OFFICIAL MINUTES
MONTEREY PARK PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
320 W. NEWMARK AVENUE
April 24th, 2012
7:00 P.M.

Planning Commission	**Staff**
David Garcia	Jim Basham, Director of Development Services
Arthur Fong	Elizabeth Calciano, Assistant City Attorney
Hans Liang	Samantha Tewasart, Associate Planner
Larry Sullivan	Crystal Landavazo, Assistant Planner
Michael Hamner	

CALL TO ORDER: The Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Michael Hamner

ROLL CALL:

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chairperson Hamner, Commissioners Sullivan, Fong, Liang, and Garcia
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	None
STAFF:	Director of Community Development Jim Basham, Assistant City Attorneys Elizabeth Calciano and Robert Smith, Associate Planner Samantha Tewasart

AGENDA CHANGES AND ADOPTION: None

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

PUBLIC HEARING:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. DETERMINATION OF CONSISTANCY OF FISCAL YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 2011-2012

Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Requested that the Commission adopt a resolution that the 2011-2012 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is consistent with the General Plan. He provided a brief summary of the project. He stated that the improved infrastructure, including streets, sewer, water, and fire stations will allow the City to enhance its resources and serve the community.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked how the determination for allocation of funds was made.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied that the funds were allocated through various state, federal and proposition funding as well as through population.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked if that is why there are three different categories for street resurfacing.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied yes.
Commissioner Fong	Asked about item #9 signage way finding program, wanted to know what new signs were to be placed in the City.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied that there are no signs up yet, but there are plans to place twenty or so signs on Garvey, Garfield and Atlantic in about a month.
Commissioner Liang	Asked about the announcements section, specifically: “While an individual project may not necessarily correspond to a specific goal, policy or outlined in the Monterey Park General Plan, the CIP as a whole is consistent with the General Plans commitment to implementing long range plans that enhances physical and economic resources of the community.” Wanted to know if there are any projects in particular that do not correspond to a specific goal or objective.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Responded that there is no public works element per se and there is not a specific element that corresponds with a specific project.

Commissioner Liang	Asked if the project is more in line with the overall plan.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied yes.
Commissioner Sullivan	Referred to Project Name and Description List, asked for clarification whether numerical numbers relate to the sequence for completion.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied that the numbers do not.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked about Wheelchair Access Ramps and whether the residual funds were used.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied the funds were used to complete fifteen wheelchair access ramps.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked what was the criteria for determining who gets ramps.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied that high traffic areas and school areas get priority.
Commissioner Sullivan	Referred to the Signage Way finding Program, specifically: “install decorative signs around the City to direct residents and visitors to key points of interest including City buildings, parks and hospitals.” Asked why the developers not responsible for supporting the cost of placing signs to direct people towards shopping centers.
Director Basham	Responded that developers support the cost when signage is part of an entitlement for new developments, but CIP is relating to existing places in the City for identity purposes.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked about item #12: Various Street Resurfacing., inquired if it was only for the area around East Los Angeles College (ELAC).
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied that the street resurfacing was for areas all around the City in areas identified by the Pavement Management Report and the condition rating of streets.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked about the status of the street improvements around the campus.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Responded that the street improvements are close to

	completion but there are underground utility issues that must be resolved prior to completion of street improvement on Collegian and Floral.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked if only one side of Floral was to be completed.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied Floral at Collegian will be widened to provide a right turn pocket. On the Collegian side, the west half of the street will be improved with sidewalk and pavement improvements to match the improvements on the East side of the street.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked if the Transit Center will replace the many bus stops around Floral.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied yes. Upon completion of the Transit Center in the summer, it will act as a hub for those using public transportation near ELAC.
Chairperson Hamner	Made a general comment that more substantial context is necessary for understanding what has been implemented and what still needs to be done according to fiscal year in the CIP as well as an outline of the areas that will be affected in order for a more full evaluation on the plan in its entirety. He asked if the projects that are not completed carried over from the previous year have more weight than those that are new.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied they do try to complete the projects from previous years before beginning new ones.
Chairperson Hamner	Asked what the criterion is for determination of which shopping centers get signage in the Way Finding Program and how is that determined.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied there are key locations that are highlighted including the Prado Center, Atlantic Square and Atlantic Times Square.
Chairperson Hamner	Asked specifically for one way driving, where would he/she see signs.
Assistant City Engineer Alfonso	Replied that if one were traveling south on Atlantic, they would see a sign at Newmark showing the direction of

City Hall, Library, Barnes Park, etc. and intended to guide visitors and residents to places of interest around town.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked how the signs would look graphically and what languages would be represented.

