

Planning Commission

Regular Meeting of June 1, 2016

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Nichols at 7:04 p.m., Wednesday, June 1, 2016 in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: John Nichols, Chairman
 Doree Morgan
 Jay Nelson
 Ryan Gallant

Commissioners Absent: Carlos Prieto

Staff Present: Konrad Bolowich, Assistant City Manager
 Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
 Natalie Patty, Contract Planner

Chairman Nichols led the Pledge of Allegiance. No items were added or deleted; no public participation comments were offered upon invitation of the Chairman.

PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 14-154 – A PROPOSAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY 15,880 SQUARE FOOT MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING ON A VACANT LOT LOCATED AT 25925 BARTON ROAD WITHIN THE INSTITUTIONAL ZONE. THE PROJECT SITE IS LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF NEWPORT AVE AND BARTON ROAD Continued from the May 18, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Nelson declared a possible conflict of interest and left the Chambers.

Contract Planner Natalie Patty presented the staff report. The proposal was for a two-story medical office building to be located at the southwest corner of Newport Avenue and Barton Road that had been heard previously by the Commission. She continued, reviewing the vicinity map, proposed construction, parking, and changes to the site map since earlier presentation of this project to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Nichols indicated that the project was back before the Commission to address traffic issues regarding ingress and egress to the site.

Ms. Patty continued, pointing out that the existing driveway cut on Barton Road would create safety hazards due to the proximity to the left turn pocket at Barton Road and Newport Avenue. The existing driveway cut was to be completely removed and a driveway established within the Southern California Edison (SCE) easement to the west of the project site, thereby resolving the traffic issues related to the ingress and egress to the site. This was made a Condition of Approval for this project. With the condition, staff believes all traffic issues related to ingress and egress issues have been addressed. She pointed out secondary/emergency vehicle access at the back of the site from the Post Office driveway.

She continued, indicating that Staff had just today received a comment letter from SCE with concerns regarding use of the Edison Easement as the main access for the project. Edison's letter indicated they

reserved the right to terminate the agreement for the purposes of construction, alteration, addition and replacement of facilities, and reserved the right to claim current use of the Right of Way. All costs incurred for restoring the Right of Way to its previous condition would be borne by applicant. These concerns were added to the Conditions of Approval for the project.

Commissioner Nichols asked about a backup plan should SCE exercise their right and close that access permanently. Ms. Patty replied that should SCE exercise the option to reclaim the property, for a day, week or permanently, the emergency ingress/egress off of the Post Office driveway would become the primary access to the site. Assistant City Manager Bolowich indicated that for all practical purposes, SCE would be doing construction off and on beginning in August 2017 for approximately a year, so that driveway would close sporadically; City staff was comfortable with sporadic closures requiring temporary use of the ingress/egress from the Post Office driveway. He indicated that SCE has been very flexible in working with the applicant to provide access via the Right-of-Way.

Commissioner Nichols asked about the possibility of connecting via the existing commercial site to the west. Mr. Bolowich responded that the applicant had discussed with the owners of that particular shopping center and was told no. The owners cited issues with McDonald's reciprocal access and parking.

Ms. Patty confirmed that there was no sharing of a parking lot with the Post Office, rather a driveway to access the proposed medical building parking lot from the driveway approach to the Post Office parking.

Commissioner Nichols asked if the Post Office would require an easement by the applicant for shared use of the Post Office driveway.

Applicant Mr. Wayne Cheng addressed the Commission indicating there was a Shared Access Easement required by the United States Post Office. This Shared Access Easement specifically stated that the driveway can only be a secondary access, meaning there has to be other primary access to the site. The SCE easement also required a secondary access in case of closure by SCE. The Post Office easement was more stringent in that it states that you could not block their driveway, could not compromise their current flow, and had to be accessory access. If their flow of traffic was hindered, the Post Office would revoke the easement. Therefore, if SCE revokes their easement, the site would have no access as the Post Office easement access could not be the primary access.

Discussion ensued regarding ingress/egress to the site, indicating that if SCE closed access and the Post Office easement only allowed secondary access, the applicant would run the risk of having no access to the site. Assistant City Manager Bolowich indicated that was a risk for the applicant, unless an agreement could be reached with the shopping center to the west or some other access easement agreement with SCE.

