

1 CITY OF LA HABRA HEIGHTS
2
3 MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
4
5 OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
6
7 SEPTEMBER 28, 2010
8
9

10 **OPENING CEREMONIES**

11
12 **1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

13
14 Chairman Black called the September 28, 2010 Regular Planning Commission
15 Meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. in the Multi-Purpose room, 1245 Hacienda Road, La
16 Habra Heights, California.

17
18 **ROLL CALL**

19
20 Present: Chairman Larry Black, Vice Chairperson Margarita McCoy, Commissioners
21 Dominick DiMario, Ray Fernandez, Judi Steffire and Alternate Ross Owen.

22
23 Staff present: City Planner Laufenburger and Planning Commission Attorney Scott
24 Porter.

25
26 **2. FLAG SALUTE**

27
28 Chairman Black led the flag salute.

29
30 **3. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE AGENDA**

31
32 **Stephen Blagden**, Citron Road, asked that the Commission Call Projects for
33 Review. There were no meetings for the prior two months. Applications are getting
34 approved by Staff having no scrutiny from the Planning Commission. They should
35 be the eyes and ears for the Community. Mr. Blagden noted that the Mayor had a
36 three level addition approved and it would have been prudent to Call for Review just
37 to show that there is no favoritism in the process and take the pressure off of Staff.
38 There are plenty of plans for you to look at. He noted that we have had record
39 declines in property values in La Habra Heights. We have gone down to number
40 seven in the County while comparable Communities have gone up or only a small
41 decline. Why are we declining? According to the Assessors, this was not a
42 mistake. Our values really did decline. The Code should be revised to restore
43 residents' property rights.

44
45 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

46
47 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JUNE 22, 2010**

48
49 **RECOMMENDATION:** That by Minute Action the Planning Commission approves
50 Planning Commission Minutes for June 22, 2010.

51
52 The Commission members agreed that the minutes were a good representation of
53 what transpired in the June 22, 2010 meeting.
54

55 **Vice Chairperson McCoy moved to approve the minutes as presented.**
56 **Seconded by Commissioner Fernandez and approved as follows:**
57

58 **AYES: Black, DiMario, Fernandez, McCoy and Steffire**

59 **NOES: None**
60

61 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**
62

63 **5. ZONING CODE AMENDMENT 2010-01 UPDATE OF THE LOCAL CALIFORNIA**
64 **ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) GUIDELINES**
65

66 City Planner Laufenburger presented the Staff Report. She stated that the City is
67 required to amend the local guidelines to comply with CEQA guidelines on the
68 newly adopted Greenhouse Gas Emission requirement that became effective on
69 March 18, 2010. Staff recommends that you adopt the resolution and forward a
70 recommendation for approval to the City Council.
71

72 Chairman Black opened the Public Hearing for public comments.
73

74 **Stephen Blagden**, Citron Road, stated that this is a timely item in the light of the
75 next agenda item where we see an incorrect CEQA determination. The most
76 important part of local CEQA determination is not included here. That is
77 determining thresholds of significance which include noise, traffic, view impacts and
78 density impacts. Are our thresholds the same as some other cities? The thresholds
79 of significance need to spell that out to help applicants and decision makers. The
80 State office of Planning and Research implements CEQA and recommends that
81 whenever possible the governing body adopt thresholds by either Resolution or
82 Ordinance after Public Hearing. We believe formal adoption is preferable.
83 Thresholds may be either qualitative or quantitative and they should be based on
84 proper data.
85

86 Chairman Black closed the Public Hearing and brought the meeting back to the
87 Commission.
88

89 Commissioner Fernandez asked if this is to bring us into compliance with the
90 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, what does Mr. Blagden's comment on thresholds have
91 to do with this.
92

93 Planning Commission Attorney Porter stated that in this situation the State has
94 mandated what we should do so it does not apply. He is recommending that we go
95 beyond what is required. There are still many questions on this subject that are
96 unanswered. We can come back at a future date to work on thresholds if we want.
97 It is a matter of policy.
98

99 Vice Chairperson McCoy stated that she would like to add the word "forest" to the
100 introductory section of Roman numeral two, AGRICULTURE AND FOREST

