



City of
Santa MonicaSM

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA

WEDNESDAY, January 21, 2015
7:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
ROOM 213, CITY HALL

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Parry called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Commissioner Ries led the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. **ROLL CALL:** Present: Jennifer Kennedy
Richard McKinnon
Gerda Newbold
Jason Parry, Chairperson
Jim Ries

Absent: Amy Anderson

Also Present: Kyle Ferstead, Commission Secretary
Tony Kim, Acting Special Projects Manager, City
Planning Division
David Martin, Director of Planning & Community
Development
Brad Misner, AICP, Principal Planner, City Planning
Division
Barry Rosenbaum, Senior Land Use Attorney

4. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**
Mr. Martin gave the Director's Report. He announced the Commission's meeting schedule as follows: January 28, February 4, February 18, and February 25, 2015. He stated all meetings will be devoted to the Zoning Ordinance Update Redline Draft Review. He announced two community workshops regarding the future of the Civic Auditorium, which will be held on Saturday, January 31 and Sunday, February 1 in the East Wing from 9:30AM to 1:00PM.

Commissioner McKinnon asked which Commissioner will be attending these workshops. Mr. Martin responded that the Commission had elected Frank Gruber to represent the Commission on the Civic Center Task Force.

Chair Parry asked which portions of the Redline are anticipated to be discussed on which meeting dates. Mr. Martin stated January 28 and February 4 will be Division

III issues and February 18 should be the Commission’s formal recommendations to City Council. He also stated the February 25 will cover the Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE) Amendments and Map Amendments.

5. **PLANNING COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None.

6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None.

7. **STATEMENTS OF OFFICIAL ACTION:** None.

8. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

8-A. **Draft Zoning Ordinance Public Review Draft:**

This is the sixth hearing to review the Redline Public Review Draft Zoning Ordinance Update and 27th hearing overall on the Draft Zoning Ordinance Update. The Planning Commission concluded and closed the public testimony on Division II at its January 14, 2015 meeting and will continue its deliberations on the major topics within that Division that the Commission and public focused on during the initial public review draft. The Planning Commission may discuss any other division of the Redline as well as potential amendments to the Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE), LUCE Land Use Map, and Official Districting Map, particularly as they relate to Division II. The Commission will provide comments and preliminary recommendations to staff on all these topics. Revisions, additions, and/or deletions will ultimately be included as part of the formal recommendation to the City Council for adoption.

Chair Parry stated that this meeting will continue the Commission’s deliberations on Division II from January 14, 2015, and there will be no public input as that portion of the hearing was closed at the last meeting. He assured everyone that public comment will be taken in future meetings on the Redline Public Review Draft Zoning Ordinance Update, hereafter referred to as the Redline.

Chair Parry gave a recap of some issues discussed at the prior meeting, including medical / dental offices and the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requirement for new buildings and applying a different standard for existing medical / dental office buildings. Commissioner Ries stated the recap is correct.

Commissioner McKinnon commented on Main Street restrictions that require a CUP if exceeded, including length of street frontage and square footage of uses. He expressed concern that Santa Monica will become like other communities with endless chain stores, including banks and coffee outlets. He asked others to comment. Chair Parry commented on chain stores and how to regulate them by requiring a CUP for uses over a certain size or frontage width. He suggested such regulations could be expanded to other districts. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum commented on regulating formula businesses (chains stores, restaurants, etc.), which are complex regulations. He stated he could speak more to the issue later. Commissioner McKinnon responded that follow-up may be needed

on chain stores, but first he would like to see how the rest of the Commission sits on this issue. Senior Land Use Rosenbaum commented that the Main Street regulations deal with uses, not whether it is a chain or not. Commissioner Kennedy stated she share the concerns on “cookie-cutter” businesses, and the key to her is the number of outlets. Senior Land Use Rosenbaum mentioned that some cities have legislated against the number of uses and there is case law in the federal courts.

