

# PIEDMONT PLANNING COMMISSION

## Regular Meeting Minutes for Monday, June 14, 2010

A Regular Session of the Piedmont Planning Commission was held June 14, 2010, in the City Hall Council Chambers at 120 Vista Avenue. In accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a) the agenda for this meeting was posted for public inspection on May 28, 2010.

### CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Robertson called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Jim Kellogg, Melanie Robertson, Clark Thiel and Alternate Commissioner Michael Henn

Absent: Commissioners Jonathan Levine and Bobbe Stehr (both excused)

Staff: City Planner Kate Black, Assistant Planner Kevin Jackson, Planning Technician Sylvia Toruno and Recording Secretary Chris Harbert

City Council Liaison: Councilmember Jeff Wieler

### CONSENT CALENDAR

There was no consent calendar.

### PUBLIC FORUM

There were no speakers for the public forum.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### **Resolution 8-PL-10**

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission approves as submitted its meeting minutes of May 10, 2010.

Moved by Thiel, Seconded by Kellogg

Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Thiel

Noes: None

Absent: Levine, Stehr

### REGULAR CALENDAR

The Commission considered the following items of regular business:

#### **Design Review 576 Crofton Avenue**

Mr. David Lawler and Ms. Saroja Raj are requesting design review to expand their residence 1,141 sq. ft., involving a 183 sq. ft. second story addition at the rear and conversion/expansion of the 589 sq. ft. existing non-code compliant basement space into a new 958 sq. ft. compliant bedroom, bath and family room. Exterior changes include a new upper level rear deck and spiral staircase, modifications to windows and doors, 4 new skylights and exterior lighting.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **Three affirmative response forms** were received. **Correspondence** was received from: Dan & Ellen Salomon

**Public testimony** was received from:

Sunny Grewal, Project Architect, described the proposed improvements intended to expand the existing house to meet the needs of the applicants' growing family while maintaining architectural integrity. In response to questions, he stated that the parking plan is workable per

the City's guidelines and the existing mature landscaping buffer will be protected and replacement plantings will be added if any existing landscaping is removed or damaged during construction. He also stated that there are no eaves along a portion of the addition's left rear corner so as to avoid the necessity for a setback variance. Roof drainage along this portion can be accommodated with a parapet wall or dam. He added that this area of the addition is not visible to the public.

The Commission agreed that overall the project reflected a sensible design and good improvement. However, the Commission objected on architectural grounds to the absence of a consistent eave line along the rear portion of the addition. The Commission voiced its support for variance approval to maintain a consistent eave line, stating that pulling back this portion of the addition so that eaves would not intrude into the setback is not architecturally reasonable (the wall would be pulled back in the middle of a bedroom) and the proposed parapet drainage solution would create an unacceptable tacked on appearance. The Commission also requested that because the house is being significantly increased in size, the door on the existing 2-car garage be made operable so that this garage is functional for off-street parking. In addition, the Commission requested that information be provided (1) regarding how the existing property line vegetation screen will be protected and/or replaced; (2) confirming that the direct furnace vent will comply with the City's noise ordinance; and (3) verifying that the parking turning radius is workable.

**Resolution 9-PL-10**

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission continues further consideration of Mr. David Lawler and Ms. Saroja Raj's application for proposed construction at 576 Crofton Avenue pending modification of said application to include a setback variance request as well as address issues related to the garage door, furnace vent, turning radius and property line landscaping.

