

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 10, 2013**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 10th day of April, 2013, at the hour of 6:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Conaway, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Andreani
Absent: None
Staff Present: Richard Thompson, Community Development Director
Michael Rocque, Assistant Planner
Recording Secretary, Rosemary Lackow

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 27, 2013

The following amendments were made by the Commission:

Commissioner Andreani: Page 1, the first paragraph, should read “Commissioner Andreani noted to Staff that the power point presentation by the Mall developers made on March 13 is not yet up on their web site. She stated that the information contained in the RREEF presentation provides important information for the public’s increased understanding of the project.” On Page 5, middle of the page, the paragraph beginning Commissioner Andreani should read: “Commissioner Andreani pointed out that the public library upgrade and improvement project was number one in the Facilities Strategic Plan, and the 2-story design is needed to fit all services that are required to fulfill the public’s expectations.” On Page 4, last paragraph, second line (before PUBLIC HEARING): strike “town” and insert “the Police and Fire Conference Room” after “continued in.”

Commissioner Paralusz: Page 1, Reorganization, in the third line: insert “stated” between “and” and “that”. On Page 6, third paragraph, first line, strike the extra space after “glare”, before the comma. On Page 6: replace the fourth paragraph in its entirety with: “Commissioner Paralusz thanked all for the many hours they put into the project so far and a lot of input is reflected in the plan described tonight. She commended the County for being a very good partner, responsive to the project evidenced by the children’s area and the area devoted to adults. She also pointed out that the footprint is smaller than that of the current library and that has created opportunity for more open space in the civic center plaza. She believes the Planning Commission can make the required findings and that most people will be very happy to use this facility. She concluded that she is in full support of the project and invited the public to look at the model of the project that is located in the lobby.”

Chairperson Conaway: Page 3, Item 1. Under Favaro testimony: strike “a” before “integration”. On page 4, for Viet Ngo testimony, first line change “sated” to “stated”.

A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Gross/Paralusz) to **APPROVE** the minutes of March 27, 2013, as amended.

AYES: Andreani, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Chairperson Conaway
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

3. **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** - None

4. **PUBLIC HEARING**

04/10/13-2. Variance from Building Height Standards for a Third Story Addition to an Existing Two-Story Single Family Residence Located at 508 3rd Street (Boyle)

Chairperson Conaway announced the hearing item and invited Staff to make a presentation. Assistant Planner Michael Rocque, the project planner, made a PowerPoint presentation, providing an orientation of the location, setting, existing conditions, history of the site and proposal. Mr. Rocque concluded by stating that the project is code compliant in all respects except meeting the building height limitation which if approved would be exceeded by eight inches. Mr. Rocque outlined the findings that the Commission must make if they approve the application.

In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani, Mr. Rocque affirmed that there is a typo in the second paragraph on page 3 of the Staff Report. Mr. Rocque stated that there should be a period at the end of the paragraph after “natural grade”. At the beginning of the next paragraph, the number 23 should be struck.

Commissioner Paralusz noted on Pages 3 and 4 of the Staff Report, that there are some comparisons to adjacent or nearby properties being built on fill. Mr. Rocque responded “no” to Commissioner Paralusz’s inquiry as to whether any of these other properties have an approved variance, and Director Thompson stated that Staff is not aware that any of these properties have applied for a Variance.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Assistant Planner Rocque stated that the City has some plans dating back to 1987 when the subject house was built but the plans are not complete, nor does the City have an “as-built” plan for the site from that date. Mr. Rocque explained that the subject home is a common floor plan that was built throughout the City.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Conaway invited the applicant to address the Commission. Commissioner Gross disclosed in advance that he has spoken to the applicant, Shannon Boyle and one neighbor when he was viewing the site.