Chair Parry suggested focusing the discussion on different ideas to regulate businesses on the boulevards. He commented on correspondence regarding Main Street standards for uses that exceed 75-feet of street frontage or 7500sf, which requires a CUP, and thought this standard could be expanded to other Neighborhood Commercial districts. Mr. Martin pointed out that 75-feet is fairly wide and the standard store width on the Third Street Promenade is 50-feet. Commissioner Newbold commented that she is comfortable with expanding the standard for all Neighborhood Commercial districts and that the standard should be 50-feet of street frontage. She made that a motion and Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion.

The motion on commercial street frontage was approved by the following vote:
AYES: Kennedy, McKinnon, Newbold, Parry, Ries; ABSENT: Anderson.

Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum reminded the Commission that all votes cast in these meetings can be revised until the final recommendations to City Council are made.

Commissioner McKinnon made a motion that the 50-foot frontage standard be expanded to all commercial districts (mixed-use boulevard, mixed-use boulevard low and OC). Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Newbold commented that the proposal seems small for boulevards and limiting. Chair Parry suggested 15,000sf and 100 linear feet street frontage for boulevards. Commissioner Newbold also commented that there is more retail on the boulevards. Commissioner McKinnon amended his motion to 75-foot frontage and 15,000sf. Commissioner Newbold stated she could support that.

The amended motion was approved by the following vote:
AYES: Kennedy, McKinnon, Newbold, Parry, Ries; ABSENT: Anderson.

Chair Parry commented on banks, which are appearing all over the City and that the previous motion not cover the smaller bank uses. He made a motion that banks not exceed 40-foot street frontage and 7500sf except by CUP. Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion.

Commissioner Kennedy asked staff if the proposed motion would be effective, reminding everyone of the Citibank on Wilshire Boulevard and Twenty-Third Street. Mr. Misner responded that he does not have a great deal of data on this issue, but it would seem it could be effective. Chair Parry asked if staff has any ideas on ways to

circumvent the CUP proposal, since banks often have more rear/parking lot uses that street frontage. He stated the motion is for all districts. Commissioner Ries commented that he does not see this as a major issue in the community.

The motion on banks and financial institutions was approved by the following vote: AYES: McKinnon, Newbold, Parry, Ries; NOES: Kennedy. ABSENT: Anderson.

Section 9.11.030 Development Standards and Table 9.11.030 (II-52 – II-60)

Chair Parry commented on Active Commercial Design (page II-56), Active Use Requirement (Section 9.11.030(A)(5) for ground floor uses and exemption cited (Section 9.16.030(A)(5)(6). page II-57) and stated he can see no reason to allow Creative Offices on the ground floor and that it should be removed. He also commented there should be a limitation on “Walk-In Clientele.” Chair Parry made his comment a motion. Commissioner Newbold asked that the concerns leading to the motion be explained. Chair Parry stated his understanding that it is for a Creative Office Use to be on the ground floor, but that does not seem to fit the Land Use and Circulation Element (LUCE). Commissioner Newbold asked if he is fine with the use if it is not in an active use area. Chair Parry answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Newbold responded that she hears what he is saying, but gave an example on Ocean Park Boulevard, an active commercial area, where there is an architecture firm and design studio, which adds to the interest of the street. Mr. Misner stated it is important to distinguish between Creative Office and “Walk-In Clientele.” He suggested an architecture office could qualify for “Walk-In Clientele” or not. Commissioner Kennedy asked how one would access such an office, from the alley or parking lot? Mr. Misner explained the Specialty Office category, such as a travel agency, as an alternative. Commissioner Ries asked if this Section is actually prohibiting ground floor residential, even for 100% Affordable Housing projects. Commissioner Newbold stated it would be for Active Commercial areas. Commissioner Ries stated this seems overly restrictive. Commissioner Newbold stated she could not support a motion that transfers this to the boulevards. There was further discussion on this motion. Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion.

The motion on creative office uses failed by the following vote:

AYES: McKinnon, Parry; NOES: Newbold; ABSTAIN: Kennedy, Ries; ABSENT: Anderson.

Chair Parry commented on limiting frontages for “Walk-In Clientele” businesses and non-residential uses above the ground floor, per the LUCE goals. Commissioner Kennedy commented that she understands this provision helps the City control height and density, so she is in favor of it.