Mr. Cheng responded that he was not willing to take the risk of having no access to the site. He presented a PowerPoint presentation with a proposed solution. He began by reviewing the comment letter from SCE, which indicated that the access through the SCE easement could not be the only access to the site. SCE's email to him indicated that the easement area was intended for electric utility purposes and SCE would continue to have the right to such use; that SCE already knew that it must be closed for multiple day periods every few months during a planned project from approximately August 2017 - August 2019; that it may also require closure for routine maintenance indefinitely; and in the worst case, SCE may determine the area is needed for future expansion and the road would have to be removed. The easement area was intended for electric utility purposes only and SCE would continue to have the right to use for such. Mr. Cheng believed there is no ambiguity to the SCE email. The right for SCE to revoke access through the easement would also affect any possible shared access with the shopping center to the west as that access would need an easement over the same SCE property.

Mr. Cheng continued, reviewing the shared access easement with the Post Office and other options regarding ingress and egress for the project. He indicated that the shared access agreement with the Post Office clearly stated that access onto their driveway was to be secondary and the agreement could be terminated should the

access through the SCE easement be closed for even 24 hours. Based on these access constraints, he continued his PowerPoint presentation that reviewed several solutions that utilized the existing driveway cut.

The concerns with utilizing the existing driveway cut for primary ingress and egress dealt with the short distance to the eastbound Barton Road left turn pocket at Newport Avenue and the potential traffic hazards when cars leave the project site and attempt to access that left turn to make a U-turn.

The possible solutions presented included 1) lengthening the left turn pocket, 2) adding vertical delineators to prevent access, or 3) adding a raised curb to prevent access to the left turn pocket. The solution recommended by the traffic engineers was to place vertical delineators to divide the eastbound left turn pocket from Barton Road to Newport Avenue, thus eliminating the ability for traffic leaving the project site to access that left turn pocket. He indicated the vertical delineators were the preferred option because they were easy to install, cost effective, more visible, less hazardous to vehicles, and were used in other areas of the City. He was not able to sign the agreement with SCE for the easement with the cautions that it would be closed for indefinite periods of time and likely permanently. His concern was that when he purchased the property, it came with legal access that already existed. Eliminating that access and with the probability of SCE revoking their easement, the site becomes landlocked. He explained that the difference between the existing driveway cut and the proposed driveway access utilizing the SCE easement was approximately 55 feet. While his traffic engineer indicated that 55 feet or 2 ½ car lengths should not make any difference as far as safety or traffic issues and the City should not be able to take away the existing driveway cut, Mr. Cheng indicated he was working with the City to come to a mutually agreeable solution. He was willing to work out a solution together with the City. He reiterated that the key problem was the u turn at Barton and Newport and his request was to be allowed to build either a cone or concrete delineator to prevent access to that left turn pocket from the existing driveway cut on Barton Road.

Discussion ensued as to the pros and cons of the proposed solutions. It was confirmed that the proposed delineators would only prevent access to the left turn pocket from the project site and the left turn pocket would still be available to other eastbound Barton Road traffic. Access to the freeway from the site could be from Mt. View, in which case vehicles exiting the site would need to use the access onto the Post Office driveway to Newport Avenue and make a left at the light or make a u turn somewhere on Barton Road; or alternatively to California Street by making right turn out of the site onto Barton Road.

Mr. Cheng concluded, indicating it was his request to have approval for the project with the proposed solution to the traffic safety issue to install the vertical delineators, a solution approved by the traffic engineers.

In response to the possibility of a raised curb vs. the vertical delineators, Assistant City Manager Bolowich indicated that the City's insurance company recommended against a raised curb due to liability issues. In response to the Commissioners concerns that the vertical delineators get knocked down, become unsightly after time and posed an ongoing expense and labor issue to the City and its Public Works Department, Mr. Cheng indicated he was agreeable to entering into a maintenance agreement with the City with regards to the vertical delineators and the cost of maintenance. Assistant City Manager Bolowich indicated that the solution of vertical delineators would need to be reviewed and approved by the City Public Works Department and City Engineer.