Shannon Boyle joined by husband **Terry Boyle**, stated they are the homeowners and introduced their architect Peter Paldino. Her intent is to explain what they are trying to do, what their challenges are and why they think their variance has merit and address concerns point by point. She noted their goal is to create a 358 square foot home office with an adjoining bathroom and 141 square foot deck at the third floor, well within the maximum permitted building floor area. She gave a PowerPoint presentation showing a photo of the house and covering in detail: the remodel plan, challenges of unusual topography and inability to lower the existing grade, details of the Variance request and concerns, supporters adjacent and nearby and their suggested grounds for approval and findings. Their presentation also included several graphics including the estimated topographic contours of 5 homes including theirs in the 500 block of Third Street, a

cross-section at the side property line between 508 and 512 Third Street from front to rear lot lines, a front architectural elevation showing the code allowed vs. the proposed variance height, ridgeline data for six Third Street homes including theirs; and a possible accounting of the historical grade on the subject site in 1924. Ms. Boyle explained their goal is to retain the character of the home and neighborhood, and noted that their portion of Third Street topographically has somewhat of a trough condition. As part of their planning, their architect reviewed all past plans and verified they have 3,038 existing square footage. She explained that they need to raise the roof up a little to gain vertical clearance in the new area but, being in the center of the house the addition will not be visible from the front or back. Summarizing, Ms. Boyle made the following points:

1. Their challenges are the unique topography which they believe is a natural condition, and the fact that they cannot lower the existing 2 levels of the house in the addition area to make up the 8 inches they will exceed code.
2. They do not believe granting the Variance will harm anyone, and will not block greenbelt views. They are able to lower the tower element towards the front if they thought it would harm a view. Further, the project will not block sunlight incrementally any more than an allowed addition would and they have support of many neighbors, including those immediately to their sides.
3. They are proposing the project because they love their home and neighborhood and they acknowledge that there is no guarantee that they will recoup the cost of the project.
4. They do not believe that the granting of this Variance will lead to another Variance, because each case needs to be evaluated on its own unique circumstances and merit.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz, architect Peter Paldino addressed whether the 8 inches that exceeds the allowed height can be reduced or eliminated. Mr. Paldino, referencing the applicant's slide of the house front elevation, stated that they need an 8-foot, 1-inch ceiling height, and at least a 1% grade roof slope to allow for drainage and avoid water damage. He feels this is reasonable and further the addition is in the lowest point of the house which is the only place where the third story can go.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gross Mr. Paldino stated: 1) the minimum code allowed applicable ceiling height is 7 feet, six inches, and additional structural supports will not help in that already there is a structural beam and two existing support posts, and 2) they looked at possible ways they could reduce the height but he doesn't think he can reduce the height by 6 more inches, especially because the roof needs to slope sufficiently to avoid ponding.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Andreani who asked if there wasn't a potential to reduce the height by a few inches if the skylight were to be a "bubble" or flat as opposed to a "triangle" design, Mr. Paldino noted that the skylight is not part of the problem; however he noted that the tower element can be reduced. Commissioner Andreani noted that the code doesn't have 2 or 3-story zones. Rather the code allows three stories not by right, but three stories is the maximum, and all other standards including the height elevation must be in compliance.

Commissioner Ortmann had no questions.

In response to an inquiry from Chairperson Conaway Mr. Paldino responded to questions about the roof joists and their spacing, and stated his understanding that the code allows a maximum of 36 feet on the low side of a building from top of highest roof to adjoining grade at the property line, and this project will be well under that height measurement.

There being no further questions of the applicant, Chairperson Conaway invited any other interested persons to address the Commission.

Ruth Wallin, resident/owner in the 500 block of Third Street since 1959 spoke. She has seen a lot of changes and one change she opposes is when someone builds as close as possible to the sidewalk and cuts off cross ventilation and sunlight. She wondered if the applicant could build at the rear, as she and her husband built an office above their garage, limiting their added area without a Variance. She expressed concern that approval would set a precedent.

There being no more persons wishing to speak, Chairperson Conaway invited the applicant to respond.

Shannon Boyle, applicant, emphasized three points: 1) the middle part of the house is the only place they can add another story; 2) others are building houses to code that are boxy and block light and ventilation; and 3) regarding concern for an undesirable precedent being set- they believe that their condition is unique and further, they can't change the existing slope of the lot.