Assistant City Engineer Alfonso — Replied design is still in the concept stage and signs would be in English.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING — Chairperson Hamner opened the public portion of the meeting.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING — Chairperson Hamner closed the public portion of the meeting.

MOTION: Moved by Commissioner Garcia seconded by Fong, to **ADOPT** the Capital Improvement Program as consistent with the City of Monterey Park General. The motion was voted on as follows:

VOTE:

AYES: Chairperson Garcia, Commissioners Fong, Liang, Sullivan and Hamner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

2. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF MONTEREY PARK AND MAGNUS SUNHILL GROUP LLC. REGARDING PROPOSED TOWN CENTER DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT 114-120 E. GARVEY AVE AND 100,200 S.GARFIELD AVE (DA-12-01)

Chairperson Hamner — Stated that this development has a long history and asked for assistance from staff on the history and background.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Provided a summary of the Town Center Development, including a brief overview of the Development Agreement in general, a history of the project and finishing with specific terms of the proposed Agreement.

Commissioner Garcia — Asked about the types of fees and fines being faced by the Developer.

Director Basham	Responded it relates to Chapter 9.54 violations of property maintenance, graffiti, etc.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked on how many occasions were the fines issued and over what period of time.
Director Basham	Responded there were multiple instances in a period of 12 months.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked if the property is currently in violation.
Director Basham	Responded if citations have not been paid and the corrections have not been made then they are in violation.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked if the violations have been corrected.
Director Basham	Responded that he would need to refer to the property owner to see if the violation of graffiti had been corrected.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked what measures are being taken to ensure the acceptance of high quality tenants in the development.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded that the City does not have the authority to force the developer to take any particular tenants, but there are tenant provisions in place for the developer to prove to the City that they are trying to locate tenants from a pre-approved tenant list and if they are unable to locate tenants they must reimburse the City for the loss of sales tax revenue expected.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked for an elaboration on the remedy for not receiving tax revenue as agreed upon.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded, firstly there is a pre-negotiated list of tenants that the developer is to try to secure for the retail portion of the development. They have two years from the date of occupancy to lease 51 percent of the rentable square footage to the defined pre-negotiated tenants. If they fail, they must reimburse the City for expected sales tax revenue. If they partially meet the expectations, they would still receive the benefits of proportional decrease in the amount owed to the City for a period of ten years.

Commissioner Fong	Asked if the issue is regarding the parking lot behind the property.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	The issue is more complex, and the parking lot parcel was the City's biggest bargaining chip in the Development Agreement to ensure that the City maintained some control over the project, that the expected uses would be there as well as high quality tenants.
Commissioner Fong	Asked if the City would still be in charge of the maintenance of the property until the site starts getting developed.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Replied that is correct, the City can continue to use the parcel as a parking lot until the beginning of the construction by the developer.
Commissioner Fong	Stated that from a citizen perspective, the parking lot is a site of complaints by residents due to its cleanliness and sanitation issues.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded that the parking lot has been the responsibility of the City and once the developer begins the construction on their site, the parking lot will cease to exist and with it the sanitation issues.
Commissioner Liang	Asked whether this is the first Agreement reached
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded yes, this is the first Development Agreement between the City and the developer.
Commissioner Liang	Asked whether the elimination of the CRA delayed the Development Agreement.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded that is correct. The draft Development Agreement was presented with a switch in the party after the decision with CRA.
Commissioner Liang	Asked what were some primary differences from what was originally agreed upon.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded there were some changes, including internal inconsistencies in the document. There were three primary changes, firstly the DDA included a substantial

discussion of the bridge loan as well as developers obligations that have since been resolved and removed. Certain financing and standards have also been eliminated. Secondly, property acquisition has also been removed from the document. Lastly, the requirement for the agency to provide one million dollars in public improvements financing has been eliminated. This requirement is met through the transfer of the parking lot parcel.

Commissioner Sullivan — Commented that there is little imagery connected with the proposal which makes it difficult to consider. Asked about the requirement for the Agency to pay one million in public improvement construction, and what exactly that covers.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Responded by asking what exactly the Commissioner was referring to.

Commissioner Sullivan — Replied he was referring to the letter from Mark Hansley regarding the Summary Background Analysis.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Responded that in prior versions of the DDA, the Agency was required to fund one million dollars for certain improvements identified as project improvements in the mitigated negative declaration that was approved in 2006. It is listed in section 1.7 of the current Agreement listed A through M which have been required as part of the project entitlement process. In the prior Agreement, the Agency would be in charge of the public improvements, up to one million dollars, but as mentioned previously in the current agreement, Magnus has agreed to pay for all improvements.

