

## MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

May 16, 2016

7:00 p.m.

Chair Gordon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Cooper,  
Clifford and Chair Gordon  
Absent: Commissioner Nibbelin

**SALUTE TO FLAG:** Led by Commissioner Campbell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Wehrmeister  
Assoc. Planner Murdock  
Police Capt. Spanheimer

**APPROVAL OF ORDER  
OF AGENDA** Commissioner Clifford moved approval of the Order  
of Agenda; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Cooper,  
Clifford and Chair Gordon  
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES:  
APRIL 4, 2016** Commissioner Evans moved approval of minutes of  
April 4, 2016; Commissioner Campbell seconded the  
motion.

Commissioner Clifford stated that, while he knew he couldn't vote on it, he spoke at that meeting and there was a correction that needed to be made.

Chair Gordon stated that they would retract the motion and he could make his correction.

Commissioner Clifford stated that on page 8, in his comments, he was quoted as stating "... land up" and he was sure he said "end up."

Chair Gordon asked for a motion reflecting the correction by Commissioner Clifford.

Commissioner Evans moved to approve the minutes of April 4, 2016 with Commissioner Clifford's correction; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0-2**.

Ayes: Commissioners Evans, Campbell, Cooper, and  
Chair Gordon  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Commissioners Baringer and Clifford

Commissioner Baringer pointed out that, in the May 2, 2016 minutes, his name was misspelled in several places.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he “got a promotion” stating that he was erroneously listed as Councilmember Clifford.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he will be abstaining due to not being present at that meeting.

**APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES:  
MAY 2, 2016**

Commissioner Evans moved approval of minutes of May 2, 2016, with corrections; Commissioner Baringer seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0-1**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford and Chair Gordon
Noes:	None
Abstains:	Commissioner Cooper

**DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 23, 2016:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they do not need a liaison.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 1. TEXT AMENDMENT TA-104-16. The City of Pacifica is proposing amendments to Title 9, Chapter 4, Article 10 of the Pacifica Municipal Code to allow massage establishments as a permitted use in certain commercial districts subject to compliance with licensing regulations administered by the Pacifica Police Department.**

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented the staff report.

Commissioner Campbell asked what the Council was trying to accomplish with this direction.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that Council was focusing on revisions to the licensing ordinance and were acknowledging that human trafficking was an issue and they wanted to continue to have licensing requirements to prohibit that activity but not be so draconian in the

licensing requirements so that legitimate practitioners are not put through the wringer to practice within Pacifica. She didn't think the use permit was even brought up. She stated that staff worked with the Police Department and noticed that there was reference to the use permit requirement and, on looking at past history, cities have used their land use power to try to prevent those illicit activities from happening but that licensing is now considered "best practice." She stated that they had an antiquated section of the code and it was appropriate to remove it as long as the licensing requirements are met.

Commissioner Campbell asked if the licensing requirements were unchanged with regard to requirements in the city for these types of establishments.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she would let Capt. Spanheimer respond to that, adding that the ordinance was revised to be clearer, but she would let him speak to whether it was more or less stringent.

Police Capt. Spanheimer asked that he repeat the question.

Commissioner Campbell thought the Council was asking for more oversight or assurances that human trafficking was not going to be occurring in some of those establishments in town and he wondered what was done to accomplish that purpose.

Police Capt. Spanheimer stated that, in reading it, he felt it was smoother and streamlines the process. He stated that the existing California Massage Therapy Council (CAMTC) approvals will continue and any new masseuses and massage business owners will be CAMTC certified. He stated that there were a handful that will be grand-fathered in under the old licensing. He felt the ordinance was very clear on the rooms, lighting, visibility from the street, what can be touched and cannot be touched and proper clothing that the masseuses wear. He felt it was clear cut. He stated that, in regard to human trafficking, they were part of a county task force that engages in investigations and stings regarding human trafficking and will routinely inspect massage parlors. He stated that the ordinance enables them to look at the records which must be maintained for two years and they can do spot inspections. If any businesses are in question, they have done their own sting operations to make sure they are in compliance with all the state laws and municipal codes.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that, if they think about the nexus findings that they need to make in the projects they review, reviewing books, registering driver licenses was not a land use function. She stated that putting a condition of approval like that on a project wasn't typically what they do and there could be a nexus argument there, but when you have the licensing in a separate section of the code, the City was within its police power to administer various licensing requirements including annual review and inspections. She stated that Planning, through land use controls, is not equipped to do that and she thought it was more appropriate to address those issues through licensing than through the land use authority.