101 RESOURCES, "In determining whether impact to agriculture and forest resources
102 are significant..." and on the third line to use "in assessing impacts on agriculture,
103 forest and farmland."
104

105 Attorney Porter stated that if we change any of this as it is State mandated would
106 mean we were not in compliance with that mandate. He recommended that no
107 changes be made.
108

109 Vice Chairperson McCoy asked if our City is required to have a Greenhouse Gas
110 Reduction Plan or will that come later?
111

112 Attorney Porter stated that it states in the guidelines "if you have such a plan", but I
113 don't know if they will later require us to have one.
114

115 **Chairman Black moved to approve Zoning Code Amendment 2010-01 update**
116 **of the local California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and**
117 **forward the recommendation to the City Council. Seconded by Commissioner**
118 **Fernandez with the correction of the Hearing Date on the Resolution from**
119 **August 24, 2010 to September 28, 2010 and approved as follows:**
120

121 **AYES: Black, DiMario, Fernandez, McCoy and Steffire**

122 **NOES: None**
123

124 **6. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A MASTER PLAN TO ALLOW FOR FUTURE**
125 **CO-LOCATED ANTENNAS ON THE EXISTING COMMUNICATION FACILITY**
126 **OWNED BY COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT LOCATED AT 16700**
127 **SKYLINE DRIVE.**
128

129 City Planner Laufenburger presented the Staff Report on Item 6. She explained
130 that this is a request for approval of a Master Plan by Coast Community College
131 District. The Master Plan describes proposed and tentative uses and the types of
132 antennas to be installed on the existing communication tower. No ground or building
133 modifications will be done to the communications facility. The proposed antenna
134 types consist of facilities for AM/FM or TV Broadcast Stations; Public Safety Two-
135 way Radio Systems; and Microwave Systems. This will not be for any cell
136 antennas. City Planner Laufenburger presented the background information for the
137 beginning purchase in 1971 and the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval by the
138 County of Los Angeles. This was prior to the incorporation of La Habra Heights.
139 She noted City Council renewal of the CUP through the years and a Variance in
140 1982. The latest action was approval by the Planning Commission in 2009 for
141 continued use for an additional 10 years, Called for Review by City Council and
142 upheld by the City Council. She presented pictures of the area where the tower is
143 located. She stated that there are now 19 antennas on the tower, only 10 are
144 active. City Planner Laufenburger showed pictures of the different types of
145 antennas and microwave dishes that possibly will be going up on the tower. The
146 proposed Master Plan will allow for the communication tower to operate in
147 conformance with the existing CUP, while allowing for the future co-location of
148 antennas on the tower. This makes it possible that they don't have to renew the
149 CUP every time a change is made that is accounted for on the Master Plan. It will
150 then be under Administrative Approval with each change. They will have to come in

151 to Planning and go through the an administrative review with the Planning Division
152 to make sure everything is correct and following the Master Plan and then go to the
153 Building Official for structural analysis and make sure they get any permits needed
154 and provide proof for any exemptions needed. They are now proposing 31 various
155 types of antennas from the drum type to the small panel types. **Staff recommends**
156 **the Planning Commission approve the Master Plan PRJ-2010-37 for Coast**
157 **Community College District to allow for future co-location of antennas on the**
158 **existing communication facility.**
159

160 Commissioner Steffire asked if they will remove any antennas that are presently on
161 the tower.
162

163 City Planner Laufenburger answered that she believed they would leave the inactive
164 antennas on the tower for emergency purposes.
165

166 Vice Chairperson McCoy asked what Coast College District is using the tower for.
167

168 City Planner Laufenburger stated that they have two microwave antennas in use.
169 Richard Patterson can tell you what they are for.
170