Commissioner Ries made a motion to eliminate the requirement for commercial above the ground floor. Commissioner Newbold seconded the motion.

Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum reminded the Commission that this provision was included in the Resolution of Intention to amend the LUCE and the Commission can revisit the issue. Chair Parry stated he would support removing the requirement

if the building envelope would allow enough space for design modifications without losing units.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: McKinnon, Newbold, Parry, Ries; NOES: Kennedy; ABSENT: Anderson.

Chair Parry raised Commissioner Anderson's idea of exempting Affordable Housing from commercial design standards. He stated that currently a 100% Affordable Housing project can ask for one modification and that the concerns of housing providers should be addressed. The Commission discussed specifics for affordable housing providers in order to finance their projects, such as tax credits, which cannot be applied is there is a discretionary aspect to the project.

Commissioner Newbold made a motion to exempt 100% Affordable Housing Projects from the Active Use Requirements. Commissioner Ries seconded the motion.

Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum and Mr. Martin explained affordable housing levels. Commissioner Ries commented that the "NMS" types of projects are not the types that will be coming forward in the future and this change is the reason. Mr. Martin stated that since this change there have been no new Administrative Approval applications, and several on file have been withdrawn.

Mr. Misner recapped the motion as allowing an exemption from the Active Use Requirements. Chair Parry agreed, then clarified it should be the active commercial design under Section 9.11.030(A). Mr. Misner verified that Section 9.11.030(B) would still apply, as in pedestrian-oriented design. Commissioner Ries expressed his dismay that Commissioner Anderson was not present, since she works with affordable housing financing. He also expressed doubt that the City will see many 100% affordable housing projects in the future with the addition of commercial uses since it adds to the financing burden. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum noted that this type of housing was promoted in the late 1990s and early 2000s, but the mandated ground floor commercial space has not been successful in the Downtown area on Sixth and Seventh Streets. Mr. Martin stated the requirement is consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan, and the draft Plan calls for more commercial space at or near the corners, not mid-block. Chair Parry asked how this would be applied to the boulevards. Commissioner Kennedy stated the ground floor residential on the boulevards should be discussed. Chair Parry commented on his wish to incentivize affordable housing on the boulevards and stated he is leaning toward the LUCE goals for boulevards and incentives for housing. Commissioner Newbold commented that the City will be lucky to see any such housing in the next few years. Commissioner Kennedy commented that ground floor residential would have a health and safety concern because of the vehicle emissions along the boulevards.

Chair Parry repeated the motion as follows: to exclude 100% affordable housing projects from the requirements in the Active Commercial Design section.

The motion on exempting 100% affordable housing projects was approved by the following vote:

AYES: Kennedy, McKinnon, Newbold, Ries, NOES: Parry; ABSENT: Anderson.

Commissioner Kennedy commented on the Pico Boulevard and Twenty-Eight Street housing project, which has an odd ground floor podium and an impediment into the sidewalk apron, which makes walking difficult. She asked if this can be addressed in the update. Mr. Kim asked if this impediment is in the public right-of-way. Commissioner Kennedy answered in the affirmative and stated the corner of the building is the actual concrete of the building and juts into the crosswalk apron.

Chair Parry raised the question on whether it would make sense to have a different limit on the number of modifications that can be requested by a 100% affordable housing project, noting that the current cap is two. He suggested that removing the caps for affordable housing projects might incentivize development. Commissioner Newbold commented that if the project is under 50-units, it can be built by-right, and asked when a modification request might occur. Mr. Martin explained there could be a design issue they cannot achieve without a modification. Chair Parry stated that the current approach is that if the project is applied for under a Development Review permit, there are no limits to the number of modifications that can be requested. Senior Land Use Rosenbaum commented that there is a separate process for modifications authorized under the State Density Bonus provisions. Commissioner Newbold commented that Commissioner Ries' option for two modifications seems reasonable.