Chairman Nichols opened the Public Hearing and invited comments from the audience. Mr. Cheng addressed the Commission indicating that as the project has been moving forward for approximately a year and a half and as the traffic engineers have agreed on the proposed solution, his request to the Commission was to approve subject to internal review by the Public Works Department and City Engineer.

Discussion ensued regarding the purview of the Commission and the ability of either party, staff or applicant, to appeal the decision to the City Council.

With no additional public comment, Chairman Nichols closed the public hearing.

City Attorney Holdaway confirmed that for this project, Planning Commission decision would be final action. If the applicant were agreeable, the City Engineer could have final approval as to the appropriateness of the option for access using the existing driveway cut on Barton Road by use of vertical delineators or concrete curb modification to the left turn pocket, with secondary access through the Post Office driveway by way of a Shared Access easement between the Post Office and applicant, as approved by the Post Office. These would be made conditions of approval, and if the City Engineer does not approve then the project would return to the Planning Commission, the Commission could approve with those added conditions. The alternative would be to continue the item to another meeting.

Commissioner Gallant expressed his reservations to providing approval prior to review and recommendation/approval from the Public Works Department and City Engineer regarding the proposed solution.

Mr. Cheng responded that he had been working diligently with staff to provide a workable solution. He was willing to enter into an agreement whereby he would be responsible for maintenance of the vertical delineators. He was requesting a decision this evening either to approve with the added conditions for review by the City Engineer of the proposed solution to using the existing driveway cut or to deny the project. He could then either move forward with the project or have the pathway to appeal to the City Council.

Assistant City Manager indicated that from staff perspective, the options presented tonight had been presented before and were not ideal, however, in light of the constraints of both the SCE and Post Office easements, presents as probably the only option. Staff was comfortable with action by the Planning Commission with the added condition that the City Engineer provide feedback and approve or deny based on the added condition. Applicant is then able to move forward, if a positive outcome he is able to move forward, if a negative outcome he has an avenue to pursue.

City Attorney added that the applicant had the right to appeal to the City Council. The scheduling of the hearing before the City Council and preparation of staff reports for that would likely take longer than a two week continuance of the proceedings before the Planning Commission. This would be the choice of the applicant. Whatever action taken by the Planning Commission, the conditions of approval should be fairly detailed and that the applicant is in agreement with each of those conditions stated as part of a motion. Some of the proposals presented tonight were presented previously in different iterations. Information included in the applicant's presentation tonight included an email from SCE dated today and staff has not had adequate time to review and consider in their recommendation.

Motion by Chairman Nichols to approve PPD #14-154 based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as amended to include that the applicant be allowed to use the existing driveway access off of Barton Road for primary ingress and egress with secondary access off of the Post Office driveway, and that the City Engineer come up with a viable solution for a barrier so vehicles leaving from the Barton Road access could not enter the left turn pocket, i.e vertical delineators, concrete curb, etc. Subject to approval by the City Engineer, the project would move forward; if approval from the Public Works Department and City Engineer is not obtained, applicant would have the right to appeal to the City Council.

City Attorney recommended that any secondary access utilizing the Post Office driveway be pursuant to a Shared Access Easement with the Post Office; that the modifications to Barton Road access to be approved by the City Engineer would include extension of the left turn pocket or modification to the median; and that any such changes required by this project be subject to an agreement with the applicant to include maintenance and indemnification as to any liability the City might incur.

Chairman Nichols indicated he was not comfortable with including indemnification in any agreement. Mr. Cheng agreed that he was not agreeable to including indemnification. City Attorney indicated that the agreement could be drafted in such a way that the indemnification would include only those incidents that would not have occurred except for this project, i.e. the requested modifications to the left turn pocket/median that might create the arguably dangerous condition. Chairman Nichols debated that any incident as described by the City Attorney would be caused by the driver acting illegally and liability would fall to that driver. Discussion continued regarding inclusion of indemnification in any agreement with the applicant.

