

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Planning Commission convened in a regular session at 7:05 p.m. on Wednesday, September 21, 2005, in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

2. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner LaBouff.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Faulk, Guyton, Horwich, LaBouff, Muratsuchi and Chairperson Uchima.

Absent: Commissioner Drevno. (excused)

Also Present: Sr. Planning Associate Lodan, Planning Associate Santana, Deputy City Attorney Whitham, Fire Marshal Carter, Building Regulations Administrator Segovia, and Associate Civil Engineer Symons.

4. POSTING OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk, seconded by Commissioner Horwich, moved to accept and file the report of the secretary on the posting of the agenda for this meeting; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the approval of the August 3, 2005 Planning Commission minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

6. REQUESTS FOR POSTPONEMENT

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan relayed requests to continue Agenda Item 8A (PRE04-00015, WAV05-00017: Michael Wellens) to October 5, 2005 and Agenda Item 8B (PRE05-00023, WAV05-00013: Les Arneson) to October 19, 2005.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi, seconded by Commissioner Guyton, moved to continue Agenda Item 8A to October 5, 2005 and Agenda Item 8B to October 19, 2005; voice vote reflected unanimous approval (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Chairperson Uchima announced that the hearings would not re-advertised because they were continued to a date certain.

Chairperson Uchima reviewed the policies and procedures of the Planning Commission, including the right to appeal decisions to the City Council

7. **TIME EXTENSIONS** – None.

8. **CONTINUED HEARINGS**

8A. **PRE04-00015, WAV05-00017: MICHAEL AND CAROLYN WELLENS**

Planning Commission consideration of a request for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of a new two-story, single-family residence with a semi-subterranean garage and a height waiver to allow the structure to exceed the 27-foot height limitation on property located in the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 208 Paseo de Granada.

Continued to October 5, 2005.

8B. **PRE05-00023, WAV05-00013: LES ARNESON**

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of a second-story addition to an existing one-story, single-family residence in conjunction with a Waiver of the required side and front-facing garage setbacks on property located in the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 207 Via Anita.

Continued to October 19, 2005.

9. **WAIVERS**

9A. **WAV05-00020: ASAKO AND SHUJI NOGUCHI (MASAYA OKADA)**

Planning Commission consideration of a request for approval of a Waiver to allow a reduction of the rear yard setback requirements in conjunction with a one-story addition that will attach an existing garage to an existing two-story, single-family residence on property located in the Hillside Overlay District in the R-1 Zone at 438 Calle de Aragon.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Santana introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of correspondence received after the agenda item was prepared.

Masaya Okada, project architect, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Phyllis Wiseman, 434 Calle de Aragon, expressed concerns that the project's west-facing windows would intrude on her privacy and subject her to noise.

Mr. Okada agreed to use obscure glass and double-paned windows on the west side of the addition.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved for the approval of WAV05-00020, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the following modification:

Add

- That the west-facing windows in the bedroom and the laundry room shall be made of obscure glass and double-paned.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Guyton and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-130.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-130 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Guyton and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

9B. WAV05-00021: JOE CHANDLEE

Planning Commission consideration of a request for approval of a Waiver to allow the reduction of the rear yard setback requirement in conjunction with the construction of a first-story addition and two new garages to an existing one-story, single-family residence in the R-1 Zone at 1816 Marinette Street.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Santana introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of correspondence received after the agenda item was prepared.

Ms. Chandlee, applicant, voiced her agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

Commissioner Muratsuchi noted that the residents at 1811 Marinette Street have alleged that Mr. Chandlee has been operating an auto repair business out of his garage (supplemental material).

Ms. Chandlee reported that her husband collects classic cars and works on them in the garage but does not operate a business out of their home.

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan advised that the City received two complaints on this subject, one in 1994 and one in 1999, but the cases were closed because there was no evidence of a business being conducted at this location.

Commissioner Muratsuchi asked about noise mitigation. Sr. Planning Associate Lodan advised that there was nothing to suggest that neighbors would be subjected to undue noise from the new garages, therefore, staff did not require any noise mitigation.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved for the approval of WAV05-00021, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Chairperson Uchima and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-131.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-131. The motion was seconded by Chairperson Uchima and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

9C. WAV05-00022: GLENN HATCH

Planning Commission consideration of a request for approval of a Waiver to allow the reduction of the side yard setback requirement for an existing one-story, single-family residence in conjunction with first and second-story additions on property located in the R-1 Zone at 22921 Adolph Avenue.