Chapter 9.11 Mixed-Use and Commercial Districts (pages II-43 to II-60) and Table 9.11.020: Land Use Regulations – Commercial and Mixed-Use Corridor Districts (pages II-45 to

Chair Parry commented on pursuing the idea of requiring a CUP for new office and production facilities in the Mixed-Use Boulevard (MUB) and Mixed-Use Boulevard Low (MUBL) Districts. He stated that according to the LUCE, the key is to expand the housing supply. He further stated office space is plentiful on the boulevard and this will not tip to housing predominance for many years. He made a motion to require a CUP for new office space in the MUB and MUBL Districts, and existing uses are exempt from this requirement.

Commissioner Newbold asked how this motion is different from the one for medical / dental offices. Mr. Martin explained that medical / dental offices are required to have much more parking than general offices. Chair Parry stated his intent is to parallel the prior motion. Commissioner Ries expressed that the motion seems onerous. Mr. Misner reviewed the terms from the medical / dental office motion, which requires a CUP for new construction but not for reusing an existing medical or dental office space. He asked if this is the same premise for the current motion. Commissioner Parry agreed. Mr. Misner stated that the foundation of the LUCE is to provide housing on the boulevards, along transit rich corridors.

Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion.

The motion on office space and media production support facilities with a CUP was approved by the following vote:

AYES: McKinnon, Newbold, Parry, Ries, ABSTAIN: Kennedy; ABSENT: Anderson.

[The Commission took a break from 8:50 p.m. to 9:04 p.m.]

Commissioner McKinnon commented on Table 9.11.030: Development Standards – Commercial and Mixed-Use Corridor, Tier 2 projects for East Wilshire Boulevard (Twenty-Sixth Street to Douglas Park) and the need to change the floor area ratio (FAR) from 2.25 to 1.75. He spoke about height, shadow and traffic impacts of the higher FAR. He made a motion to reduce the FAR from 2.25 to 1.75 for East Wilshire Boulevard. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ries commented on the much higher FAR on Wilshire Boulevard in West Los Angeles and how it has produced housing. He stated he does not favor reducing FAR. Chair Parry expressed concern that there is not enough incentive to gain more housing along the boulevards and an FAR reduction would lessen the likelihood more. He stated that the standards have been studied by experts and he is reluctant to reduce the FAR. Commissioner McKinnon commented that he also wants to remove Tier 3 projects for the east end of Wilshire Boulevard. He noted there are no alleys in this area to project the neighborhoods. Commissioner Newbold stated the proposal does not make sense to her and she will not support it.

Chair Parry commented on the Zoning Ordinance map, which shows R-2 zoning along the commercially zoned area. Mr. Martin noted there are no R-1 properties adjacent to the C-6 District, which Mr. Misner also confirmed. Mr. Martin stated there may be some A-Lots, used as parking lots, between the residential and commercial properties.

The motion failed by the following vote:

AYES: Kennedy, McKinnon; NOES: Newbold, Parry, Ries; ABSENT: Anderson.

Commissioner McKinnon commented on correspondence received regarding the OP-D district, and asked staff to comment on it. Mr. Misner stated that staff also received the correspondence late this afternoon, but has not had time to review it in depth. He commented that the issue is the standards for the OP-D district and a request for certain standard changes for parcels. Chair Parry commented that the intent is to talk about the South Beach Tract (R2R zoned), specifically regarding some disincentives to retain the unique character of the area. Mr. Kim responded that the intent was to carryover the existing residential standards and, if needed, re-evaluation would be done as a part of a different work effort after the Zoning Ordinance Update. Commissioner McKinnon expressed support for the work effort. Chair Parry commented that resolution to this matter is being left to staff for review.

Commissioner Ries commented on the development standards on page II-53 (Table 9.11.030) and the discrepancy between Pico Boulevard and other areas of the City in terms of density and height. He stated that incentives should be across the board and he is not happy with these provisions. He also stated he will not make a motion

on this.

Commissioner Kennedy commented on page II-48, Small Scale Facility at the top of Table 9.11.020, regarding Game Arcades. She stated the table does not agree with the text in Section 9.31.340, which only allows Game Arcades on the Pier.

Commissioner Newbold commented on the January 7, 2015 staff report, making sure that the upper story setbacks had been covered. She stated the Redline reads that the formula setbacks have been removed, however there is an average five-foot setback from the top of the first floor and would require a LUCE amendment. She stated she is comfortable with letting it stand.