Moved by Henn, Seconded by Kellogg

Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Thiel, Henn

Noes: None

Absent: Levine, Stehr

**Remand of Design  
Review & Retaining  
Wall Design Review,  
201 Park Way**

The City Planner stated that the City Council has remanded back for Commission action Mr. and Mrs. Jim Riddiough's design review application for proposed construction at 201 Park Way. The City Council considered an appeal of the Commission's March 8, 2010 conditional approval of the Riddiough application by Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Welmond on April 19th and directed that the Commission re-evaluate the proposed design in light of new information. Following the Commission's March 8 action, errors in submitted plans were discovered and have since been corrected, sun studies have been submitted by both parties and the Council has requested that design modifications be made to mitigate sun and light impacts on the Welmond's property at 137 Park Way.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **Five affirmative, four negative response forms** were received. **Correspondence** was received from: Cordella & Larry Raymond; Anna Hinck; Debbi

DiMaggio; Angela Grubb; Andrew & Kenna Welmond; William Holland

**Public testimony** was received from:

Lisa and Jim Riddiough stressed the reasonableness of their proposed plan, the exhaustive review of expansion options and their belief that the proposed design reflects a fair compromise intended to meet both their needs and that of their neighbors.

Lisa Joyce, Project Architect, reviewed the various alternative design options considered and the variety of reasons said alternatives were found less desirable than the submitted plan. She emphasized that the proposed design has minimal impact on neighbor light and privacy and that the presence of the existing hedge and fence should be factored into sun study conclusions -- the applicants sun study incorporates these two factors, the Welmond's sun study does not. She also stated that a large portion of the existing house will be rebuilt (approximately 69%). She also referenced a proposed "lowered roof alternative" that would lower the height of the addition by 1 foot.

Brian Mooney, Don Eidan, Ellen Wilson and Debbi DiMaggio all voiced support for application approval, stating that the proposed improvements are consistent with neighborhood standards, homeowners should be encouraged to improve the City's older housing stock, the design complies with the City's Design Review Guidelines, the neighborhood's aesthetics and property values will be enhanced, the expansion has minimal impact on adjacent neighbors and this process has continued far too long and needs to be resolved.

Arleta Chang, hired by the Riddiough's to examine light impacts on the Welmond's property, stated her conclusion that the amount of shadowing is modest and similar in degree to many other rear addition situations in Piedmont. She felt that the project complied with the City's Design Review Guidelines and was consistent with the neighborhood's development patterns and footprints.

Andrew and Kenna Welmond and their son Michel, strongly opposed the proposed project, citing the loss of sunlight, privacy, property enjoyment and value. They argued that alternative expansion designs, such as those developed by their architect Bill Holland, are available to achieve the Riddiough's expansion needs with less negative impact on their own property.

Bill Holland, Architect retained by the Welmonds, referenced his letters and submittals in arguing that the proposal as currently designed and sited will impose significant shadowing impacts on the Welmonds' property and that minor tweaks to the design, including the "lowered roof alternative" will not mitigate these impacts. He voiced his support for either flipping the plan or constructing a 1-story addition adjacent to the Welmond property.

Cordella & Larry Raymond, owners of 211 Park Way (east side neighbor) opposed the project, citing objections to its close proximity to their property line and the resulting loss of air circulation and open space. They requested that the addition either be lowered 2 to 3 feet or

a 1-story addition be constructed. Commissioner Kellogg responded that the proposed addition is 50 ft. away from the east side property line, 70 ft. away from the Raymond patio and is screened by dense vegetation. However, the Holland "flip" plan would locate the addition along the east (Raymond) property line.

Owen Erickson opposed project approval because of the adverse impacts on the Welmonds.

The Commission acknowledged that errors in the previously submitted plans related to the evaluation of shadowing impacts and separation distance between structures were significant factors in terms of the Commission's original position regarding project approvability. Based on the corrected information, the Commission agreed that the proposed project does impose more impact on 137 Park Way than originally believed. The Commission then discussed at length possible modifications to the design that would lessen these impacts on the Welmond's property. During discussion, several redesign suggestions were mentioned, including: (1) reducing the size and changing the configuration of the master bedroom walk-in closet; (2) lowering the family room ceiling and floor; (3) stepping down the master bedroom; (4) readjusting the dimension of the master bedroom overhang; (5) reconsidering the number of new windows on the west elevation; (6) pulling back the addition from the west property line to better protect the existing hedge and allow additional landscape screening; (7) realigning the west side wall so that it is not just one, long straight wall; and (8) relocating the master bedroom bath to the other side of the master bedroom. The Commission emphasized that because the project is essentially a "tear-down" there are lots of ways to reduce the square footage and height of the addition to lessen its intrusion on the Welmond's property.