171 Chairman Black opened the Public Hearing for public comment.
172

173 **Stephen Blagden**, Citron Road, stated that the project history failed to note the
174 illegal and bootleg installations and the continued talk to justify antennas that should
175 have been removed. This tower provides no benefit to the City. He stated that they
176 should pay us an annual in-lieu fire fee of \$10,000 as the Habitat Authority does.
177 The dangerous propane tank is exposed and unpermitted by the City. The retaining
178 wall and grading for the propane tank is also unpermitted. Is the generator also
179 unpermitted? Has the City Engineer reviewed the as built plans for the tower on
180 static and live load calculations? What is the wind loading and seismic stability of
181 the tower with the proposed antennae? These questions need to be answered for
182 our protection. If the tower was not engineered for the additional antennas, there is
183 no need to approve the Master Plan. Mr. Blagden noted that when the General
184 Plan was approved in 2004 and the Codes 2006, the tower was assumed to be
185 removed by 2009 as required by the CUP. The City determination of a Categorical
186 Exemption is incorrect. The tower has never been subjected to scrutiny of CEQA,
187 Alquist Preolo or the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act. There are such hazards in that
188 area. The change in conditions since 1971 demands an EIR. The 1982 variance
189 requires lot size to be increased for the proposed Master Plan. The Master Plan
190 materially violates the 1986 consent agreement that settled a law suit against the
191 City. The Administrative Approval would have to be consistent with the 9 year CUP
192 expiration. In his opinion the project is not ready to be heard.
193

194 **Bill Kerwin**, Attorney and Risk Manager for Coast College, stated that many of Mr.
195 Blagden's comments had been addressed at the time of the last CUP renewal and
196 his statements tonight were filled with many factual errors. He noted that the law
197 suit mentioned was a completely different situation and had nothing to do with
198 Coast Community College. We do take his concerns seriously. We want to keep
199 communication open and do not want to create a visual blight. Mr. Kerwin stated
200 that most of the unused antennas are whip type that are not that noticeable. They

201 are there for emergency response coordination with the County of Orange between
202 public entities and colleges and for our own internal emergencies. This would be a
203 backup for us if we need it to communicate between our multiple sites.
204

205 Commissioner Fernandez asked to know more about the safety of the tower with
206 the proposed added antennas.
207

208 Mr. Kerwin answered that he was always concerned with safety. That tower has
209 been inspected and maintained throughout its lifetime and in 2008 it underwent a
210 complete painting and restoration. Each step of our Master Plan will be checked by
211 both your Planning Department and the Building Department for your protection.
212

213 Commissioner Fernandez asked if you have actually calculated the effect on the
214 tower when the planned antennas have been added.
215

216 Mr. Kerwin explained that we cannot project a future use if we don't have a potential
217 user. We have calculated what exists now as being there. We don't have any
218 prospective tenants yet.
219

220 Commissioner Fernandez asked what Mr. Kerwin thought of Mr. Blagden's
221 comment that there was no benefit to the City from the tower.
222

223 Mr. Kerwin stated that he valued Mr. Blagden's statements, but he did think that
224 they added value to the La Habra Heights City by what they have on their tower.
225 We are also working with the Fire Department to possibly provide them with a better
226 antenna location. We are upgrading the CHP equipment and extend their term to
227 serve a greater community area.
228

229 Vice Chairperson McCoy noted an error of the lot size on the second page of the
230 application for the Master Plan.
231

232 City Planner Laufenburger noted that they check everything and the Staff Report is
233 correct. The application had been added and they had not checked it.
234

235 Mr. Kerwin stated that they would have that corrected on the application.
236

237 Commissioner Steffire asked if Staff has a written report on the last inspection done
238 in 2008.
239

240 City Planner Laufenburger stated that this would be under the Building Official and
241 she did speak to him that he was not here in 2008, but they are a public entity and
242 are sometimes subject to exemptions and are subject to the State requirements. If
243 the Building Department needed a building permit or a check of the structural values
244 they would have dealt with it. She could not verify the structural significance. There
245 was nothing in the file.
246

247 Richard Patterson, applicant, stated that he believed that for the 2008 project the
248 load factor of the microwave dishes and the tower structure they were mounted to
249 was presented as part of the permitting project and I may be able to get the diagram
250 with the structural engineering stamp on it. We realize that for the Master Plan the

251 wind load is a very critical factor. Untill we know what is going on the tower we
252 cannot have an Engineering study done. We will have to go through the permitting
253 process with each step through the Master Plan. The FCC requires that the tower
254 is to be inspected every two years. We inspect the tower every year which is done
255 by a State certified, Federal certified inspector and they inspect every part of the
256 tower.

257
258 Vice Chairperson McCoy asked if he has a record of what has been recommended
259 and what has been done.

260
261 Mr. Patterson stated that he can provide a report on this. We have followed the
262 recommendations.