The public hearing was closed.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Gross made two main points: 1) height limit is a very important issue for Manhattan Beach and, after reading the findings under which a Variance can be approved, he believes the topography condition could be considered an unusual condition, but 2) he has concern that if granted, that may constitute a special privilege and the issue is where do you draw the line? He stated he thought he might be able to grant a 2-inch height Variance.

Commissioner Paralusz, in referring to a chart on page 14 of the Staff Report, got clarification from the applicant that with the request, they would be able to have an 8 foot ceiling. Commissioner Paralusz stated she is somewhat torn. On one hand she recognizes the plan is relatively modest, seems reasonable and the applicant has made a good presentation. On the other hand, she is still troubled with granting an 8-inch height Variance, and she is not convinced that the topography is exceptional in that this isn't the only home with this condition. She sees that this would be the case if they could not build a third story at all, but based on testimony, they are able to build a third floor with only a 2-inch Variance. She doesn't want to penalize the applicant, but cannot support all the findings for the request to exceed the code by 8 inches.

Commissioner Andreani stated she also is wrestling with approval of the request, recognizing the attractiveness of Third Street and the proposal, but she is unable to see how the project meets all the criteria for the findings. She sees the topography not as a unique hardship but a unique characteristic of the neighborhood. If denied and the lot were scraped, the flip side is that a new structure would have to provide more open space. She would like to support the request but would like to hear from her fellow Commissioners.

Commissioner Ortmann fully appreciates being on the receiving end of this height issue. He fully appreciates the question of setting precedence and in his case he did not ask for a Variance because that would block a view of a neighbor and his ceiling height is being built to 7.5 feet. This feels to him like a situation where the view issue is generally not an issue. The house is in a low area of the street, and it is trying to integrate seamlessly into the neighborhood. Nevertheless the Commission must be very judicious. He has no trouble with making all the findings, and believes the Variance can be granted without compromising the spirit of the ordinance, and he is comfortable with the 8 inches.

Commissioner Paralusz explained that 2 inches would be the minimum that the Variance would be needed and still meet all codes, including the minimum ceiling clearance.

Commissioner Ortmann stated his belief that still this feels like a reasonable Variance.

Chairperson Conaway commended the applicant but he has difficulty with two things; First, regarding a unique condition, and referring to the applicant's slide with the section of street and neighbors' land contours. He stated that if he applies the same logic as in this case to the other neighbors, he believes that 516 3rd Street could build 9 feet taller than the Boyles and that concerns him. He believes a 7-foot 6-inch ceiling would be very livable. Secondly, he is not convinced the architect has looked at many other construction options, such as using steel or some kind of engineered wood. He believes also that the code intent in the finding of unusual circumstance is to accommodate something like a pie shaped lot or much more unusual topography.

Development Director Thompson suggested that the Commission consider a motion, to either deny or approve as requested; or approve subject to conditions, for example, that the variance be for a maximum of 2-inches over the applicable height elevation.

Commissioner Gross indicated that he could support a 2-inch Variance, but asked if the approval document can make it very clear that the approval does not include the tower element which can be lowered to meet the height limit. He asked if something could be in the approval to address that the project is not in a view area, out of concern that this approval would not become a precedent, to which Chairperson Conaway recalled that the City doesn't have a view ordinance and therefore perhaps this should not be in the record of the approval. However the document could address other things such as light and ventilation impacts.

Commissioner Andreani stated her agreement with the prior statements, and believes that massing is important, but prefers to focus on this being a variance for a height limit.

Director Thompson added that staff will word the Resolution clearly that this is not setting a precedent and would document specific conditions relevant to this application.

Commissioner Paralusz stated that she is struggling with the idea that even two inches in height are needed and that she requires further information from the architect.

Director Thompson suggested that the public hearing can be re-opened, and the Commission and ask the applicant if they would consider lowering the ceiling height.

RE-OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Conaway reopened the public hearing. The Chairperson asked Ms. Boyle if they want to go forward tonight or go back and work with Staff.

Shannon Boyle asked and the Chair affirmed that three votes on the Commission is a majority and she further asked for clarification as to what it meant to go back and work with Staff.