Commissioner Sullivan — Asked about the live, work, play concept, and whether there is a window that allows for the condos in the development to be part of the live, work, play concept.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Responded that there are no entitlements that are in place beyond those approved in 2006, however section 2.1 defines the possibility of a live, work play proposal but it must come back to the City for approval because it is not included in underlying entitlements.

Commissioner Sullivan	Asked about the change in codes that would occur once the development of a live, work, play concept began.
Director Basham	Responded that the Commissioner is absolutely correct. Building Permits still needed to be pulled for the residential areas by June. If the developer decided to modify the floor plans to change either fire code regulations or building code regulations, construction floor plans could change significantly resulting in further entitlements or amendments to the plans. The plans have only been in the preliminary discussion phase.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Stated that the language addresses that changes can be found in section 1.1 of the Agreement.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked for clarification whether the code covers home offices for future purposes.
Director Basham	Responded at this time it covers the construction of residential condominiums.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked whether a resident can work out of their condominium.
Director Basham	Replied that the Residential Section of the Municipal Code covers what is considered a Home Occupation Permit which covers minimal business activity. The concept of a live, work, play environment is completely different, and converting residential condominiums to this concept may change their occupancy from residential to commercial. This can trigger different code requirements to the 2010 Building Code regulations, rather than the 2007 code requirements they are currently under.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked about the surrounding businesses in the project area, and whether the developer would take responsibility to those buildings if any damage were done to the property and or buildings.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded that the Agreement includes an indemnification provision where the developer would hold the City harmless for any impacts or liability that comes as a result of the project including demolition and construction of the proposed town center project.

Commissioner Sullivan	Asked about the existing issue of tour busses along Garfield Avenue and asked whether this project would allow for these buses along the street.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Stated he would have to defer to Director Basham as the Development Agreement does not do anything in terms of site plans or building plans that have been approved by the City, which are the proper mechanism to ensure there is both clearance and safety for the other buildings.
Chairperson Hamner	Interjected the point that there is the evaluation by CEQA which addresses the circulation element and how that has changed since the mitigated negative declaration was given could address the issue.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Replied that is correct. The evaluation by CEQA and its age can be viewed as relevant to the impacts the project is faced with now.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked whether the changes to the pre-approved tenant list would be subject solely to the approval by the City Manager.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Replied that is correct.
Commissioner Sullivan	Asked what is the criteria for determining whether the new tenant is qualified to be in the development.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	There are no specific criteria laid out, but it is up to the discretion of the City Manager to ensure that the tenants are similar the quality of tenants already on the list, and must have a significant presences both in California and nationally as well as meet the sales tax criteria of section 1.5 of the development agreement.
Chairperson Hamner	Commented he has some sense of the background and history of the project but there is still quite a bit lacking in the way of clarity regarding the project in general. Asked specifically with issue to exhibit 4, who put the list together.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded the list was prepared jointly with the City Manager as well as Director Basham, the consultant and developers team.

Commissioner Hamner	Commented that the list presented is disingenuous because the list of tenants is not realistic. Asked for clarification regarding the requirement of good faith for quality tenants.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded that the requirement begins after two years and up to ten years to be sure that 51 percent of the project have been filled with pre-approved tenants.
Chairperson Hamner	Commented that to get the amount of commercial to the area, the project allows for one hundred plus units of housing in an area that does not allow for residential. Similarly, the list of pre-approved tenants were similar for the development at North Atlantic and it did not do as well as promised even with its proximity to a thoroughfare. So with this development there is little promise at best that the developer will be able to deliver what has been promised.
Commissioner Fong	Commented that the City has the responsibility to encourage development, and that developers should not be penalized for not bringing certain establishments to the development, and not being able to meet the 51 percent standard for pre-approved tenants.
Chairperson Hamner	Commented that the economic vitality of the City is what is most important and that is why mechanisms are in place to create vital businesses. He commented that the City can only support so many mom-and-pop shops because the larger chains are the ones who bring in traffic and revenue which cannot afford to do so.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Added for clarification, firstly the reason why they chose not to present visuals of the project was because building permits have already been issued for the project so any attempts to redesign the project would have been in vain and the focus was mostly on the Development Agreement itself. Regarding the CEQA analysis, the Development Agreement does not propose any additional development and the standard for additional review under CEQA is that if there is no substantial change to the project itself, there is no need for additional environmental review.

Chairperson Hamner — Responded that he agrees that the comment helps the community feel reassured to the measures taken in the project are for the community benefit.

Commissioner Sullivan — Commented that there is a certain amount of frustration by the Commission due to the lack of concrete plans in the planning of the areas around the downtown area and that needs to be further addressed by the City.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING — Chairperson Hamner opened the public portion of the meeting.