**Resolution 10-PL-10**

WHEREAS, the Piedmont City Council has remanded back for action Mr. and Mrs. Jim Riddiough's Design Review and Retaining Wall Design Review application for proposed construction at 201 Park Way, Piedmont, California, which was conditionally approved by the Commission on March 8, 2010, and considered under appeal by the City Council on April 19; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission was directed on remand to address errors in the March 8 approved plans, consider new information supplied by sun studies and evaluate ways to mitigate impacts on the adjacent property at 137 Park Way; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that the March meeting information, when corrected, as well as the new information provided represents a significant change in project impact and as a consequence changes the Commission's previous position. Therefore, the Commission now finds that the application has a significant impact on the light of the adjacent neighbor; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission now finds that the project as submitted does not comply with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

- The proposed new multi-level structure/expansion has not been designed in a way that reasonably minimizes view and light impacts on neighboring properties (as defined in Section 17.2.70), including consideration of the location of the new construction, lowering the height of the addition, expansions within the existing building envelope, lower level excavation and changing the roof slope or ridge direction. The proposed improvements, primarily from the west elevation, do not comply with Design Review Guidelines I-2(d), I-5, I-9 and the lower roof alternative does not comply with II-3. In addition, if the project is considered as a renovation/addition, rather than new construction, the project does not comply with Guidelines II-6(b) and II-7.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission denies the design review application of Mr. and Mrs. Riddiough, including both roof alternatives, for construction at 201 Park Way, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City.

**THIS MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF SECOND**

The Commission majority felt that a continuance rather than denial was more in keeping with the Council's remand in that it allowed the applicant an opportunity to revise the project to incorporate mitigation measures that could then be evaluated by the Commission as directed by the Council. The majority felt that a denial action could be appealed and, if so, the City Council would then likely once again remand the application back to the Commission to consider mitigation measures.

**Resolution 11-PL-10**

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission continues, for the shortage duration possible at the applicant's discretion, further consideration of Mr. and Mrs. Riddiough's application for proposed construction at 201 Park Way to allow the applicant an opportunity to redesign their proposal per tonight's discussion and to readjust and verify project story poles to reflect the revised design; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, that appropriate public notice shall be given when this application is scheduled for resumed consideration by the Commission; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the findings contained in Resolution 10-PL-10, above, are hereby incorporated into this continuance decision.

Moved by Kellogg, Seconded by Henn

Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Henn

Noes: Thiel

Absent: Levine, Stehr

The Commission recessed for dinner at 8:00 p.m. and reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

**Design Review  
21 Littlewood Drive**

Mr. and Mrs. Cliff Gardner are requesting design review to make window and door modifications on the east, west and south side of the existing residence, install a new skylight, add exterior lighting, and make minor interior improvements. This original Staff Design Review

application is being deferred to the Commission for review and action due to staff's concerns regarding the stylistic compatibility between the existing materials on the residence and the new steel doors being proposed on the north side.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **Five affirmative response forms** were received.

**Public testimony** was received from:

Ahmad Mohazab, Project Architect, acknowledged that while most of the window and doors on the home are wood, his clients really desire the proposed metal doors and windows for their appearance and ability to let more light into the home's interior. He noted that because of the applicants' property is a flag lot, there is no street view of the home.

The Commission agreed that the home is an eclectic mix of exterior materials and the addition of the proposed steel windows and doors will further enhance its eclectic nature. However, the Commission requested that vertical mullions be added to provide greater continuity in window/door treatment.