Chairman Nichols restated his motion to approve PPD #14-154 based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as amended to include that the applicant be allowed to use the existing driveway access off of Barton Road for primary ingress and egress, with secondary access off of the Post Office driveway pursuant to a Shared Access Easement with the Post Office, and that the City Engineer come up with a viable solution for a barrier so vehicles leaving from the Barton Road access could not enter the left turn pocket at Barton Road and Newport Avenue, i.e. extension of the left turn pocket, vertical delineators, concrete curb, etc. to include an agreement for maintenance of any such modification. Subject to approval by the City Engineer, the project would move forward; if approval from the Public Works Department and City Engineer is not obtained, applicant would have the right to appeal to the City Council. Motion seconded by Commissioner Morgan and carried. Commissioner Gallant no; Commissioner Nelson abstained.

Chairman Nichols and City Attorney Holdaway indicated that any decision by the City Engineer could be appealed to the City Council and at that point the entire project move to the City Council. Applicant was agreeable and thanked staff and the Planning Commission for their efforts towards this project.

TIME EXTENSION FOR PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 10-78 – THE APPLICANT REQUEST A ONE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION (FROM SEPTEMBER 14, 2016 TO SEPTEMBER 14, 2017) FOR PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PPD NO. 10-78. THIS PROJECT PROPOSES TO CONSTRUCT 152 AFFORDABLE SENIOR APARTMENT UNITS IN TWO, THREE-STORY BUILDINGS ON 5.46 ACRES LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF POPLAR STREET IN A MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) ZONE (EXHIBIT A, VICINITY MAP)

Assistant City Manager Bolowich presented the staff report, indicating this project was the affordable senior housing project on Poplar Street. When the project was entitled, it was proposed to be completed in phases, dependent upon availability of funding. Funding for this type of affordable housing was dependent on any number of combinations of County, Federal, State, and/or tax credit funding sources. Approximately one third of this project was built and applicant was requesting that the entitlement continue until such time as funding became available and the project could move forward. Staff was supportive of this request; this project was a beneficial addition to this community.

In response to questions regarding any applicable development code updates and the project being subject to those updates when it does move forward, Mr. Bolowich and City Attorney indicated that the project would be conditioned to comply with all then current planning development and building codes. It could be argued however, that this is considered one project on a single parcel and construction had commenced, in which case the project would be locked in as far as the design portion, i.e. setbacks, height, landscaping, exterior appearance; however it would have to meet then current building codes and standards in effect when plans were submitted.

Chairman Nichols opened the public hearing and invited public comment. Hearing none, the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Gallant, seconded by Morgan and unanimously carried to approve the Time Extension for Precise Plan of Design No. 10-78 based on the analysis and original project Findings and Conditions of Approval. Prieto absent.

PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 16-019 – CITRUS LANE – THE PROJECT IS A REQUEST TO REVIEW AND APPROVE THE PROPOSED SITE PLANS AND DESIGNS FOR THE CITRUS LANE PROJECT, ON A PREVIOUSLY SUBDIVIDED 9.5 ACRE PARCEL OF LAND. THE SUBJECT SITE IS LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CITRUS AVENUE AND CALIFORNIA STREET (EXHIBIT A).

Assistant City Manager Konrad Bolowich introduced Rob Dalbeck, a soon-to-be graduate of California State University San Bernardino who was working as a Planning Intern with the City. Mr. Dalbeck presented the staff report, reviewing the Vicinity Map and the existing setting as an approximately 9.5 acre site with a single-family residence to be moved to Heritage Park and on-site groves that were recently removed. General Plan designation was low density residential (0-4 dwelling units/acre); zoning was Single Family Residence (R-1), with surrounding land uses as agriculture and a church to the north, agriculture to the east and west, and multiple-family residential development to the south.

The proposal was to construct 35 single-family units consisting of three architectural styles and floor plans including: Spanish Colonial, Santa Barbara and California Ranch. In addition to having three architectural styles, there would be three different exteriors or plan. Lots would range in size from 7,215 SF to 11,442 SF, with two-story residential homes ranging in size from 3,100 SF to 3,300 SF; all homes would have a two-car attached garage, with Plan 1 including an additional tandem space. Construction of street improvements would occur along California Street and Citrus Avenue. The development would provide 4 lettered lots (over 20,000 SF) for open space to be used for water quality purposes. Access to the site would be provided from California Street and Citrus Avenue, with a cul-de-sac in the center of the development.