Director Thompson reiterated the options available, and Chairperson Conaway called a recess for five minutes to give the applicant time to consider their options.

Chairperson Conaway reopened the public hearing after the recess.

Director Thompson addressed the Commission, reporting that the applicant has decided to ask for a vote on a 2-inch variance.

Chairperson Conaway closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Gross requested information asking if the 2 inches would accommodate insulation requirements.

Chairperson Conaway affirmed, in his opinion that the applicant may have to look at different options. His concern is the roof slope for drainage, and because of this, he supports a 2-inch Variance in order to give some design and construction flexibility.

Commissioner Andreani stated her concurrence with the Chairperson's rationale and thanked the applicant for reducing the extent of the Variance request to the degree possible. She also appreciates the work of the City in terms of height codes and handling Variances and believes she can support the revised request and truly values the discussion during the recess to get to a 2-inch Variance.

Commissioner Gross believes he can support a 2-inch Variance if staff can detail special circumstances in the findings of the Resolution of approval.

Commissioner Paralusz concurs and appreciates the effort of the applicant and recognizes that the 6 inch compromise is not insignificant and she would support 2 inches because that is the minimum needed to build a third story.

ACTION

A motion was **MADE** and **SECONDED** (Gross/Andreani) to **APPROVE** the subject application subject to the condition that the extent of the height variance be limited to 2-inches above the applicable height limit.

AYES: CHAIRPERSON Conaway, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Andreani
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Commissioner Gross added that he is aware that the discussion on the height Variance is closed, but hopes that staff will work with the applicant to try and lower the tower element to comply with the height requirements.

Director Thompson announced that a Resolution of approval would be put on the April 24th Planning Commission agenda.

04/10/13-3. Consideration of Zoning Code and Local Coastal Program Amendments to Implement the Newly Adopted and Certified Housing Element Update (2008-2014).

Chairperson Conaway announced this item and invited Staff to make a presentation.

Director Thompson briefly reviewed the history of the Commission's review, the City Council's

adoption and State Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) certification of the Housing Element. Mr. Thompson introduced the City's consultant, Mr. John Douglas, who made a thorough PowerPoint presentation, including a history of public review and several "program actions" to be undertaken to implement the certified Element including: Facilitate Affordable Housing Development (3b): Precise Development Plan (3b), Streamline Multi-Family Review Process (5b) with Site Development Permit (5b), Facilitate Affordable Housing: lot consolidations (3b), Facilitate Affordable Housing: parking standards in CD and CNE zones (3d), Density Bonus (5a), Reasonable accommodation (7d), Emergency Shelter (7e), and Transitional and Supportive Housing (7e), Two more actions, Facilitate Affordable Housing – Setting a Maximum units per lot in mixed-use developments (3d) and Second Units are to be addressed in upcoming 2013 Housing Element in a few months, and to enable Staff to do further research. Mr. Douglas explained that the program actions are part of the already state certified Housing Element and therefore are a commitment by the City. He proceeded to explain the Program Actions and responded to a number of questions by the Commission. The actions include:

1. Facilitate Affordable Housing Development (3b) through establishing a Precise Development Plan for affordable housing. This proposed new process is acceptable to HCD because it provides a streamlined process for affordable housing.

In response to a question from Commissioner Paralusz Director Thompson noted that the City Council has already approved the Housing Element with this program.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Director Thompson stated that, as a practical matter, he estimates that one could expect a project that had between 4 and 8 units on a multi-family zoned site made up of no more than two combined standard sized lots. The City hasn't had many projects with such density and he does not expect that to change.

Mr. Douglas noted that the Precise Development Plan applies to 5 or fewer units and could be administratively approved by the Director of Community Development, and would be exempt from CEQA. This is different from the Site Development Permit, which applies to 6 or more units and typically market rate housing developments and which would come for review before the Planning Commission and also would be subject to CEQA.

