off that unified appearance. Commissioner Lew stated that she opposes anything that makes it more difficult for walkers and bicyclists.

Mr. Atkinson stated that there is no rear entrance to the theater from the hotel side. Mr. Atkinson stated that there are only doors for employees or deliveries. Mr. Atkinson stated that there are good accesses from the front of the property around to the theater and the rest of Union Landing.

Ms. Malloy suggested using the condition of approval for the fence that is in the desk item.

Chairperson Anderson agreed with adding the fence condition of approval.

Ms. Malloy stated that there was a question about having a staging plan for the project. Ms. Malloy stated that she does not think that this condition is necessary.

Chairperson Anderson stated that he does not think it was necessary.

Commissioner Lew stated that she doesn't think that the condition is necessary. Commissioner Lew stated that we do not ask for this condition in other projects so why start now.

Ms. Malloy stated that in this case because the site is occupied by an existing business, staff thought it might be necessary.

Ms. Campbell stated that these details are sometimes shown on the plan and may already be in the plans.

Chairperson Anderson stated the consensus is to not include this condition of approval.

Ms. Malloy stated that there is still a question about the Transit Demand Program and truck parking. Chairperson Anderson stated that he is not opposed to truck parking because as the economy improves they would prefer the car rather than truck patron.

Chairperson Anderson stated that the consensus is not to condition about truck parking.

Commissioner Panlilio made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of Site Development Review SD-01-09 and Variance V-01-09, making findings 1 – 14, with the amended conditions of approval and adopt a resolution confirming this action.

Commissioner Gonzales seconded.

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

**VI. SUPPLEMENTAL STAFF REPORTS:**

**A. CONTINUED REPORTS:** None.

**B. NEW REPORTS:** None.

**VII. REDEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REPORTS:**

**VIII. COMMISSION MATTERS:**

- A. Follow-up on Planning Commission referrals to the City Council.
- B. Upcoming applications for the Planning Commission meeting for May 7, 2009.

**IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER:**

Commissioner Lew stated that there will be a Bicycle Safety information class in Union City on Thursday, May 7<sup>th</sup> between 6:00 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. at the Charles Kennedy Community center and it is sponsored by the East Bay Bicycle Coalition and ACTIA. Commissioner Lew stated that it is free and sign ups can be done on-line at the East Bay Bicycle website.

- X. **ADJOURNMENT:** 9:55 p.m.

**APPROVED:**



**TIKISA ANDERSON, CHAIRPERSON**

**ATTEST:**



**JOAN MALLOY, SECRETARY**