Recommendation

Approval.

Glenn Hatch, applicant, voiced his agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the approval of WAV05-00022, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner LaBouff and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-132.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-132. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

10. FORMAL HEARINGS

10A. CUP05-00026: SOCIAL VOCATIONAL SERVICES INC.

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a state-licensed educational facility that provides vocational services in existing tenant spaces on property located in the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Del Amo Sub-district Two, at 3535 Torrance Boulevard, Suites 6, 7, 8, 9 and 22.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Santana introduced the request.

Yolanda Nunez and Liz Cohen-Zeboulon, representing Social Vocational Services, Inc., voiced their agreement with the recommended conditions of approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi, seconded by Commissioner Horwich, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Muratsuchi moved for the approval of CUP05-00026, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner LaBouff and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-133.

MOTION: Commissioner Guyton moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-133. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

10B. MOD05-00008 (PP81-32), DIV05-00007: INTERNATIONAL CHURCH OF FOURSQUARE GOSPEL (ROSA VELAZQUEZ)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Modification of a previously approved Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of a new gym and approval of a Division of Lot to allow two existing lots to merge into one on property located in the Precise Plan Overlay in the R-3 Zone at 18090 Prairie Avenue.

Recommendation

Approval.

Planning Associate Santana introduced the request.

Reverend Nancy Johnson, Senior Pastor of International Church of Foursquare Gospel, expressed concerns that Condition No. 7 (requiring the undergrounding of street lights and utilities) could be extremely expensive and asked if there was some way to avoid this expense. She voiced her agreement with the remaining conditions of approval.

Senior Division Engineer Symons explained that the City Council has directed that the undergrounding of streetlights and utilities be required when new projects are brought forward in commercial areas and staff felt this property was a good candidate for undergrounding since the main electrical lines are across the street.

Commissioner Muratsuchi asked what could be done if the applicant could not afford the undergrounding. Senior Division Engineer Symons suggested that the applicant contact Edison for a cost estimate and then staff would take another look at this issue. He stated that, obviously, if the undergrounding costs as much as the project it would be unreasonable to expect the applicant to bear this expense, however, if it's 10% or less, staff would like to have it done.

Commissioner Faulk questioned whether the applicant could resubmit the project for consideration by the Planning Commission should the cost of undergrounding be prohibitive.

Deputy City Attorney Whitham suggested that the Commission could modify Condition No. 7, stating that the undergrounding shall be required unless the Community Development Director determines that it is not feasible due to cost. She noted that the City sometimes waives fees or elects not to impose monetary requirements for non-profit organizations.

Reverend Johnson indicated that the school has full non-profit status.

Commissioner Faulk stated that churches are the cornerstone of the community and he did not favor unduly burdening this project with the cost of undergrounding utilities.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Uchima, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved for the approval of MOD05-00008 and DIV05-00007, as conditioned, including all findings of fact set forth by staff, with the following modification:

Modify

No. 7 That the applicant shall explore the feasibility and cost to upgrade the existing overhead-serviced street lighting and utility system with an underground fed system complete with Marbelite poles all along property boundaries, including Prairie Avenue, and implement to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Guyton and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-134 and 05-135.

MOTION: Commissioner Faulk moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution Nos. 05-134 and 05-135 as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Guyton and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

10C. PRE05-00021: SUZANNE BUTLER (CBB ARCHITECTS – CHARLES BELAK-BERGER)

Planning Commission consideration for approval of a Precise Plan of Development to allow the construction of a second-story addition to an existing two-story, multiple-family residential structure and the construction of a detached garage and laundry room on property located in the Hillside Overlay District in the R-3 Zone at 336 Paseo de la Playa.

Recommendation

Denial.

Planning Associate Santana introduced the request and noted supplemental material available at the meeting consisting of correspondence received after the agenda item was prepared.

Suzanne Butler, applicant, submitted a report containing written material and photographs detailing the basis for her remarks. With regard to the view impact at 163 Paseo de la Concha, she stated that this 16-unit condominium complex has a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in excess of 1.3 and most of the views are un-permitted, acquired views created after the Hillside Overlay Ordinance was passed in 1977. She explained that this development was originally built as an apartment complex and was converted to condominiums in 1988, therefore, these homeowners have no legal standing. Additionally, she noted that most of the units have un-permitted balcony enclosures, approximately 25 feet by 8 feet, increasing the already high FAR, and enhancing the view by pushing windows out to the edge of the building. She called for the Building and Safety Department to take action on these un-permitted remodels. She reported that this property also has a terrible drainage problem as it does not drain out to the street.