Mr. Dalbeck continued, reviewing the site plan and elevations and materials for each of the designs, as well as the proposed landscape plan. The project complies with all of the development standards of the R-1 Single Family Residence Zone, was reviewed under CEQA and a Negative Declaration was circulated for a 30-day public review, all potential associated with the development can be mitigated to less than significant levels. One comment letter was received June 1 from Ms. Chavez regarding the palm trees that were recently removed and concerns about water usage compared to the current usage. There are no significant impacts with regard to water usage as citrus groves require almost double the amount of water consumption as the proposed development.

Commissioners' comments and concerns included:

- Increased traffic on California Street and the impacts on the intersection at California Street and Redlands Boulevard – Assistant City Manager responded that traffic had been addressed in the environmental review and annexation and subdivision for this project wherein mitigation measures were discussed including right in/right out onto California Street, in addition the City was currently working with the Army Corps of Engineers and Department of Fish and Game to build an extended box culvert at California Street and Redlands Boulevard, thereby widening the street to the north. Construction should begin within approximately one year, which should coincide with construction on this project.
- How phasing of the project affects landscaping along the perimeter of the project – Applicant David Wood addressed the Commission indicating the project was proposed in three phases, initially consisting of the model homes and parking, as well as all perimeter improvements along Citrus and California. Phase one would consist of 10 homes along the east portion of the site, with Phase two being the homes along Citrus Avenue and Phase three the interior cul-de-sac homes. Each phase should take approximately 6 – 8 months to complete, with completion of all phases expected by the end of 2017.

Applicant continued, indicating home prices would be approximately \$200/sq.ft. or in the \$600,000 range.

- Mr. Wood responded to questions regarding the palm tree that were recently removed. He indicated the trees could not be incorporated into the project as they would have been in the middle of the street and not salvageable based on a review by an arborist. Preserving the orange grove was not feasible due to the age of the trees.

Chairman Nichols opened the public hearing and invited comment from the public. Hearing none, the public hearing was closed.

Additional questions from Commissioners –

- With regard to Condition of Approval #24 regarding maintenance of landscaping and replacement of dead and dying plants, standards would be established through the Home Owners Association and Landscape Maintenance District; private lots as well as public areas would be subject to the LL Municipal Code and code enforcement, as in other areas of the City.
- Assistant City Manager Bolowich confirmed that the street widths were wide enough to allow for parking and emergency access.
- Condition #59 regarding timing of payment of Prime Farmland Conservation fee, it was indicated that the payment would be due within one year of the final Certificate of Occupancy.
- Condition #60 regarding the review process for the proposed signs – would consist of City review, as part of the Mission Historic District would most likely go to Historical Commission for input to a master sign program.
- Condition #61 regarding the relocation of the existing single family residence – house would be placed on a new foundation at Heritage Park with every effort being made to keep the exterior intact to be restored. Commissioner Nelson thanked the developer for making the effort to relocate.
- Condition #66 regarding incorporation of Palm trees into the overall design of the proposed project – the intent was to recreate the feel of the current look, with the actual number consistent with what was removed and size would be established during the plan check process pursuant to Public Works street tree standards.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Gallant and unanimously carried to approve Precise Plan of Design No. 16-019 – Citrus Lane based on the findings and subject to Conditions of Approval as presented in the staff report. Prieto absent.

DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT (DCA) 14-133 – DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE – THE PROJECT IS A REQUEST TO APPROVE AN UPDATE TO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE, SPECIFICALLY AFFECTING TITLE 17, ARTICLE 2 – ZONES, ALLOWABLE USES AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (EXHIBIT A).

Assistant City Manager Bolowich presented the staff report indicating that the review of the Development Code began in 2014 with the intent to overhaul the development code to something more user friendly, relevant and functional for the citizens and those doing business in Loma Linda. The intent of the update process included:

- Eliminating outmoded provisions, inconsistencies, and redundancies;
- Better integrating and referencing other development standards;
- Ensuring consistency with state and federal law;
- Adding clarity, transparency, and efficiency to the City development review process; and

- Making the code as easy to use, administer, and enforce as possible.