Chapter 9.13 Employment Districts (Industrial Conservation and Office Campus), pages II-62 to II 73

Chair Parry commented on staff's recommendation regarding housing. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum stated this is a legal issue and under the Redline, the only authorized housing in these districts is 100% affordable housing, which raises issues with the Costa Hawkins law. He further stated that when this issue was brought up before, the Commission used a Resolution of Intention to expand the allowance for all housing. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum explained that upon further review, it appears this would trigger the need for additional environmental review, which would be time consuming. He stated that the short term solution is to allow no housing in these two districts.

Commissioner Ries made a motion to remove all housing for the Industrial Conservation and Office Campus District. Commissioner McKinnon seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: Kennedy, McKinnon, Newbold, Parry, Ries; ABSENT: Anderson.

Commissioner Kennedy asked about the Commercial and Mixed-Use corridor (page II-50, Table 9.11.020) and Auto Dealerships, Specific Limitations (6) and Section 9.31.070 new language, specifically that expansion will also mean "new." She read the changes between the two sections and asked staff to comment. Mr. Martin explained that (6) on page II-50 speaks to placement of an Auto Dealership under the LUCE. Commissioner Kennedy stated that was her reading as well and that the Redline is clarifying language.

Chair Parry asked staff to confirm that the development standards for the Hospital Mixed-Use (HMU) come from the LUCE, which refers to the Hospital Area Specific Plan (HASP) and stated his understanding that under the Zoning Ordinance Update, the Commission can set lower height standards. Staff confirmed. Chair Parry commented that the maximum height standard is 45-feet for Tier 1 and 70-feet for Tier 2 (page II-71, Table 9.13.030) with FARs of 1.5 and 2.5. He noted these standards exceed the MUB which are adjacent to these two areas. He made a motion to have staff to return with standards more in keeping with the adjacent boulevards than is in the HASP. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion.

As there were no objections to the standards as drafted and Chair Parry withdrew the motion.

Chapter 9.14 Oceanfront District (pages II-74 – II-84)

Commissioner Ries commented that he is perplexed by the e-mails received on this area and that really only two sites being discussed. He stated he is reluctant to change the standards for a whole district based on this information. He also stated that there is parking available above grade behind one site, although hidden from the street. He suggested variance findings might solve the problem. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum commented that staff shares the same position on this matter. Commissioner Ries asked staff on the issue of FAR and the slope of the site, if a variance can even be requested. Mr. Misner thought a variance could be requested, however, this cannot create a situation where the FAR exceeds what is permitted. He stated staff is still studying the issue. Commissioner McKinnon commented that many e-mails were received on this issue; however, they came from only three people who are related to the project sites.

Chapter 9.15 Public and Semi-Public Districts (pages II-85 to II-91)

The Commission had no comments on this Chapter.

Chapter 9.16 A Off-Street Parking Overlay District (II-92 to II-94)

Commissioner Newbold commented that this Chapter should have lots of issues as it deals with “A” lots. Mr. Martin stated the issue so far is which parcels have been designated as “A” lots as opposed to how they are regulated under the Zoning Ordinance. Chair Parry stated the discussion on “A” lots will be part of the Map Amendment discussion and this Chapter is about how “A” lots are regulated.

Commissioner Ries commented on Section 9.16.040 Conditionally Permitted Uses (B) (3), which says “any code-required parking in an existing “A” parcel is replaced in the structure.” He stated the assumption is that this is Code required parking or is it surplus parking. Mr. Martin stated it is a combination of both, noting that some “A” lots are just parking adjacent, but not required for, a commercial business. Commissioner Ries asked about (B) (4) for “temporary parking of transient motor vehicles and trucks” and could it not be use as shared parking for residents. Mr. Martin responded that this aspect was not being precluded, but instead restricting potential auto dealer over-night vehicle storage and is taken from the existing Code. He stated the language can be amended. Commissioner Ries commented that it would be nice to see one of these converted to open space on top.

Chapter 9.17 Residential Mobile Home Park (pages II-95 – II-96)

Chair Parry commented that the question had been raised about relaxing the requirement of needing a Development Review permit has been covered.