DEVELOPER:

Nelson Huang — Commented on his involvement with the project since 2008, and shared his thanks for support for the project. Plans on addressing the issues regarding the project and diverts the details to Paul Harrigon who had been working on the project since early 2003. He addressed the fines and penalties faced by the property. Commented that the penalties on the property began in 2006 when the old building was still there, and the latest issues were a result of Chinese Lenten Festival when the property was used by a sponsor for the event which resulted in some problems. For the historical penalties, they would like to understand the nature of the citations and will then deal with them.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked the speaker whether he was negotiating.

Developer Huang — Replied no, he is just trying to understand the issues.

Chairperson Hamner — Responded that the question was direct and the response sounds as if there is negotiations going on.

Developer Huang — Replied he is just trying to understand the issues.

Director Basham — Interjected that there are no negotiations with outstanding citations, they must be paid and that is why the City Attorney is bringing it up. When you are going into a good faith effort with negations with the developer and it is going before the City Council, you want to make sure as a developer you want to have a clean record with any

outstanding obligations to the City, you need to clear those and that is why it is being brought up this evening.

Developer Huang — Leaves questions to be answered by Paul Harrington, in house council.

REPRESENTATIVE:

Paul Harrington — Stated that the original concept of the project was to deal with the kind of issues brought up by Chairman Hamner. The concept was born out of an observation by a first generation Chinese man, that his children did not have a place in Monterey Park to shop at the kinds of American stores they liked. The development is different than that of Atlantic Times Square in that the project strived to acquire national retail credit tenants. So when they were approached by a City Council member to agree to the 51 percent, everyone was in agreement. The list of national credit tenants was made up to illustrate the types of tenants they would strive to get. Nothing was intended to say the development was going to get one or the other; it was to create a workable document. Goes on to comment on the history, and discussed the December 2010 notice of default. Goes on to describe how the project was already financed by a major bank, and they had tenants arranged by a major commercial brokerage firm finding tenants to meet the 51 percent required. In late 2008 the financial market collapsed and their lender pulled out of the deal as well as their anchor tenant who had an option out clause and was lost. Goes on to comment on the thoroughness of his background knowledge of the project and asked if there are any comments.

Commissioner Fong — Asked how long it would take to break ground on the project assuming the City approves the plan.

Representative Harrington — Responded that the groundbreaking can begin as early as late June or early July, and they plan to move quickly on the plan, but cannot do so without taking care of the reverter clause. Explains that there was no intention to bind the City's hands with timing, but they would like to break ground. Goes on to explain that he understands why the City wanted the reverter clause, explaining the City wanted to make sure that the developers did not do

something else with the City's key hold on the project, which was the parking lot.

Commissioner Fong — Commented that all agree that they want a developer to do a good job and bring good tenants to the downtown area.

Representative Harrington — Replied if there is one thing they have agreed on throughout the entirety of the project it is to achieve that very goal.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked for clarification regarding the 60-day extension mentioned at the last City Council meeting.

Representative Harrington — Replied the agreement transferring the parking lot has a deed element written in describing if there was no effective development agreement by May 1st then the property goes back to the City and the money returns to the developer. Due to the process of code provisions, with multiple City Council hearings and 30 days in order to be effective, there was no way the deadline would be met. Therefore the extension was a result of a negotiation by the developers and City Council to get an approval on the development agreement.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked whether the extension is purely in regards to the parking lot, and does not affect any other amendments.

Representative Harrington — Replied yes. The extension only has to do with the one provision regarding the parking lot. After which the developer could go ahead and get a construction loan as well as move the project forward.

Chairperson Hamner — Stated that for the record the issues that were brought up were not purely of his concern, but they were in the report and therefore they were focused on. Also stated at the end of the day it is about whether or not the project can sustain itself financially. Asked what brokers are being used to find tenants and asked to describe the type of track record they have.

Representative Harrington — Responded that one of the gentlemen behind him is actively involved in getting tenants and he would not comment on who is involved because it is a public record and the deal is not yet finalized. One of the firms,

