

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
MONTEREY PARK PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 13, 2014**

The Planning Commission of the City of Monterey Park held a Regular Meeting of the Board in the Council Chambers, located at 320 West Newmark Avenue in the City of Monterey Park, Tuesday, May 13, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planner Tewasart called the roll:

Commissioners Present: Larry Sullivan, Ricky Choi, Michael Hamner, Rodrigo Garcia and Stephen Lam

Commissioners Absent: None

ALSO PRESENT: Karl H. Berger, Assistant City Attorney, Michael A. Huntley, Director of Community and Economic Development, and Samantha Tewasart, Senior Planner

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None

AGENDA CHANGES AND ADOPTION:

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 22, 2014 –

Action Taken: The Planning Commission approved the minutes of April 22, 2014.

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Choi and seconded by Chairperson Sullivan, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Sullivan, Choi, and Hamner

Noes: Commissioners: None

Absent: Commissioners: None

Abstain: Commissioners: Garcia and Lam

PUBLIC HEARING:

OLD BUSINESS:

1-A. TENTATIVE MAP NO. 071737 – 608 NORTH HUNTINGTON AVENUE (PM-12-02)

The applicant, Ben Kwok, is requesting approval of a tentative map for the subdivision of air rights to establish and maintain a two-unit condominium project at 608 North Huntington Avenue in the R-2 (Medium Density Residential) Zone.

Planner Tewasart provided a brief staff report. She stated that this item was previously brought before the Planning Commission at the meeting of April 22, 2014. At the meeting, the Commission expressed concerns about the vehicle backup distance and the floor plan and requested some points of clarification be provided.

Commissioner Hamner inquired about the code allowance for backup space into a planter. Planner Tewasart replied that the vehicle can overhang into the planter.

Chair Sullivan opened the public hearing.

Architect Terence Kwok at 260 East Garvey Avenue, Monterey Park, CA 91754, stated that the vehicle backup is 26 feet and the lot is 50 feet wide. When the vehicle goes in and out of the garage door is open. It does not include a wall. The width of the landscape planter can be reduced.

Commissioner Hamner stated that there are multiple components of the code that needs to be met. The fact that the property is 50 feet wide is not a concern. The concern is about allowing the landscape strip to be a part of the required backup area if it is fully planted. Landscaping is not just ground cover. It can be trees or shrubbery. This is about real life experiences and accessibility. It is a nuisance problem even with 26 feet.

Director Huntley stated that in the near future some of the clean up items that will be brought back has to do with backup and circulation. Based on the current code, a 50 feet wide lot makes it difficult to meet the 26 feet backup. The city has a modification allowance and in this case the applicant applied and got approval. The applicant moved forward with the construction of the units which are currently under construction. It is not unusual, based on the way the code is written, that a 50 feet wide lot has difficulties meeting all the distance requirements. There have been minor modifications made. The code is set up in such a way where we want people to comply. If there are deviations there has to be special or unique circumstances that would allow for such changes. There have been similar cases with 50 feet wide lots where the city has allowed minor modifications.

Commissioner Hamner stated that the code discusses in writing that when you have spaces that can be deemed as a potential bedroom it has to be addressed as such. The probably of a room becoming a sleeping space such as a den is open to interpretation in the future.

Chair Sullivan inquired about the minor modification or deviation. Director Huntley replied that people can deviate through a variance procedure. A minor modification is set up to allow for minor deviations, which is much easier to process. A variance requires much more strict findings to be made.

Chair Sullivan inquired if the modification allowance decision is administrative. Planner Tewasart replied yes.

Chair Sullivan closed the public hearing.

Action Taken: The Planning Commission after considering the evidence presented during the public hearing adopted **Resolution No. 07-14** approving Tentative Map No.

071737 (PM-12-02) to subdivide air rights for a two-unit residential condominium development at 608 North Huntington Avenue.

Resolution No. 07-14, entitled:

A RESOLUTION APPROVING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 071737 (PM-12-02) TO SUBDIVIDE AIR RIGHTS FOR A TWO-UNIT RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT AT 608 NORTH HUNTINGTON AVENUE

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Garcia and seconded by Commissioner Choi, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Sullivan, Choi, Garcia, and Lam
Noes: Commissioners: Hamner
Absent: Commissioners: None
Abstain: Commissioners: None

1-B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – 220 WEST GARVEY AVENUE (CU-14-01)

The applicant, Steven Chen, is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow on-sale beer and wine (Type 41) in conjunction with a retail eating establishment (i.e., Younique Café) at 220 West Garvey Avenue is zoned C-B, P-D (Central Business, Planned Development) Zone.