**Resolution 123-DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. Cliff Gardner are requesting permission to make window and door modifications on the east, west and south side of the existing residence, install a new skylight, add exterior lighting, and make minor interior improvements located at 21 Littlewood Drive, Piedmont, California, which construction requires design review; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission finds that the project is categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Section 15301, Class 1(e) and the proposal conforms with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

1. The exterior design elements are aesthetically pleasing as a whole and harmonious with the overall sense of the existing eclectic style of the residence. The proposed steel doors and windows will increase light and views, adding positive value to the home. The project complies with Design Review Guidelines II-3 and II-3(a).
2. The design is appropriate, considering its effect on neighboring properties' existing views, privacy and access to direct and indirect light because the improvements are not visible to the public and are compatible within the context of the applicants' property. The project complies with Design Review Guidelines II-1 and II-2.
3. The safety of residents, pedestrians, and vehicle occupants and the free flow of vehicular traffic are not adversely affected, considering the circulation pattern, parking layout and points of ingress and egress because there is no impact on circulation patterns. The project complies with Design Review Guideline II-7.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission approves the design review application of Mr. and Mrs. Gardner for construction at 21 Littlewood Drive, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City, subject to the following condition:

- a single vertical mullion be added to the new steel french doors and the adjoining fixed steel window to divide the single pane glass into multiple panes so as to be consistent with existing window patterns.

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the approval of the Planning Commission/City Council and any conditions of that approval shall not extend to any particulars set forth in the documents submitted for the project which are inconsistent with or in violation of any applicable law, including but not limited to Chapters 5 and 17 of the City Code, nor does the approval extend to matters not set forth, or inadequately represented, in submitted documents (whether or not consistent with applicable law). The City reserves the right to require compliance with applicable laws and to attach conditions after initial approval is given, if noncompliance is discovered or additional conditions are considered necessary and appropriate in light of Commission/Council findings.

Moved by Kellogg, Seconded by Henn

Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Thiel, Henn

Noes: None

Absent: Levine, Stehr

**Fence Design Review  
and Design Review,  
111 Hazel Lane**

Mr. and Mrs. George Krusi are requesting fence design review and design review for two separate applications:

- The first application proposes to expand the front patio to the south (near the southern Hazel Lane frontage) and construct a new spa and equipment enclosure. A new retaining wall and fence that is approximately 15'9" high at the highest point is proposed to be located approximately 5'6" closer to the street from the existing wall and fence that is approximately 14 ft. tall at its highest point. The materials and design of the new wall/fence are proposed to be similar to the existing wall/fence.
- The second application proposes to replace the existing air conditioner with a new unit located in two alternative locations: Location #1 is near the current location of the air conditioner in the rear courtyard and Location #2 is in the yard on the southern frontage of Hazel Lane. An optional 3'6" high wood lattice screen is proposed for Location #2. This Staff Design Review application is being deferred to the Commission for review and action.

Written notice was provided to neighbors. **Four response forms** were received.

**Correspondence** was received from: Deni Bates; Christopher Colby & Phyllis Solomon

**Public testimony** was received from:

Grier Graff, Project Architect, stated that the new air conditioner is replacing an older unit which will be removed. The applicants prefer Location #1 for this new unit and the unit will comply with the City's noise ordinance (Location #2 is less desirable because it poses potential maintenance problems). Also, while a lattice screening option is proposed for the Location #2 site, the applicants would prefer to screen this location with vegetation. The spa equipment will be enclosed and can have a roof cover if additional noise and visual screening is desired. This equipment will also comply with the City's noise ordinance.

Deni Bates, Landscape Architect, responded to Commission questions regarding the clarity of submitted plans related to the height and location of the proposed brick retaining wall and fence.

Richard Deutsche voiced concern that the close proximity of the air conditioner unit to his bedroom will be acoustically intrusive. He stated that the old unit is easily heard from his bedroom and he requested that either the new air conditioning unit be eliminated or it be located in Location #2.