Commissioner Evans referred to mention of the proposed zoning revision saving the businesses an estimated \$3,000 and he asked what the change was, such as save them \$3,000 or add a different fee for the business license.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she didn't know what the licensing fee was, but this was referring to the use permit fees and was a ballpark amount.

Commissioner Evans assumed it was attributable to the Planning Department's processing costs.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans asked Capt. Spanheimer if there was a different cost for the business license.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that he couldn't comment regarding the business license. He stated that the fee they charged at the Police Department has been unchanged with no increases for the last couple of years.

Chair Gordon thought they were talking about a net change of \$3,000 less since the use permit will not be required.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Baringer referred to the report and rather than looking at the ability of vetting the operators, he was looking at it from a land use standpoint and the types of uses, and if they were talking about an inline facility in an existing shopping center, he could see it working efficiently, but he could see issues if one of the operators wanting to construct a free standing location. He asked how the Planning Commission would deal with that in terms of making sure that the development was appropriate, and worked from parking, etc. He mentioned a conditional use letter where they required them to have a permanent sign as opposed to a banner, and he was concerned about how those types of issues would be handled with this new ordinance.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, if there was new construction involved, there would likely be a site development permit that would be required for a new construction in a commercial district.

Commissioner Baringer assumed they would take into consideration the use anticipated for the new building, even though it was in a C-1 district. He stated that he couldn't tell if they had specific parking requirements for that type of use such as a restaurant but he assumed it was buried in there.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would consider the issues related to site development, with parking spaces, setbacks, etc. She stated that was an appropriate land use area of the code and it would require at least a site development permit or a coastal development permit if it was brand new construction.

Commissioner Baringer concluded that either staff or Commission would have an opportunity to look at that and comment on it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Baringer referred to sequencing, asking if they start the process after the applicant is already approved.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if he meant for a new construction.

Commissioner Baring responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it goes through the Planning Department first.

Commissioner Baringer assumed it would then go to the Police Department for the issuance of the operating permit.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Campbell asked if the public loses any rights to comment with the loss of the use permit requirement.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that he was correct, as there wouldn't be a use permit required for a new massage establishment and as far as she read in the licensing requirements, there was no public notice and they would not have the ability to comment. She stated that the significance of that would depend on your point of view. She stated that it seemed like a benign use to her.

Commissioner Campbell stated that, if you research San Francisco's efforts to address this issue, there was a robust discussion, mentioning some of the specifics, and it appeared to be a big concern in San Francisco and he wondered if that was different here.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought there were provisions in the proposed licensing ordinance, and if the operator has been cited or if the location has had problems, they and the location would not be licensed again.

Commissioner Campbell asked if Capt. Spanheimer wanted to expand on that.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that the chief of police has discretion as far as renewal goes which was on an annual basis. He stated that he can comment on past experiences regarding enforcement of massage parlors. He stated that it was many years ago, and they conducted several enforcement operations and they have not experienced a problem with that issue in a number of years, adding that we are fortunate. He reiterated that they were part of the human trafficking task force and they are in constant contact with neighbors. He added that they have had more problems along the El Camino corridor and Pacifica was fortunate that we have not.

Commissioner Campbell asked if he would have any objection if they kept the use permit, such as would it get in their way.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that he didn't believe it would impede them, but it lengthens the process that a future business owner may have to go through and it may afford the public to speak on the topic, but as far as the law enforcement perspective, it would lengthen the process but he didn't think the licensing and permitting would change significantly.

Chair Gordon asked what the purpose was in eliminating the use permit in this context, such as were we trying to encourage entrepreneurship or lower the burdens. He asked if this was an issue raised by masseuses or potential masseuses.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that this was initially driven to streamline the permitting process. She stated that now it was the licensing as well as the use permit for a new establishment. She stated that, in looking at what was being reviewed with the use permits, it was possibly not quite as stringent as what the licensing already does so it was redundant. She thought it was trying to improve efficiencies. She then referred to Commissioner Campbell's comment, stating that, if you are looking at the proposed licensing ordinance on page 7, it discusses that no reapplication would be accepted within one year after an application or renewal was denied or certificate revoked, followed by the statement that City registration certificates may not be issued to massage businesses seeking to operate in a particular location if another business was operating at that particular location and was suspended. She concluded that there were provisions to not keep reissuing a permit if there were problems.

Commissioner Campbell wonders if that means when they refer to that massage business, does that limit a liability for that company and they can reincorporate under a different name and come in. He wanted to get more information on Chair Gordon's point, asking if there have been complaints from the massage community businesses that was driving this or a matter of staff seeing it and saw an opportunity to clean it up.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was staff driven.