Chapter 9.20 Beach Overlay District (pages II-99 – II-100)

The Commission had no comments on this Chapter.

Chair Parry asked for other comments on Division II. Commissioner McKinnon

asked about Lincoln Boulevard south of the freeway and whether the FAR has actually been doubled in the Redline. He cited page II-53, top of the page (Table 9.11.030). Commissioner Newbold noted that this is for 100% affordable housing projects. She then asked why Tier 2 with community benefits has 1.75FAR on Lincoln Boulevard or 2.0FAR if on-site affordable housing is provided. Mr. Misner responded by explaining the sliding scale for FAR and the base standards for FAR. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum commented this is an odd circumstance since the affordable housing component is called for as a community benefit and is specified in the LUCE.

Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum commented on the proposed recommendations from the Landmarks Commission for increased height and FAR for Landmarked properties. He further commented on the hand-out from that body which deals with a landmarked property and the ability to add height and FAR for additional structures on the site. He noted that the proposal is for additional height which is greater than Tier 2 and Tier 3 for some properties and staff believes this would require a LUCE amendment or could possibly be done as a transfer of development rights (TDR) as established in the LUCE, but staff does not agree on this point. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum stated the proposed heights exceed the LUCE Tier height maximums. Commissioner McKinnon asked if staff is saying a Zoning Code process should include the recommendations and a LUCE amendment process to comply with the request. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum responded that it not just the heights being in the Tier 3 range, but also that Tier 3 projects must be filed as a Development Agreement, which is not what the Landmarks Commission is requesting. Chair Parry asked if, within the proposal, any zoning districts where the standards were within the Redline Tier 2 standards. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum stated he does not think so. This issue was discussed, but no motion was made.

Commissioner McKinnon asked staff if the current Code requirements for basements were continued in the new Code, would it work. Mr. Misner stated the primary reason for changing the Code was to reduce the number of variances coming forward for sloped lots. He also stated staff is still working on amending the basement standards and should have new wording in the near future. Commissioner McKinnon commented on the Sunset Park hillside.

Chair Parry stated that at the next hearing, January 28, 2015, the Commission will begin their discussion on Division III. He asked staff if Division III will be divided in two parts and how many staff reports are expected. Mr. Kim stated there will be two staff reports, the first one on most of Division III, except the sections on Parking, Loading and Circulation and Transportation Demand Management (TDM), which will be released before that discussion is held. Senior Land Use Attorney Rosenbaum commented that has been past practice, staff will update the Greenline to include changes made to the Redline as of this meeting.

9. DISCUSSION:

- 9-A. Set New Hearing Date for Appeal 14-009 of Architectural Review Board 13-451,

2930 Colorado Avenue. The hearing date was previously set for February 18, 2015 on December 3, 2014.

Mr. Martin recommended the hearing be set for March 18, 2015. Chair Parry made the motion to set the hearing date for March 18, 2015, for Appeal 14-009. Commissioner Newbold seconded the motion, which was approved by voice vote.

9-B. Set Hearing Date for Appeal of Architectural Review Board 14-361, 2919 Lincoln Boulevard and 802 Ashland Avenue.

Mr. Martin recommended the hearing be set for March 18, 2015. Chair Parry made the motion to set the hearing date for March 18, 2015, for the 2919 Lincoln Boulevard and 802 Ashland Avenue appeal. Commissioner Newbold seconded the motion, which was approved by voice vote.

Commissioner McKinnon expressed concern with holding these two hearings on the same date as they will likely have many public speakers. Mr. Martin explained that the Code requires setting the hearing date within 30 days of the filing. He also the dates can be changed if necessary.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

- 10-A. Planning Commission Caselist
- 10-B. Transmittal of Development Projects Information

11. FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS: None.

12. PUBLIC INPUT:

One member of the public, Denise Barton, addressed the Commission on a number of topics including transitional housing; limiting the number of table for restaurants; Coastal Commission jurisdiction; and the Ocean Front area.

13. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned by Chair Parry at 10:18 p.m.

APPROVED: April 22, 2015