The Commission acknowledged that because the applicant's property is a corner lot, it is reasonable and acceptable to create some private outdoor space on the less dominant street side of the property. However, the Commission preferred that the brick retaining wall be stepped down toward the street with a landscaped planting strip in between and a 6 ft. fence atop. The Commission felt that this stepped design would soften the streetscape appearance of the wall/fence and lessen the vertical plane within the front setback. The Commission also supported the addition of a trellis or opaque roof structure over the spa equipment enclosure for visual purposes. As to the air conditioner, the Commission, with the exception of Alternate Commissioner Henn, supported either Location option provided it is verified that the air conditioning unit's operation will be in compliance with the City's noise ordinance. Alternate Commissioner Henn preferred the Location #2 site for the air conditioner for the reasons stated by Dr. Deutsche.

**Resolution 131-DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. George Krusi are requesting permission to expand the front patio to the south (near the southern Hazel Lane frontage) and construct a new spa and equipment enclosure. A new retaining wall and fence that is approximately 15'9" high at the highest point is proposed to be located approximately 5'6" closer to the street from the existing wall and fence that is approximately 14 ft. tall at its highest point. The materials and design of the new wall/fence are proposed to be similar to the existing wall/fence located at 111 Hazel Lane, Piedmont, California, which construction requires fence design review; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission finds that the project is categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Section



15301, Class 1(e) and the proposal conforms with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

- The exterior design elements (including but not limited to height, bulk, arrangements of structures on the parcel and concealment of mechanical and electrical equipment) are aesthetically pleasing as a whole and harmonious with existing and proposed neighborhood development in that the project complies with Design Review Guidelines II-3, IV-1, IV-2, IV-4, V-1, V-2, V-3, V-5, V-5(c), V-6, V-7, V-8 and V-10. Given the constraints of this lot, fronted on two sides by streets, the height of the fence and retaining walls within the 20 ft. setback is appropriate and reflects the highest design standard. The proposed location is along the less dominate street side of the property and thus is treated like a side yard.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission approves the design review application of Mr. and Mrs. Krusi for construction at 111 Hazel Lane, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Construction Management Plan.** A comprehensive Construction Management Plan shall be developed by the applicant. The Construction Management Plan shall address noise, vibrations, traffic control, parking, debris removal, dust control, sanitary facilities, and other potential construction impacts, as well as other details involving the means and methods of completing the Project including the construction route. The City Building Official shall have the authority to require modifications and amendments to the Construction Management Plan as deemed necessary throughout the course of the Project and until the final issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

2. **Construction Completion Schedule.** Work on the Project, once commenced, shall be promptly executed with continuous good faith and reasonable progress. Since timely completion of this Project is of the essence, the Applicant shall submit for approval a Construction Completion Schedule, which will specify, in detail, the duration and percentage complete of each phase.

a. The Construction Completion Schedule with associated construction values for each benchmark shall set forth completion dates for the following benchmarks:

- i. Completion of Excavation;
- ii. Completion of Retaining Walls;
- iii. Completion of Foundation;
- iv. Completion of Rough Framing;
- v. Completion of Electrical;
- vi. Completion of Plumbing;
- vii. Completion of Mechanical;
- viii. Completion of Fire Sprinklers;
- ix. Completion of Home;
- x. Completion of Hardscaping and Landscaping;

and of any further construction benchmarks and conditions of occupancy as may be determined by the Director of Public Works.

b. The Director of Public Works shall, before the Project commences, make a determination as to the completion dates applicable to the Project and such determination shall constitute the "Approved Schedule" and be binding on the Applicant. The City may, at the Applicant's sole cost, engage the services of a consultant to review the Applicant's proposed Construction Completion Schedule and, to the extent the period allocated for any work appears unjustifiable, recommend to the Director of Public Works a reasonable completion date for any benchmark.

c. If the work for any specific benchmark has not been completed within 90 days after the completion date set forth in the Approved Schedule, and the delay in completion has not been caused by force majeure, the Director of Public Works shall have the option at any time thereafter to make claim against the Applicant's Performance Security in order to complete such benchmark.