Referring to minutes from past Commission meetings, Ms. Butler noted that Commissioners have tended not to afford protection to views acquired after the Hillside Overlay Ordinance was enacted and have recognized the need to strike a balance between the interests of neighbors and the rights of property owners. She reported that her neighbors have shown no willingness to compromise and have instead maintained that she has no right to block any portion of their view. She stated that she felt she has already compromised by limiting the height and size of her addition and expressed frustration that despite her efforts to contact every neighbor who has lodged objections, they have offered no suggestions other than “don’t build.”

With regard to the building at 342 Paseo de la Playa, she explained that this 6-unit apartment building has been illegally converted into 8 units by dividing the unit on the top floor into sub-standard sized units and contended the view impact would not have been so great if the unit had not been divided because only a small portion of the panoramic view would be affected. She suggested that the photograph submitted to demonstrate view obstruction from Unit 6 might have been taken when standing on a chair because the sill height of the north-facing window is at least 5 feet above the floor level and the ceiling is clearly visible in the photograph.

Addressing 157 Paseo de la Concha, she reported that this building was built in 1977, the same year as the Hillside Overlay Ordinance was adopted, however, it was

converted into condominiums in 1981, therefore, homeowners do not have legal standing. She related her observation that the primary views from these three-story, townhouse-style units are to the north and to the east, although there is a partial ocean view over rooftops from some of the units. She stated that Unit No. 5 has an acquired view due to remodeling, but she was unable to locate permits for the remodel so she was not sure what the original view was and that Unit No. 3 has an acquired “peak-a-boo” view from a remodel, which is in progress. She disputed the claim that the project would impact the view from Unit No. 2.

Commenting on claims of economic loss, Ms. Butler maintained that the condition of a property sometimes has a greater influence on its sales price than views and noted that Unit No. 5 at 163 Paseo de la Concha, which is currently in escrow, has been a rental unit for a number of years and failed to sell when it was listed in 2004.

Commissioner Muratsuchi asked about Ms. Butler’s claim that views from properties converted to condominiums after the Hillside Overlay Ordinance was enacted should be considered acquired views.

Deputy City Attorney Whitham advised that this was the first time someone has raised this issue; that she was not particularly persuaded that a change in the form of ownership would somehow restart the clock; and that it would be up to Commissioners to decide whether they agreed with this argument.

Commissioner Horwich related his understanding that un-permitted balcony enclosures could be permitted after the fact assuming that everything has been built to Code.

Assistant City Attorney Whitham advised that City staff would have to investigate each case because some may be “grandfathered in” depending on when they were built.

Commissioner Faulk voiced his opinion that whether or not the balconies have been enclosed is irrelevant because adding glass does not change the view.

Jennifer Jones, representing her family, the owner of apartments at 342 Paseo de la Playa, contended that the project would greatly diminish natural lighting to three apartments, obstruct the northern coastline view from balconies, and negatively affect the value of the property. She proposed that the project be scaled down by eliminating the bay window, which would result in a reduction of only 150-200 square feet while preserving tenants’ views and sunlight.

Don Whitehurst, 157 Paseo de la Concha, #5, voiced objections to the compromise proposed by the previous speaker, stating that project would still block 60% of the view from his living room.

Nicole Adams, 157 Paseo de la Concha, # 3, stated that the proposed project would take away 100% of her view and that it was unfair for someone who has an ocean front property to take away the view of so many other people.

Michael Duffy, prospective buyer of 163 Paseo de la Concha, #5, expressed concerns about the effect the proposed project would have on the view from this unit, voicing his opinion that it would significantly affect the value of the property.

Treva Merritt, 163 Paseo de la Concha, #6, reported that she has lived at this location since 1972 and the balcony was already enclosed at the time she purchased it. She maintained that the proposed project would obstruct 50% of her view to the west and 30% of her view to the north and greatly diminish the value of her property.

Betty Harrigan, 146 Via Pasqual, indicated that she was not directly affected by the proposed project but wanted to applaud Ms. Butler's efforts to keep the quaint beach community spirit intact rather than razing the property and building condominiums.

Bruce Scher, 157 Paseo de la Concha, #5, contended that the proposed project would significantly impair his view. He reported that Ms. Butler visited his property and observed the impact, but rather than being conciliatory, threatened to unite with adjacent property owner to build a huge condominium complex should this project not be approved.