Commissioner Evans asked if he was correct that there will be no process at all for the public's knowledge prior to a business starting, even within their neighborhood and there was no recourse for them to speak to anyone about this.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, if you have a commercial district in your neighborhood and it was a permitted use, provided the Commission makes its recommendation and Council approves it, there would be no noticing. She then pointed out that you can already do massages in your home, provided you follow the home occupation requirements which includes limited noticing and that won't change.

Commissioner Evans mentioned that, when a dog grooming business comes before them, there was an opportunity for the public to speak in favor or against this.

Commissioner Evans assumed, with this new change, there would be no opportunity for the public to speak one way or the other.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Clifford referred to Commissioner Campbell's question about being no line of masseuses wanting to open a business, and the most recent ones they received were from 2004, and he thought it was like trying to fix a problem that does not exist. If there aren't people saying they want to open a business and then he assumed the City was not holding anyone from getting a business license, because they weren't making applications. He asked if that was correct.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she was not aware of anyone who has not come to town because of the use permit requirement.

Commissioner Campbell referred to Commissioner Evan's comment, stating that his concern was that you could open up a business in a residential home and put the signs up without public notice, but that was not the case.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the home occupation provisions are not changing. She then pointed out that, if they feel that the main potential concern are things that would be addressed with the licensing and are not land use issues, there was not much for the Commission to do about potential public comments, explaining that if someone came and asked that they do a background check on everyone who works there, that was not the Commission's purview and that was actually going to happen through the licensing requirements. She was having a problem with what land use concerns would be for people who would be noticed for a use permit.

Commissioner Campbell thought there would be signage, parking, etc.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they still have to comply with signage and parking standards of the shopping center.

Commissioner Baringer asked whether they could limit the hours of operation.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she believes the hours of operation were addressed in the licensing.

Commissioner Baringer assumed they were controlled by the Police Department.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Baringer asked what the hours of operation were.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that closing is at 9 pm, adding that it specifies that you may start a massage at 9 pm, but it ends at 9 pm, and it shall not go beyond that. He stated that he would have to flip through the proposal for the opening hours.

Commissioner Baringer assumed that seven days a week was permitted but there was a hard stop at 9 pm.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that the opening shall be between the hours of 7 am and 9 pm.

Commissioner Baringer assumed 7 days a week was permitted.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that he didn't see anything referring to the days they may be open for business. He then referred to the problems mentioned regarding San Francisco, stating that part of the licensing process was Live Scan and once they do that process, they get notified automatically of any subsequent arrests or law violations.

Chair Gordon stated that it sounds like the issue was whether there were issues that the public could raise regarding permitting for a massage establishment that would not be covered in the licensing regulations but would be within Planning's jurisdiction to address that would be of concern to the public. He thought, if that was the case, it sounded like they would lose something

that was potentially worthwhile. He asked if that was summing up where the commissioners were headed.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the only thing that readily comes to their mind was, if they were partitioning tenant space into very small treatment rooms, that it would thereby potentially be creating a higher parking standard requirement than was contemplated.

Chair Gordon referred to Commissioner Campbell listing some things he thought would fall outside the licensing rules but would be within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Campbell stated that it was signage and the Planning Director stated that the signage ordinance would have to be followed, but he was unclear on whether that could be something that they could look at. He thought that was a fairly big deal in this town, as well as parking.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that these concerns are more likely to come up if it was a new construction building, which they would see, but not necessarily moving into an existing tenant space.

Commissioner Baringer asked whether, if hypothetically they approved this at this meeting and it goes off and they have a bad experience that they all missed despite their best efforts, they could always amend it again.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated, to be clear, this was a recommendation. The Council could choose to adopt or not adopt the ordinance amendment. She stated that, if there was an issue, the Council can direct them to bring it back.

Chair Gordon stated that they would normally give the applicant a chance to speak, but the applicant was Pacifica, and he asked if they were going to skip that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would go straight to public comments if any.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Campbell stated that his original reaction was that this was a solution in search of a problem. He stated that they don't have people lining up to changing this and they would be losing public input if they did change it. He stated that, while he wasn't impugning the industry, he didn't see the public asking for the change. He felt the use permit offered them an opportunity to ensure that anything that comes in looks good and he thought that was worthwhile.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he was always in favor of more public input, and he would resist changing it because it cuts the public out of the process.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was reading the codes and permissible usage, and he thought they were singling out a massage parlor or another type of service facility, listing the services that were allowed under the zoning without any permitted use in a C-1 district. He concluded that there are many other uses that are permitted without any use permit and he thought this type of activity was going overboard. He stated that the other conditional use permit was an amusement

machine arcade building. He thought there was some update that needed to be done to the code and he didn't see any problem with these revisions.