Planner Tewasart provided a brief staff report. She stated that this item was brought before the Planning Commission at the meeting of April 22, 2014. At the meeting, the applicant requested to extend the hours of operation from 10:00 p.m. to 4:00 a.m. on Fridays and Saturdays. The applicant was informed to contact the City's Police Department to request for approval and obtain comments and conditions. The applicant met with the Police Department on May 5, 2014. The Police Department did not express any concerns and did not provide any additional comments nor request any amendments or addition of new conditions for the request.

Chair Sullivan opened the public hearing.

Representative Alison Fung at 219 North Sierra Vista Monterey Park, CA 91754 stated that the applicant read the conditions of approval and accept the conditions.

Chair Sullivan closed the public hearing.

Action Taken: The Planning Commission after considering the evidence presented during the public hearing adopted **Resolution No. 08-14** approving Conditional Use Permit (CU-14-01) to allow on-sale alcoholic beverages (beer and wine) in conjunctions with a bona fide public eating establishment at 220 West Garvey Avenue.

Resolution No. 08-14, entitled:

A RESOLUTION APPROVING CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CU-14-01) TO PERMIT ON-SALE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES (BEER AND WINE) IN CONJUNCTION WITH A BONA FIDE PUBLIC EATING ESTABLISHMENT AT 220 WEST GARVEY AVENUE

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Lam and seconded by Commissioner Choi, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Sullivan, Choi, Hamner, Garcia, and Lam
Noes: Commissioners: None
Absent: Commissioners: None
Abstain: Commissioners: None

1-C. PRECISE PLAN – 808 WEST GARVEY AVENUE (PP-13-01)

M&A Gabee, LP seeks discretionary approvals from the City to construct a new building at 808 West Garvey Avenue that would include a hotel and apartments. If the project is approved, the hotel would include 148 rooms; there would be 98 apartment units.

Planner Tewasart provided a brief staff report.

Commissioner Garcia inquired about tour buses, how they were analyzed, and what the conclusions were since back-up and flow of traffic were discussed. Planner Tewasart replied that following the previous Planning Commission meeting staff met with the traffic engineers and one of the items discussed was the frontage on West Garvey Avenue and the possibility of providing more space for larger buses or two smaller buses. The project was able to increase the length of the pull-in and tapering areas.

Planner Tewasart stated that the applicant also contacted some tour bus businesses to get information on the standard tour bus length and whether arrangements are made between the tour bus company and the businesses that allow for pick-up and drop-off. Two companies responded and stated that they do have arrangements for the location and times of pick-up and drop-off.

Director Huntley stated that even before this application came before the city, the item of tour buses was looked at. In the San Gabriel Valley there is a greater need for tour bus parking as compared to other areas in the Los Angeles Basin. Applicants are encouraged to incorporate some type of tour bus parking, loading and unloading. This item was discussed with the applicant and they have provided it.

Director Huntley stated that the traffic engineers were asked to look at what the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) and the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Handbooks say about tour buses and neither one of those have standards for tour buses. Staff asked the traffic engineers to step outside of the box and evaluate it and provide a recommendation and what they think would work depending on the hotel operations. Staff is relying on the traffic engineers who have the experience.

Commissioner Hamner stated that tour bus parking has to be addressed for what it really is. The applicant is not providing tour bus parking. The city is allowing them to cut out the right-of-way that will house parking for large vehicles.

Commissioner Hamner stated that this is one of potentially three future hotels. The city is supposed to evaluate that and look at this project in the bigger picture. He inquired about the impact of this project or three projects of various different sizes. The city may not be prepared to understand that and if it is in the best interest of the community. The city needs to understand what the impacts are going to be if all these projects are going to be built. Increasing the curb-cut by 10 feet does not address a management decision

of the hotel talking to tour bus companies. The city has no control over how the hotel is going to operate and should forecast for when tourism for this area increases. If these properties cannot support the increase on their own and they are using the public right-of-way to do it, it is already throwing the city a substandard development.

Chair Sullivan stated that the issue is not the turnout on Garvey Avenue. This project has a double edge sword because there are buses on Atlantic Boulevard that pull in front of this project as well as this turnout. The city is in a position where this project is setting the bar for the coming future projects and this project is fortunate to have a fairly significant piece of property where there is the ability to adjust and do these things compare to the other properties. The staff is going to have to look at the other projects to address these issues.

Commissioner Hamner inquired if staff considered the value of the homes on Mabel after the project is completed. Director Huntley replied that in 2001 the City amended its General Plan and it identified the four properties to the west as part of the Mixed-Use I District.

Traffic Engineer Bryan Estrada, RK Engineering Group, 4000 Westerly Place #280, Newport Beach, CA 92660, gave a brief overview of the traffic impact study and some of the changes and reanalysis that had been done since the previous meeting to address some of the Commission's concerns. Some of the main topics are the level of service and the associated significant impacts, site access, parking, circulation, and tour bus.