Mr. Bolowich continued, reviewing Title 17 of the Loma Linda Municipal Code which included Residential Zones (HR-1, R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-4), Commercial and Industrial Zones (BP, C1, C2, CM, and CO), Special Purpose Zones (I-HC, OS, PC, and PF), and Combining/Overlay Zones (FP, GH, HM, and PD). Broken out within each Zone was the different uses.

Using the Residential Zones as an example, he pointed out that each section began with defining the purpose and intent, followed by further defining things such as primary and accessory uses, as well as prohibited uses and additional regulations. The section then included a table as a more simplified method to process a project.

He indicated the purpose of the discussion at this meeting was to explain the logic behind the suggested modifications and obtain input from Commissioners as to whether this approach/method makes sense; would there be uses permitted without any Planning Commission input, and/or should particular uses require review by the Commission by way of a CUP.

He continued, pointing out Table 2-3, Hillside Residential Standards incorporated those standards that were a part of Measure V that were not addressed in the current development code.

With regard to Table 2-3 it was noted that:

- Acronyms were not defined. Mr. Bolowich indicated those definitions would be added.
- Question regarding distance between structures being redundant as setback distances would accomplish the same thing.
- Parcel coverage should be structure footprint not roof coverage.

Mr. Bolowich indicated that the same concept had been carried through all sections of Chapter 17, indicating what was permitted, allowed by CUP, or not allowed. It was noted in Table 2-4 that formula-based fast food drive-through restaurants were not allowed by ordinance adopted by the City Council

Mr. Bolowich continued, reviewing Special Purpose Zones, i.e. Institutional-Health Care, Open Space, Planned Community, and Public Facilities that were unique uses that don't fit in any other established category. It was noted that table 2-6 and 2-7 did not include a column for Public Facilities; however, Public Facility regulations were outlined in Table 2-8.

He briefly reviewed the Combining/Overlay Zones which included Flood Plain, Geologic Hazards, Historic Mission, and Planned Development Overlay Zones. These zones would provide additional standards/restrictions/requirements for a proposed project within a particular overlay zone.

He reiterated the goal was to have a development code that was consistent, easy to navigate and useful. Staff recommendation was for the Planning Commission to review and provide feedback in the next couple of weeks; that feedback would be incorporated and returned to the Commission for final recommendation to the City Council.

Chairman Nichols indicated that careful review by the Commissioners with feedback to staff seemed appropriate in order to provide well thought out recommendations to the City Council for a clean, concise and user friendly Development Code document. He asked that his fellow commissioners carefully review the provided information and provide to staff their comments, questions and concerns by June 16 for incorporation into a final document for consideration at the Planning Commission meeting of July 6.

Chairman Nichols opened the public hearing and invited comments from the audience. Dick Wiley addressed the Commission regarding minimum standards for storage space in residential developments from closets to more storage space in garages.

Chairman Nichols closed the public hearing.

Motion by Morgan, seconded by Nelson and carried unanimously to have Planning Commissioners study, evaluate and provide feedback to Staff on the provided Development Code Update 14-133 by June 16 for inclusion and return to the Planning Commission at the regularly scheduled meeting of July 6. Prieto absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Gallant, seconded by Morgan and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of March 2, 2016 as presented. Prieto absent.

Discussion ensued regarding the minutes of April 4, May 4 and May 18 that were indicated as adjourned due to lack of quorum vs lack of agenda items; Mr. Bolowich explained there were agenda items that were continued to date specific so there had to be an agenda, however the item was not ready to move forward.

Motion by Morgan, seconded by Gallant and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of April 4, May 4, and May 18, 2016 as presented. Prieto absent.

REPORTS OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Chairman Nichols commented on the unfortunate loss of the Palm trees on Citrus Avenue. Commissioner Nelson related a story which pointed out the need to specify the size of replacement trees in a development.

REPORTS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

Assistant City Manager reported that the parking structure at Campus Street and Barton Road providing patient and visitor parking would be operational beginning June 6.

He discussed scheduling a Planning Commission tour of various projects completed or nearing completion and recommended July 6.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

Approved at the meeting of August 3, 2016.



Barbara Nicholson
Deputy City Clerk