Commissioner Evans agreed with Commissioner Cooper, stating that he was not against it and thought it was a great improvement, especially by the Police Department. He was for anything that saves small businesses money, but he was a little leery of backing out of the possible access to a venue for the public to speak on a business coming within their area. He thought it was a wonderful thing, but he was reluctant on pulling back the ability for the public to speak. He did acknowledge that it was not on everything, but felt it could be one thing at different times and they are pulling a lot of information from the public. He appreciated the input and liked the conversation.

Commissioner Baringer appreciated the effort to create a business friendly environment in Pacifica and he thought it was a good thing and they should do it. He was concerned about why they carved this one use out without some sort of context other than the Council wanted it. He thought, if there was a trade association that felt the ability to operate that kind of business in Pacifica was a cumbersome process and stopped him from doing it, he would understand. He understood the nexus issue that, if they do have a public hearing with input, they may not be able to acquiesce to the wishes of the public if they are overwhelmingly opposed to it. He thought public input was part of the process, sometimes painful and sometimes beneficial. He thought, while there was a time and cost delay, if a business person can look at it with a logical progression, they would understand that. He has concerns about taking out the public input and concerns about things they might miss. He acknowledged that they could always amend it later if they chose to approve it at this time.

Chair Gordon asked Capt. Spanheimer when the last enforcement action was against a massage establishment in Pacifica.

Capt. Spanheimer stated that it was two weeks ago.

Chair Gordon was going to raise the question if they were in search of a solution for a problem that doesn't exist, but, in reference to Commissioner Cooper's point, they seem to be singling out the massage business for somewhat onerous treatment or differential treatment from other uses. He was going to use Capt. Spanheimer's evidence as proof that massage parlors have a pretty clean history in Pacifica, but he thought it seemed that he was wrong.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought the enforcement action was because they didn't have a license, not because there was anything wrong with how they were operating.

Capt. Spanheimer agreed that it was not enforcement against a massager parlor but that they didn't have a license to be a massage parlor. He stated that they did a few operations and everything was on the up and up, a legal massage but not licensed.

Chair Gordon asked when was the last time in Pacifica that there was an enforcement action against a massage parlor where the issue was sexual business.

Capt. Spanheimer thought he meant illicit activity, and he thought it had been several years. He stated that he would have to look it up in the records.

Chair Gordon asked for a rough date.

Capt. Spanheimer thought possibly 2010.

Chair Gordon thought that, if within the last ten years, it was relevant to Pacifica. He thought there was a reasonable basis to treat the massage business differently, since there is a relatively recent history of that kind of activity going on.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that Assoc. Planner Murdock brought up the point that this may not be something they want to consider, but she thought there was a different way to “slice this up.” She stated that, if they were looking at potential land use concerns, such as a size that would be permitted, she wasn’t prepared to give them a recommendation.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that, as indicated by Planning Director Wehrmeister, the Council’s intent was to remove any sort of onerous permitting requirements and, the smaller the business, the more onerous the use permit requirement is. He stated that, as a planner they deal with many of the operators at the counter, fewer in Pacifica than other places he worked, but many are poorly resourced businesses. They are just getting out of the massage school with little capital to get started, and the money they need for a security deposit, first and last months’ rent, was burdensome for them, and the prospect of another \$3,000 to \$4,000 for a use permit was overwhelming and may encourage them to look elsewhere or piggyback on another existing massage establishment. He thought that the Council was trying to support a single operator and a few additional therapists, by removing unnecessary permitting requirements. He stated that, if the Commission were interested, staff could look into and make a recommendation to make that carve out for the small independent operators that are less likely to generate neighborhood impacts as opposed to the ones they may be familiar with in larger cities where they divvy up the multiple treatment areas that lend themselves to illicit activity, adding that with that connection they would connect with the Police Department.

Chair Gordon stated that he was interested in that as a good compromise. He stated that he has a massage license from 1960 and he was in that position once and felt it was daunting to start his own business. He was in favor of looking into that.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he doesn’t know enough about the industry to do this on the fly, and he would not be opposed to bringing it back. He also appreciated Chair Gordon’s comment and Planner Murdock’s comments that there are small business owners who might want to find a way to do this. He stated that he would be willing to look at it but not with what they have in front of them.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed that they wouldn’t be prepared to help them at this time, and she recommended that they continue this item to a date specific, possibly the next meeting.