	Coldwell Banker George is one of the largest commercial brokerage firms at this time, and would be the one to contact those firms on the list and would work to meet the good faith requirement.
Chairperson Hamner	Replied he is looking for more of a track record in another area where developments have been done in a similar situation.
Representative Harrington	Responded that he would have to defer to the realtors.
Chairperson Hamner	Replied what has been described is all discretionary and is not selling the project for his vote.
Representative Harrington	Stated he would not give specifics because he is not in the position to ruin a potential deal by mentioning it now.
Chairperson Hamner	Replied the speaker is misunderstanding his request in that he is wanting a track record for the commercial brokerage firm, and the lack of information demonstrates a lack of effort on the speaker's behalf.
Representative Harrington	Retorted the reality is the subject matter should be the staff report that was prepared.
CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING	Chairperson Hamner closed the public portion of the meeting.
Commissioner Garcia	Asked a question directed to Robert Smith regarding the Agreement, if there are any issues that are glaring or that could be problematic as the project moves forward, if it moves forward.
Deputy City Attorney Smith	Responded that it is a process of negotiation that has been going on for the past year and there are provisions that have been pushed harder for in certain drafts, but there are also certain things that have to be given up to reach agreement with the parties. One provision is the tenant requirement, there are situations that could be more strenuous, but it was one provision that was negotiated pretty heavily between the Council and developer. That being said, there is a pretty good deal on the money that is required to be paid if they do not meet the requirement. They tried to find various ways to define the tenant requirement, however there were many

loopholes in the definitions, so outside of an absolute guarantee that locks the developer into a certain list, which is difficult due to the market conditions, we feel there is a good result with the issues given. There have also been issues related to overall control of the project as well as the City's stake in the project as it moves forward. The developer agreed after a significant amount of negotiation to get the City the continuing right to approve the transfer of rights to another developer. Overall, we are comfortable where the agreement ended up and we recommend approval.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked about the monetary minimum the development must meet and how enforceable is the threshold if the developer isn't making money, and if he cannot take care of the five thousand dollar code enforcement fee, how are they to be trusted to collect hundreds of thousands in tax revenue.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Responded that there was a 3.4 million dollar debt that the City and Agency was successful in recovering. He added that it is a contractual obligation that if need be will go to litigation. He also replied that there is no provision in the contract that excuses non-performance due to economic inability or market conditions but added there are different considerations if the company were to go bankrupt.

Chairperson Hamner — Replied it should be noted that they deserve credit for taking care of the bridge loan.

Commissioner Sullivan — Stated that there is an issue of about five thousand dollars outstanding, where the developer is trying to negotiate the fees while the City is saying there is no room to negotiate. There is a significant amount of sales tax criteria that must be met, and the developer faces a hurdle in that they have to build confidence with the residents of the City.

MOTION: Moved by Commissioner Liang seconded by Fong, to **ADOPT** the resolution approving the requested development agreement subject to conditions and aproval.

Chairperson Hamner — Stated that there should have been a better effort to

provide documentation information regarding the project.

Commissioner Garcia — Asked if there was a way to add the condition that the fines be paid to the resolution because there was no clear answer to whether or not the applicant will take responsibility for the fines.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Replied the fines are not nor cannot be negotiated and it may have been mentioned from the developers side but it is not up for negotiation. There is also a provision in the development agreement as provided that warranties there are no outstanding liabilities, debts or obligations.

Commissioner Garcia — Asked if the applicant is aware of such provision.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Replied that the applicant is indeed aware of the provision where they will not be able to meet the terms of the agreement with those fees outstanding.

Commissioner Garcia — Asked whether the stipulation could be added to the resolution, and asked whether the applicant would accept the change to the resolution before voting.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked if the staff would accept the changes.

Director Basham — Stated the approval is contingent on the changes, and noted the Council would have to make a friendly amendment to the resolution and vote on that motion before motioning and voting on the resolution.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked Commissioner Liang if he would consider amending his motion.

Commissioner Liang — Responded positively.

Commissioner Fong — Seconded the motion.

Chairperson Hamner — Asked the applicant if they were in agreement with the condition of approval.

Developer Huang — Replied that for clarity, he never used the word negotiate and then responded to the chairman’s question affirmatively.

The motion was voted on as follows:

VOTE:

AYES: Chairperson Garcia, Commissioners Fong, Liang, and Sullivan
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Chairperson Hamner
ABSENT: None

Chairperson Hamner — Stated there is a nineteen day appeal period.

Deputy City Attorney Smith — Replied the resolution goes to the City Council after two hearings.

ITEMS FROM DEVELOPMENT SERVICES: None

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION:

Director Basham — Welcomed Councilmember Theresa Real Sabastian to Planning Commission hearing. Thanked Commissioner David Garcia for his service to the community as he is terminating his tenure with the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Hamner — Thanked Commissioner Garcia for his work and his time.

Commissioner Garcia — Thanked the staff, Commissioners and Chairperson for the experience.

ADJOURNMENT: The Planning Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m. on April 24th, 2012, until the next regular meeting of May 8th, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

_____
Jim Basham
Director of Community Development

_____
Lorena Egurvide
Minutes Clerk