2. Facilitate Affordable Housing Development (3b) through lot consolidations. Mr. Douglas explained -this is an incentive for consolidating lots to construct affordable housing. The amount of bonus density is based on site size. Between .5 and 99 acre = 5% density bonus and if 1.00 or more acres in area= 10 % density bonus. This is separate from the State mandated density bonus.

3. Revise parking standards consistent with state law in CD and CNE zones for affordable housing. This program would allow reduced parking standards consistent with State density bonus law for affordable units in the CD and CNE zones. Development Director Thompson clarified the current code requires two spaces per unit and this program would require one space per unit.

In response to Commissioner Andreani's concern about how the reduced parking standard which is inclusive of guest spaces, would work in providing needed parking, Mr. Douglas explained that the State law often reflects a "one size fits all" situation in that it applies equally to all cities throughout the State even though demand for parking may differ by geographic area. Commissioner Paralusz added that perhaps the thinking also is that parking is not part of an affordable plan.

In response to a question from Commissioner Andreani about the parking standard on page 27 of the Staff Report (page 19 of the draft Resolution, "Reduced Parking" section "a") that requires 2.5 spaces for units with 4 or more bedrooms, Mr. Douglas explained that 2.5 is used, instead of a

whole number because this is a multiplier and after applying it to the project, the total required spaces would be tallied and rounded up.

4. Density Bonus (5a): Mr. Douglas explained this program is state mandated and provides for a sliding scale that determines the total number of units that can be built, depending on the number of affordable units that are proposed.

In response to a suggestion by Commissioner Gross, Mr. Douglas agreed that it would make sense to add the words “at least” in the Resolution on Page 15 (Page 23 of Staff report) in paragraphs 1, 2, and 4 just before, respectively, 10% (of the total units) for paragraph 1, 5% for paragraph 2 and 10% for paragraph 4.

5. Reasonable Accommodations (7d). Mr. Douglas explained that this provision is again, a State mandate that requires the City to have an administrative process for “reasonable accommodation” requests. An example is where a resident of a two story house has lost mobility and needs an elevator which would encroach in a setback. Under this provision, Staff would be able to approve such encroachment without a variance or special permit, provided showings that there is a disability and this is the only way to achieve mobility.

6. In response to a question from Chairperson Conaway, Mr. Douglas stated that he didn’t think the City needs to adopt implementing definitions, suggesting that Staff default to the State definitions. Development Director Thompson added that in his experience this problem comes up only in older homes, and newer homes are planning elevators as part of their construction.

7. Emergency shelters (7e) Mr. Douglas explained this provision is based on law passed in 2007, and provides for year round temporary housing with minimal support services on a year round basis. Most cities are wrestling with this to bring their ordinances into compliance. The State has said it will not certify any Housing Element that does not contain this provision. In the proposed Element, the PS and IP districts are identified as zones where shelters could be considered per the following standards: minimum 10 beds facility, a minimum separation of 300 feet between shelters, one parking space per 4 beds plus staff, management and operations plan, and other development standards per zoning district. The City has discretion on the maximum number of beds and HCD has accepted our proposed standard. There are not a lot of emergency shelters and none in the local beach cities, because they are often developed by non-profit organizations that rely on federal grant money. Management and operations plans that are required would include policies on weapons, alcohol, and communications with the City. The City can consult with police departments in establishing these plans and the “rule of reason” will apply as to the types of things that can be in that management plan.

7. Transitional and Supportive Housing (7e) This is housing of a longer term compared with Emergency shelters and provides night to night housing, and was also mandated by law passed in 2007. This housing would be permitted subject to the same standards as applicable to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone. In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, Mr. Douglas stated that these could be for alcohol or drug rehabilitation, but he emphasized this is not an application of group home law under which the City can apply the CUP process if providing housing for 6 or more clients and go through the Planning Commission and City Council . However, it was explained that if someone comes in with a supportive housing project for 12 clients this would be treated under group home standards, and not as a Single Family Residence.