Commissioner Baringer moved that they continue this item for further discussion to meeting of June 6, 2016; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Cooper,  
Clifford and Chair Gordon  
Noes: None

**CONSIDERATION:**

2. Annual Report to the City Council.

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cooper thought it would be interesting for people to understand how many applications the Planning Department processes, such as counter reviews, applications they reviewed and/or processed. He thought they were getting busier, but he only sees the ones presented to the Commission.

Planning Director Wehrmeister assumed he was talking about administrative permits.

Commissioner Cooper thought there was a value to the permits, but he wasn't sure. He knows they have to put a value down, and he thought they might keep track of the value of the permits approved over the year. He thought the public would find it interesting.

Commissioner Evans agreed with Commissioner Cooper. He knows what it was like several years ago and they weren't meeting very much at all, but they were now meeting regularly with multiple items. He thought that would be a big star for the Planning Department to show the increase.

Commissioner Baringer thought it could also be an opportunity for staff and the Commission to share what their vision would be for the future. He thought, if they could illustrate the disproportionate workload the staff has compared to other jurisdictions, that may be useful. He thought there could be an opportunity to talk about projects that they talked about when going through the orientation with Commissioner Clifford and him. He thought those types of exercises could benefit the City long term and are not moving forward in an expedited way with their staffing constraints. He thought that would be an opportunity to make that case. He thought, if they can quantify it in terms of value of permits, etc., that would be great. He thought there was an opportunity to take what they have and catch up in things that have been dragging due to staffing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought they should include the pipeline.

Commissioner Baringer agreed, stating that he felt the pipeline was directly related to staffing levels. He acknowledged that they were working to supplement that and add to it. He stated that he wouldn't limit the thinking just to what they need to stay alive but what they need to be excellent and he felt there was an opportunity to do that. He stated that he and Commissioner Clifford have attended two meetings in 2016 and they would like credit for those, or three after this meeting.

Commissioner Cooper stated that, over the years, they have talked about improvements they would like to see made within some of the codes, such as the parking in lieu fee being increased, etc. He thought they should look at some things, but he wasn't sure it was necessary for the report. He suggested keeping a running list of those things.

Commissioner Clifford stated he would second looking for a way to talk about the in lieu parking fees and getting them adjusted. He stated that they haven't been adjusted since 1986 and are

really out of date. He felt they were not collecting enough money. He stated that now was a good time to be talking about it because they don't have an applicant in front of them who would be expecting to pay the fees as now set so it would be a good time to discuss raising the fees to an appropriate sum.

Chair Gordon asked if they were getting productive ideas.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought she has what she needs, and she would like to work with Chair Gordon directly, if the Commission was okay with that, to firm this up and get it prepared for the 13<sup>th</sup>. She asked if they could check their calendars and plan to be there at the Council meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Cooper asked if she would send invites.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she would.

#### **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

Commissioner Evans asked staff about the current status of 7-Eleven on Hickey.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that the applicant was still working through the building permit review process, with the agent speaking with the building official today. Staff thought they were very close to receiving a building permit. He added that they have to sort through a couple of issues with Engineering with respect to their encroachment permit, stating that they will have to do some work in the right-of-way and the traffic control plan they submitted was incomplete. They expect to be able to issue a permit soon, possibly as soon as a week.

Commissioner Evans asked for the status of the burned out home behind the pastry shop, mentioning that he thought it was no longer re-buildable.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that the building was red-tagged currently. He thought the address was 1070 Palmetto Avenue. He stated that he has been in contact with representatives of the property owner, explaining that they need to obtain an emergency coastal development permit from the Planning Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit. He stated that he has provided them with all the application information and he was prepared to answer any questions, adding that he thought they were working on the submittal at this point.

Commissioner Evans thanked him, adding that he was concerned because of its condition right there on the cliff.

Assoc. Planner Murdock understood that some of the delays were attributable to the insurance company that insured the property, and they were interested in understanding the circumstances of the incident, given the timing. He thought they have sorted out with the issues and are ready to proceed with the demolition as soon as they can get the permits in place.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he asked this question at the last meeting, and asked again if the proponent of the quarry development has provided any sort of traffic analysis regarding entry/exit at Reina del Mar Avenue.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have not.

Commissioner Campbell asked if there was any word or ETA.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought it was June that they are expecting to submit an application.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister introduced their two new planners, Bonny O'Connor and Rob Smith. She and the Assoc. Planner were happy they were here.

Commissioners all expressed a welcome.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.; Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Cooper,  
Clifford and Chair Gordon  
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director Wehrmeister