Ina Elminoufi, 163 Paseo de la Concha, #12, stated that the proposed project would take away 50% of the view from two windows.

Dana Crawford, president of 163 Paseo de la Concha Homeowners Association, maintained that there would be a substantial impact on property taxes should this project go forward due to the devaluation of properties with views. She reported that the balconies have been enclosed for a long time and residents were not opposed to the City's investigating them.

Charles Belak-Berger, project architect, suggested that the best use for this site would be to build condominiums, however, Ms. Butler was not proposing anything near what could be built on this site, noting that a 35-foot tall building would be allowed according to the zoning. He explained that Ms. Butler would simply like to have more living space to house her children and grandchildren when they visit and he did not believe this request was unreasonable. He reported that he investigated the original plans for 163 Paseo de la Concha, which is comprised of small apartment-sized units with balconies that over the years have been converted into living space, resulting in an FAR almost twice what is currently allowed. He asked for direction from the Commission, expressing his frustration that there are no clearly defined rules as to what is permitted.

Commissioner Muratsuchi related his observation that the proposed project would significantly obstruct the ocean view from Units 5 and 6 at 163 Paseo de la Concha, thereby decreasing the value of these properties.

Mr. Belak-Berger maintained that 163 Paseo de la Concha is so massive and out of conformance with any standards that it was unfair to deprive Ms. Butler of the right to improve her property in a reasonable manner based on the impact on these units.

Chairperson Uchima suggested that the applicant might wish to meet with neighbors to try to arrive at a compromise. Mr. Belak-Berger stated that Ms. Butler has made every effort to work with neighbors, but they have been unwilling to compromise.

Voicing support for the project, Manoucher Adli, 328 Paseo de la Playa, stated that very little has been done to buildings on this street and they are getting old and tired looking, possibly because there are too many restrictions, and suggested that it should

be the jewel of Torrance and merits upgrading. He further stated that people pay a lot of money for properties with ocean views that cannot be obstructed, while people who live behind pay substantially less and should expect that their views could be blocked in the future.

Commissioner Faulk disputed the idea that people who live behind those with unobstructed views should expect that their views will be blocked.

Kavon Adli, representing his grandfather who owns 332 and 334 Paseo de la Playa, expressed concerns that this was becoming a majority rule situation and maintained that the proposed project was a reasonable expansion necessary to support the modernization of the beach area. He stated that if this project is not approved, he could not envision any expansion of beachfront property.

The Commission recessed at 8:50 p.m., and Chairperson Uchima encouraged Ms. Butler and Mr. Belak-Berger to meet with neighbors during the break to discuss possible ways to mitigate their concerns.

The Commission resumed the hearing at 9:00 p.m.

Darryl Boyd, representing Aylin Salem, the owner of 163 Paseo de la Concha, #5, noted that Ms. Salem submitted a letter (of record) explaining that the pending sale of her property has been in limbo since June, due to the proposed project. He estimated that the project would obstruct 50% of the view from her living room.

Virginia Levanas, owner of 147-153 Paseo de la Concha, reported that her units are the only one-story apartments on this street and thanked the Commission for doing a good job of preserving views in this area.

Patricia Acone, 163 Paseo de la Concha, #14, received confirmation that her letter dated September 15, 2005 was included in the agenda material.

Allen Schanhaar, 145 Via Pasqual, expressed the hope that a compromise could be reached that would satisfy both neighbors and the property owner.

Doug Hoffman, 336 Paseo de la Playa, stated that his landlord, Ms. Butler, is a very caring and giving person who deserves an opportunity to improve her property. He reported that most of the homes facing the beach are rundown and in need of updating.

Ms. Butler clarified that while balconies at 163 Paseo de la Concha may have been enclosed for some time, more recently people have been removing sliding glass doors and exterior walls and turning the balcony area into living space, and this is what she objects to. She noted that she met with neighbors during the break and was unable to arrive at a compromise because each neighbor has a different idea as to how she should expand.

Commissioner Horwich commended Ms. Butler for doing a remarkable job of gathering information, but indicated that he was not persuaded that the conversion of an apartment unit to a condominium changes the date the view originated or that enclosing a balcony, permitted or not, actually changes the view. He stated that he does not respond favorably to threats about building condominiums, noting that any project built

on this site would be subject to the same criteria. Offering direction to the applicant, he indicated that he personally thought a view loss of 25% or less would be acceptable.