263
264 Chairman Black asked if this is the only tower that Coast Community College
265 District owns.

266
267 Mr. Patterson stated that they also own one tower at Orange Coast College. It is a
268 monopole with two microwave dishes there that connect between Coastline
269 Community College and Golden West College. On the top of Golden West College
270 we have two monopoles on the theater. We also have several cell towers that
271 Telco operates.

272
273 Mr. Kerwin noted that the tower in La Habra Heights is the only tower of that type,
274 the others are much smaller.

275
276 Chairman Black asked if there are any new FCC or FAA rules that are coming out
277 that might affect the appearance or performance of the tower.

278
279 Mr. Kerwin stated that there is nothing coming out that they are aware of that we
280 have to comply with that we are not already complying with. We have a legal
281 service that keeps us aware of what we need to know about.

282
283 Chairman Black asked if there is anything that might cause radio interference to any
284 AM or FM broadcast bands or digital technology. What kinds of provisions are
285 made to mitigate such problems? Can you assure us that interference will not
286 happen from any of the new antennas?

287
288 Richard Patterson answered that any time an antenna is proposed it has to go
289 through an FCC application process. Notice is sent out to all broadcast stations in
290 that geographical area to give them an opportunity to submit any claims that it may
291 interfere with their broadcasts.

292
293 Chairman Black mentioned that a tower to the southwest of us suddenly changed to
294 bright white lights that were quite disturbing at night. This lasted for some time and
295 has just recently changed back to red lights. Has the FAA changed their rules? We
296 wouldn't want this if the regulations changed.

297
298 City Planner Laufenburger noted that she had found that these strobe lights are
299 required when repairs are being made. It is temporary.

300

301 Richard Patterson verified the regulations. He did not think the FAA would ever
302 change their regulations from red to white all the time as it does affect insects and
303 birds.
304

305 Commissioner Steffire asked if the new antennae or the present antennae benefit
306 La Habra Heights in any way.
307

308 Mr. Patterson stated that it only benefits the City in an indirect way. There are a
309 large number of La Habra Heights students attending our colleges. The microwave
310 dishes provide internet connectivity and a lot of student services at the campus
311 network. The CHP is here.
312

313 Mr. Kerwin noted that the La Habra Heights Fire Department may move higher on
314 the tower to give them better coverage.
315

316 Commissioner Steffire noted that she lives directly below the tower and is not able
317 to receive AM or FM radio there. She stated that we do have a lot of Ham radio
318 operators in the area that could benefit from the new tower use and asked if any of
319 this will improve for us.
320

321 Mr. Kerwin stated that they would welcome the opportunity if there is a relatively
322 inexpensive solution that the City could afford and we could place on the tower to
323 work on this with you. He stated that Mr. Patterson and he could look to see if there
324 is anything that might help this situation and pass the information on to the La
325 Habra Heights Planning Commission.
326

327 Vice Chairperson McCoy asked if they have any sure agreements on new antennae
328 users.
329

330 Mr. Patterson noted that they do have a digital broadcast TV station that is currently
331 interested in leasing space on the tower. Over the last two years we have lost a
332 potential FM radio client.
333

334 Mr. Kerwin stated that there is an extension with the CHP in the works.
335

336 Commissioner DiMario commented on the Staff Report did such a good job on page
337 two of the report with answers to the ten questions listed there. It really gives all of
338 the answers we need.
339

340 Chairman Black closed the Public Hearing and brought the meeting back to the
341 Commission.
342

343 Alternate Ross Owen stated that in his opinion there seems to be sufficient public
344 benefit out of this to us if we can push the Fire Department to get a higher antenna.
345

346 Commissioner Fernandez noted that he agreed with the comments made by
347 Commissioner DiMario.
348

349 Vice Chairperson McCoy stated that she had been against this the whole time. She
350 stated that she is weighing the risk against the gain and does think the risk much

351 outweighs the gains. She is very concerned of the fire danger. She also noted that
352 it is basically an unattended site.
353

354 Chairman Black stated that he agrees with Commissioners DiMario and Fernandez.
355 He stated that he got his questions answered. Staff has done a good job on the
356 report.
357