8. Second Units: Mr. Douglas gave a quick preview of this program (5e) which is one of two programs that will be delayed a few months and is not in the draft Resolution. Staff wants to

thoroughly review what other cities have done, and come back with a more thoughtful recommendation. This is an issue that goes back a long time in State law, starting out as being known as “granny flats”. That description is no longer valid as state law has been changed so that you cannot restrict their use to seniors.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ortmann as to how delaying second units will be received by HCD, Mr. Douglas stated that he expects it will be adequate to explain in meetings with HCD that this will be resolved before the next Element cycle which comes up in six months. Another benefit is that the next cycle will have smaller RHNA numbers and will not be as challenging, in that it will apply the status quo on most issues.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Gross, Mr. Douglas affirmed that in the meantime, the City would apply existing state law for second units. Mr. Douglas also noted that Hermosa Beach adopted an ordinance with findings based on public health and safety concerns, that does not allow second units on lots smaller than 8,000 square feet and this has been in effect since the early 90’s.

This concluded the Housing Element presentation, and Chairperson Conaway invited any questions of Staff. Staff would like to have a decision from the Commission to approve the draft resolution.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gross, as to whether incentive (e) in paragraph 1 of Section C. “Types of Affordable Housing Incentives” on page 19 of the Draft Resolution, pertaining to building height increases, is really necessary in the code. Mr. Douglas remarked that the intent of the housing law is that the City must make density bonuses feasible. For example, if a developer can show that they need a height variance to accomplish the project units and the project meets the City’s density bonus code, then the City would need to work with the developer to get to the best situation. However, Mr. Douglas also responded that State law does not specifically mandate that the City must grant a height variance as an incentive. Director Thompson noted that with the City’s voter initiative in our Code, there may be a good argument that granting a height Variance for a density bonus would be in conflict with the City’s Code. Mr. Douglas responded further that he would pose this question as to whether (e) can be eliminated, to the City Attorney before this item goes to City Council.

Commissioner Gross also pointed out a typo on page 20 of the draft Resolution, in the Section entitled Administration; paragraph C, “Orange County” should be struck and replaced by “Los Angeles County”

Commissioner Andreani pointed out a typo on page 11 of 33 (Page 3 of the draft Resolution) in the paragraph on emergency shelters. Staff should strike a “due to a person’s” because it is repetitive.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Conaway opened the public hearing and invited speakers and seeing none, closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Andreani stated that she recognizes that City has little flexibility since these are state requirements. A motion was MADE and SECONDED (Andreani/Paralusz) to ADOPT THE DRAFT RESOLUTION, recommending that the CITY COUNCIL ADOPT the proposed

2008-2014 Housing Element programs.

AYES: Andreani, Gross, Ortmann, Paralusz, Chairperson Conaway
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Director Thompson announced that this matter will be forwarded to the City Council with the recommendation to conduct a hearing and adopt the recommendation.

Commissioner Paralusz commended Staff and Mr. Douglas, as City consultant for making the subject Housing Element understandable

5. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

Commissioner Andreani noted that on April 11th in the Fire and Police Conference Room, the concept plan for the Veteran's Parkway Maintenance Improvement Project will be presented. She also stated that the Final EIR for the Mall project is available on the Manhattan Village website, and on the City's website there is an Executive Summary which is very informative.

Commissioner Paralusz stated that she has received notice of the availability of the Manhattan Village FEIR due to her proximity to the Mall. She also asked about the status of the Chalk Preschool development project to which Director Thompson responded that he does not believe the owner is going forward with the preschool project.

Chairperson Conaway noted on April 15th there is a townhall meeting at City Hall to discuss potentially expanding the City no smoking ordinances.

Commissioner Gross stated that he encourages the public to look at the Manhattan Village project FEIR and noted that there is much time for this. Also he does not see any evidence that the FEIR contains any of the new design for the parking structure, to which Director Thompson noted that at the next meeting, the developer will be providing an updated Phase I and II plan with more details, and the Final EIR does not necessarily contain that much detail.

- 6. TENTATIVE AGENDA – April 24, 2013**
- a. Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project**

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. to Wednesday, April 24, 2013, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 1400 Highland Avenue

ROSEMARY LACKOW
Recording Secretary

ATTEST:

RICHARD THOMPSON
Community Development Director