Commissioner Muratsuchi stated that he also appreciated all the research Ms. Butler had done and thought she had raised an interesting argument in terms of acquired view. He wanted to make it clear that he was basing his decision on TMC Section 91.41.6, which states that the project shall not have a harmful impact on the land values and investment of other properties in the vicinity, and reported that the view impact he observed in Units 5 and 6 at 163 Paseo de la Concha alone was significant enough to deny the project. He suggested that the applicant investigate each claim of view blockage and try to reach a compromise.

Ms. Butler commented on the difficulty of trying to please all of her neighbors.

Commissioner Faulk questioned whether Ms. Butler's unit has always been one unit. Ms. Butler explained that at one time it might have been partitioned, creating a second bootlegged unit, noting that the unit is poorly designed, that's why she would like to remodel it.

Mr. Belak-Berger stated that he did not believe it would possible to arrive at a feasible design by conferring with the various neighbors, however, he would like to explore reducing the view blockage to 25% or less per Commissioner Horwich's suggestion by opening up view corridors.

Chairperson Uchima stressed the need for those impacted to allow the architect to view the project from their perspective in order to arrive at a compromise.

Commissioner Guyton commended Ms. Butler for the information she provided, but indicated that he could not support the project because he observed that it would have a significant impact on views. He stated that he couldn't offer an exact percentage of view loss that he would find acceptable and would have to see the revised silhouette before making a decision. He noted that supporters have suggested that properties on this street are almost blighted and he wanted to make clear that no one was objecting to the remodeling of the structure, but rather to the view impact caused by the additional square footage.

Chairperson Uchima asked if Ms. Butler would like to continue the hearing so the project could be redesigned. Ms. Butler stated that she was willing to compromise, but she was not willing to take the time or spend the money to re-silhouette.

Chairperson Uchima explained that the project must be re-silhouetted in order for Commissioners to gauge the impact of revisions. Ms. Butler related her preference that the Commission vote on the project this evening.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, moved to close the public hearing; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

Commissioner Faulk wanted to clarify that Commissioners base their decisions on the merits of each case and it has nothing to do with the number of people for or against a project. He noted that some unique arguments were raised in this case, however, he did not believe issues, such as un-permitted remodels, buildings with

excessive FARs and condominium conversions, were particularly relevant. He stated that the Hillside Ordinance is primarily concerned with view impairment and the impact on views is undeniable in this case. He related his observation that both beach and white water views would be affected and the view from one unit would be completely blocked. He expressed surprise at some of Mr. Belak-Berger's comments, stating that there is no reason to believe a large condominium complex would be approved on this site.

Commissioner Muratsuchi stated that he would vote to deny the project based on TMC Section 91.41.6 and these rules apply to everyone and provide clear guidance for anyone who wishes to build in the Hillside area. He explained that he did not consider the view from 163 Paseo de la Concha to be an acquired view because this structure remains as originally constructed and it was not a matter of someone who has added a second story trying to prevent a neighbor from doing the same thing.

MOTION: Commissioner Horwich moved to deny PRE05-00021 without prejudice. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Guyton and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

Planning Associate Santana read aloud the number and title of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-136.

MOTION: Commissioner Guyton moved for the adoption of Planning Commission Resolution No. 05-136. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Horwich and passed by unanimous roll call vote (absent Commissioner Drevno).

For the benefit of the applicant, Chairperson Uchima reviewed the process for filing an appeal.

11. **RESOLUTIONS** - None.

12. **PUBLIC WORKSHOP ITEMS** – None.

13. **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS** – None.

14. **REVIEW OF CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING MATTERS**

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan reviewed recent City Council on Planning Matters, noting that Development Impact Fees were approved and will go into effect October 1st.

15. **LIST OF TENTATIVE PLANNING COMMISSION CASES**

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan reviewed the agenda for the Planning Commission meeting of October 5, 2005.

16 **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

16A. Commissioner Faulk requested an excused absence for the meeting of October 19.

Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Chairperson Uchima, so moved; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

16B. Commissioner Guyton noted that former Commissioner Botello is still listed on the Planning Commission's web page.

Sr. Planning Associate Lodan explained that the City's website is in the process of being revamped and that it will soon have an entirely new look.

16C. Commissioner Muratsuchi requested an excused absence for the meeting of October 19.

Commissioner Horwich, seconded by Commissioner Faulk, so moved; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

17. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:50 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Wednesday, October 5, 2005, at 7:00 p.m.

Approved as Written November 16, 2005 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
--