358 **Commissioner Fernandez moved to adopt Resolution No. 22010-xx approving**
359 **Master Plan PRJ 2010-37 to allow for future co-location of antennas on the**
360 **existing communication facility located at 16700 Skyline Drive as approved**
361 **under amended Conditional Use Permit 2009-04. Seconded by Commissioner**
362 **DiMario and approved as follows:**
363

364 **AYES: Black, DiMario, Fernandez, and Steffire**
365 **NOES: McCoy**
366

367 **ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION**
368

369 **7. CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF VIEW RESTORATION DUE TO THE GROWTH**
370 **OF TREES IN PROTECTED VIEWS.**
371

372 City Planner Laufenburger noted that the Commission had discussed this subject at
373 their last meeting in July and directed her to look into what is in the Code currently
374 and if there is anything there that can be used. There is nothing in the current Code
375 that can be used for Code enforcement. In order to address this there would have
376 to be a Code amendment from you that would be recommended to the City Council.
377

378 Chairman Black asked for opinions on this issue from the Commission and started
379 with Alternate Ross Owen.
380

381 Alternate Owen stated that he thinks they need a simple procedural system that
382 people would have to go through. There has to be a starting point where neighbors
383 talk to each other and we need guidelines on how far it can be taken back.
384

385 Commissioner Steffire stated that views are very important here. She was of the
386 opinion that to deprive someone of their view due to not maintaining the growth on
387 property should be a Code violation. You should be able to file a complaint with
388 someone. You need to start with a paper trail by writing a letter to the neighbor and
389 anyone else that is affected by this overgrowth stating how important the view is to
390 you and that you would be happy to participate in the cost. Negotiate with the
391 neighbor.
392

393 Commissioner Fernandez cited a recent case here where a home sold and the
394 appraiser upped the price \$250,000 due to the view. A view really matters. He
395 noted that Goal # 3 of the General Plan states "Preserve Scenic Views." Land Use
396 Element Policy # 53 states "The City *shall* Establish a Procedure to help resolve
397 disputes between property owners of landscaping and those who claim a loss of
398 views due to the growth of landscaping materials." He suggested a three person
399 committee and if someone has lost their view they can fill out a simple form with the
400 information and part of that information would be that they had already talked to

401 their neighbor. Then the Committee would review the information and make a
402 recommendation. If no progress can be made, it would go to legal action between
403 the two parties. Commissioner Fernandez was of the opinion that the Code
404 amendment could be done by adding "or existing elements" to Chapter 7.12-A –
405 Landscaping Standards. We would pass this suggested change recommendation
406 on to the City Council.

407
408 Vice Chairperson McCoy stated that she did agree with Commissioner Fernandez.
409 She was of the opinion that the Commission should recommend that the Council
410 form a committee for the purpose to set up procedures for those people who feel
411 their view is being impaired. Then it can be announced that this committee exists
412 and can assist with the problem. Their first job would be to make the rules on how it
413 should proceed. The Code amendment could be suggested to them to give them
414 more teeth in what they are doing.

415
416 Planning Commission Attorney Porter stated that it would be good to know that you
417 have the Council's blessing to begin with.

418
419 Chairman Black stated that the Commission needs to express their concern on the
420 issue and a need for a process.

421
422 Vice Chairperson McCoy noted that it gets so complicated because somebody's
423 view is someone else's privacy.

424
425 Chairman Black stated that he is not personally in favor of a separate review
426 committee because he does not think it works well. He would favor a committee to
427 explore what our recommendations are to change the Code so we have some
428 guidelines.

429
430 Alternate Owen asked if it would be better to have the Committee from the
431 Commission as they are more familiar with the Codes.

432
433 Chairman Black stated that he thought it was all in the intent. He would like to see
434 some sort of process that when someone plants a tree they automatically contact
435 neighbors to let them know they are doing that because of a desire to preserve
436 privacy. It will grow to a certain height and will maintain that height. The committee
437 will be able to talk about such ideas.

438
439 Commissioner DiMario stated that there is now a case in Superior Court of a
440 woman in La Habra Heights who sold her home. The home had cleared escrow but
441 the new owners had not yet taken possession of it when the up-side neighbor went
442 on the sold property and cut down 8 or 9 trees. The person who bought the home is
443 backing out and suing the woman who sold the home and she will now have to sue
444 the neighbor who cut down the trees.