Engineer Estrada stated that the level of service is used to determine significant impacts for a project. It looks at the peak hour intersection analysis, the amount of traffic that is at an intersection during the peak hour of the day. One of the concerns is that this area is a congested part of town, but is deemed to have a less than significant impact when there is a significant amount of congestion. The City of Monterey Park along with the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program has established certain criteria for determining how much traffic can be added even during peak times of day. This project contributes less than the allotted change in the volume to capacity ratio, thus resulting in a less than significant impact.

There are three access points to the project. The main access is on Garvey Avenue where a new traffic signal will be put in that will align with the existing driveway on the north side of Garvey, the Atlantic Place Shopping Center. The new traffic signal will provide full access to both sites. An extensive analysis was conducted in terms of how the two signals will work together. The proposed and existing signals at Atlantic and Garvey, it is recommended that both signals will be interconnected and coordinated as well as a modified striping plan be done to Garvey Avenue to accommodate left-turn queues and ensure that backup does not occur into the existing intersection.

The second access is on Atlantic Boulevard, which will be restricted to a right-in, right-out only access. On the left side signing and striping is recommended as well as median construction to make it difficult to make a left out of the project site. One of the concerns raised by the Commission at the previous meeting was regarding sight-distance coming out of the Atlantic Boulevard driveway, particularly when buses are stopped at the bus stop on Atlantic. A sight-distance diagram was prepared since the last meeting. Two buses are shown on the diagram in the event that two buses do stop at that stop. It

takes a two stage approach to turn. One additional feature of the project is a 4 feet dedication along Atlantic Boulevard to allow buses to get over slightly more and provide 20 feet on the outside lane.

The third access is on Mabel Avenue, which will be restricted to the residential tenants of the site only by a security gate. Recommendations have been made to restrict access to right-in, left-out only. In order to help prevent any cut-through traffic on Mabel through the residential community signing and striping recommendations have been made as well.

The issue of parking and shared-parking has been addressed. The project does meet the City requirements, but the ULI shared parking model which looks into the different uses at the site and characteristics of each use and how peak within certain times of the day as well as certain times of the year. The ULI has collected quite a bit of data on these types of uses, it is a spreadsheet calculation that includes all the square footages of each use within the site and it estimates peak demand. One thing about the ULI shared model that came up at the last meeting was regarding the meeting spaces and whether that was accounted for. The City's code does not have a ratio for that, but the meeting rooms were included in the shared parking model. The shared model showed that the demand would be less than what is provided.

There were a few changes to on-site circulation; mainly the lobby drop-off was extended in front of the residential portion of the lobby, where this was going to allow slightly more space for vehicles to pull in, also shuttle buses and smaller vans that are able to be used within tours can come onto the site. There will be valet parking for the project and if the project gets approved and before it is operational there will be a valet parking management plan done by the valet provider.

There are a few tandem spaces within the site. Those will be strictly for the residential tenants only. Delivery trucks for the hotel and the restaurant portion of the site will be using the Atlantic access, which will have two stories of vertical clearance and will have sufficient turning movement radius to access the loading bays.

Lastly, the item of tour buses, the turnout was lengthened by about 16 feet to a 50-foot turnout with extended transitions to be able to get the buses over to get out of the stream of traffic as quick as possible. The turnout is designed to accommodate up to a 50-foot bus. Those are about the largest coaches seen on the road and it is designed to accommodate only one bus at a time. So one of the conditions that were added was in the event that large tours are going to be taking place, the hotel operator would need to coordinate with the tour bus company to ensure that no more than one bus arrives at the site at a time.

Commissioner Hamner stated that one of the things that people need to understand is the LOS and the level of service that is acceptable to the type of community that Monterey Park is. On the northwest side of Monterey Park an urban acceptance is different than a suburban acceptance. These levels of services occur within a certain windows of time and increase to better service after peak hours. Using the ITE or ULI model never really seem to address the unique features that have occurred here and things that are happening because they are documents that are looking at the bigger picture.

Engineer Estrada stated that sometime the perception of the level of service can vary quite a bit compared with what is actually computed within the technical analysis.

Commissioner Choi inquired about cut-through traffic and Margarita and Mabel.

Engineer Estrada replied that the limited access on Mabel will make it less conducive to cut-through traffic in order to get into the site. The installation of the traffic signal will encourage the commercial users to come through the main access. Typically, the residents that are familiar with the area would be the ones that would find the shortcuts.

Commissioner Hamner stated that if the project is relying on signage and an arrow it may be difficult to police it, but by design the configuration could be adjusted and angled in such a way that making that right turn would be much harder to maneuver.