3. **Stormwater BMPs for Construction.** Applicant shall implement stormwater treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs) as well as Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association's "Start at the Source" criteria for stormwater quality protection. City Staff may impose additional requirements involving the prevention of storm water pollution during construction and permanent drainage, erosion and sediment control. These items will be reviewed as part of the Applicant's Construction Management Plan.

4. **C&D Compliance.** Compliance with Chapter 9 Article III of the Municipal Code, which governs the recycling of construction and demolition debris, is required for all phases of this project. This Project is eligible to participate in an incentive program in which the City will provide one-half the cost of debris boxes provided by the City's franchised waste hauler and used exclusively for the purpose of removing recyclable construction and demolition debris, subject to continued availability of funds.

5. The front appearance of the retaining wall shall be stepped, subject to staff review and approval.

6. The spa equipment screening structure over the spa enclosure shall be subject to staff review and approval; said screen shall be for aesthetic and not acoustical reasons.

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the approval of the Planning Commission/City Council and any conditions of that approval shall not extend to any particulars set forth in the documents submitted for the project which are inconsistent with or in violation of any applicable law, including but not limited to Chapters 5 and 17 of the City Code, nor does the approval extend to matters not set forth, or inadequately represented, in submitted documents (whether or not consistent with applicable law). The City reserves the right to require compliance with applicable laws and to attach conditions after initial approval is given, if noncompliance is discovered or additional conditions are considered necessary and appropriate in light of Commission/Council findings.

Moved by Thiel, Seconded by Henn  
Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Thiel, Henn  
Noes: None  
Absent: Levine, Stehr

**Resolution 135-DR-10**

WHEREAS, Mr. and Mrs. George Krusi are requesting permission to replace the existing air conditioner with a new unit located in two alternative locations: Location #1 is near the current location of the air conditioner in the rear courtyard and Location #2 is in the yard on the southern frontage of Hazel Lane. An optional 3'6" high wood lattice screen is proposed for Location #2 located at 111 Hazel Lane, Piedmont, California, which construction requires design review; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the application, plans and any and all testimony and documentation submitted in connection with such application, and after having visited subject property, the Piedmont Planning Commission finds that the project is categorically exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Section 15301, Class 1(e) and the proposal conforms with the criteria and standards of Section 17.20.9 of the Piedmont City Code:

1. The exterior design elements are harmonious with existing and proposed neighborhood development in that the air conditioner unit replaces an existing feature, albeit with a different size and shape, in a similar location. The project complies with Design Review Guideline II-3.
2. The design is appropriate, considering its effect on neighboring properties' existing views, privacy and access to direct and indirect light because there is minimal impact on neighbor light and views.
3. The safety of residents, pedestrians, and vehicle occupants and the free flow of vehicular traffic are not adversely affected, considering the circulation pattern, parking layout and points of ingress and egress because there is no impact.

RESOLVED, that based on the findings and facts set forth heretofore, the Piedmont Planning Commission approves the design review application of Mr. and Mrs. Krusi for construction at 111 Hazel Lane, Piedmont, California, in accordance with the plans and specifications on file with the City, subject to the following conditions:

1. the air conditioner is approved for both Location #1 and #2 provided both locations comply with the City's noise ordinance. If Location #2 is chosen, the design of the enclosure at Location #2 shall be subject to staff review and approval under Resolution 131-DR-10;

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the approval of the Planning Commission/City Council and any conditions of that approval shall not extend to any particulars set forth in the documents submitted for the project which are inconsistent with or in violation of any applicable law, including but not limited to Chapters 5 and 17 of the City Code, nor does the approval extend to matters not set forth, or inadequately represented, in submitted documents (whether or not consistent with

applicable law). The City reserves the right to require compliance with applicable laws and to attach conditions after initial approval is given, if noncompliance is discovered or additional conditions are considered necessary and appropriate in light of Commission/Council findings.

Moved by Thiel, Seconded by Kellogg

Ayes: Kellogg, Robertson, Thiel

Noes: Henn

Absent: Levine, Stehr

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Robertson adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.