445
446 City Planner Laufenburger noted that for the owner who plants a tree, it is not in the
447 Code that they must notify neighbors. They would have to be doing over a 50%
448 improvement to their yard before they have to come in and get a landscape plan
449 approval. You will have to amend the code to do this. This will be a costly change.
450 She stated that she gets calls about trees being trimmed and trees not trimmed, so

451 it goes both ways. We require privacy protection with trees and we also have a lot
452 of pepper trees that continue growing and are a problem. Everything has to be
453 considered.

454
455 Chairman Black opened the Public Hearing for Public Comment.

456
457 **Stephen Blagden**, Citron Road, stated that he agreed that adding two words to the
458 existing Code would not work, as it is within New Development. We could find what
459 has been done in other cities to handle this situation and possibly copy one of their
460 Codes and readjust for us. "Simple" usually leaves out the details that makes things
461 work and causes confusion. He stated his opinion that the cost should not be put
462 on the owner of the tree alone for the benefit of another person. He stated that they
463 should agendaize it for a future meeting to recommend to the Council that they task
464 you of implementing the General Plan Policy you are concerned with.

465
466 Chairman Black brought the meeting back to the Commission.

467
468 Planning Commission Attorney Porter noted that if the Council appoints three
469 persons for the Committee it would be under the Brown Act and the meetings would
470 be subject to the rules. If the City Manager would appoint three people for a
471 Committee it would not be subject to the Brown Act.

472
473 Chairman Black stated that would make the meetings go smoother and the
474 information would still be brought back to the Planning Commission for presentation
475 to them and there would be a public hearing so the public would be able to speak
476 on it. He stated that the Commission could take his suggestion as to this.

477
478 Commissioner Fernandez stated that he thought the idea that anyone planting one
479 tree should have some sort of review is rather extreme.

480
481 Chairman Black stated that he was just noting extremes and how we need to find a
482 way of coming to a happy medium for action. That was not a recommendation.
483 There has to be some type of notification. The committee will have to think it over
484 and have some detail to what they decide on.

485
486 Commissioner Fernandez agreed that we need to come to a reasonable solution for
487 trimming existing trees. He suggested that the Commission make a motion to
488 recommend to the Council that they appoint a three member committee to study
489 and make recommendations of how to implement Land Use Element Policy 53.

490
491 It was noted that the committee should be formed by the City Manager to avoid
492 Brown Act complications and when the suggestions from the committee come back
493 to the Planning Commission it would be a Public Hearing under the Brown Act.

494
495 Commissioner Fernandez suggested that one of the three person committee should
496 be City Planner Laufenburger.

497
498 Chairman Clark stated that some information from an attorney would be good to
499 provide the proper framework for what they will be working on. The attorney would
500 not have to be at all of the meetings of the committee. We do not want to put a

501 financial hardship on the City. He stated that he was in favor of the City Manager
502 picking the committee.

503
504 **Commissioner Fernandez moved that we recommend that the City Manager**
505 **appoint a three-member Commission to study ways to implement Land Use**
506 **Element Policy 53 and recommend their findings to the Planning Commission.**
507 **Seconded by Chairman Black and approved as follows:**

508
509 **Planning Commission Attorney Porter suggested that it go through the City**
510 **Council.**

511
512 **Commissioner Fernandez amended his motion to be worded that he moves to**
513 **recommend that the City Council recommend that the City Manager appoint**
514 **the three-member Commission for the study.**

515
516 **Chairman Black agreed.**

517
518 **AYES: Black, DiMario, Fernandez, McCoy and Steffire**
519 **NOES: None**

520
521 **ITEMS FROM STAFF**

522
523 **8. MONTHLY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT REPORT**

524
525 **RECOMMENDATION:** Receive and File Report.

526
527 Chairman Black noted that they would Receive and File the report.

528
529 **ADJOURNMENT**

530
531 **10. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING BY THE CHAIRMAN**

532
533 Chairman Black encouraged all to volunteer for their City and also asked that
534 people drive at a safe speed on our streets. He adjourned the Planning
535 Commission meeting at 8:54 p.m.

536
537
538

LARRY BLACK, CHAIRMAN

539
540
541

KATHERINE LAUFENBURGER, CITY PLANNER
542