Engineer Estrada stated that a pork-chop was considered. The issue arose with the Mabel access with the structural design coming out of the parking structure. There needs to be a wider driveway in order to do that and the width was not there to channelize people over. So that is why there are limitations in terms of what can be done at that entrance.

Chair Sullivan stated that the report submitted to the City was very detailed. One of the issues with this project is that bus turnout is more of a band aid and will be taken advantage of by trucks. The turnout must be defined for a purpose and the purpose must not be exceeded. That is more of an issue for the City than the applicant.

Developer's Attorney Brant Dveirin, Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP, 221 North Figuerero Street, Suite 1209, Los Angeles, CA 90012, stated that the developer is committed to the project and to getting it done in the right way. The project complies with all the legal requirements from the code. The project will be completed in two to three years. In 2017, based on an initial occupancy rate of 63 percent at \$120 per night, the TOT will be \$490,000 per year in taxes. Two after years after that, on a conservative estimate of 80 percent occupancy, rise to \$726,000. Considering the financial difficulties that cities are under in terms of reduced tax revenues, the taxes can assist with restoring services to the city. The sales tax from retail establishments on this project will be \$54,000 from the smallest retail in annual sales tax. The property tax will be \$400,000 based on a \$40 million property value. Currently, \$62,000 is paid in property taxes. Building plan check fees will be \$480,000 to be paid almost immediately, building permit fees will be paid later along with school fees. In terms for jobs, 75 will be created for the hotel and the restaurants will be 78 jobs.

Commissioner Choi inquired about the operator.

Developer Arman Gabee, 9034 West Sunset Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90069 stated the company has been involved with the property since 1997. There was a development agreement with the City in 2007. They worked closely with the city staff trying to come up with a project that everyone can be proud of. Considering the challenges, this proposed project is by far the best plan. Several different flags have been interviewed. There is a company called Crescent Partners. They currently operate 68,000 rooms. They are a publicly owned company. They will be engaged to get a flag for the hotel.

Chair Sullivan expressed concerns about the traffic.

Speaker John Jang, 823 West Mabel Avenue, stated that he does not live in Monterey Park. He bought the house adjacent to the project 20 years ago for his mother. He stated that he is not against the project. He believes it is good for the City. He has been seeing the vacant lot for a long time and a lot of transients jump over the fences for many years. However, if the project last for two years he does have concerns about the noises during construction and the dust for a senior.

Commissioner Choi inquired about pile driving, vibrations, and a sound blanket for the project.

Commissioner Garcia added that construction and heavier equipment can occur at certain periods of time.

Speaker Bryan Jang, 823 West Mabel Avenue, expressed concerns about cut-through traffic on Mabel Avenue. He inquired if the traffic impacts were considered less than significant for the Atlantic Times Square development because to the people that reside near that project, the impacts are not less than significant.

Speaker Yu Chen, 840 West Mabel Avenue, stated he purchased his property for the view and the project will block his view.

Speaker Joshua Pak, 846 West Mabel Avenue, stated he is glad there is a project, but wished it was a smaller in scale. He expressed several concerns, the first is safety with the homeless and inquired about demolishing the vacant properties and the second is the view. Also, parking and home values.

Director Huntley stated that the three vacant properties will be demolished within the next two to three weeks. The construction fences have already been installed.

Speaker Jimmy Kha, 862 West Mabel Avenue, expressed concerns with the homeless and public safety. He inquired about public service impacts. He also expressed concerns about on-street parking, traffic sound levels, and construction noise.

Speakers Ken Lau and Henry Kwan – Parkview Estates Association, 245 A-F South Atlantic Boulevard, stated that they are glad there will be a project, but expressed concerns about project impacts, such as the traffic impacts and safety. He inquired if the project can be scaled back.

Attorney Dveirin stated that the lot has been empty for a long time. When there is an empty lot for an extended period of time people get use to it. When a project goes in there will be a change.

Engineer Estrada stated that certain traffic calming measures can be implemented along Mabel such as speed cushions and striping to help reduce speeds and conducisiveness to traffic cutting through. He stated that in terms of the perception of what an impact is, the technical number were reviewed including the existing traffic numbers, the volume-capacity-ratio, the project traffic results and increase, and based on that there is a less than significant impact. All the project driveways will be signed and striped according to the standards for stop controls.

Commissioner Lam stated that any development that happens in one place will have effects, but efforts need to be made to minimize the impacts. He stated that he

appreciated the public comments and it is important to find a balance for everyone. The city needs to move forward. Something needs to be built, so people have more choices and not have to go to adjacent cities. Monterey Park is behind other cities; there needs to be progress.

Commissioner Garcia stated that with any development anywhere there are always going to be tradeoffs. He stated that there is a report that is required that studies the issues there were brought up, including public services. This is the best that can be done as responsible citizens of the community and as representatives of the community. The best that can be done is to use the tools that are available and use the professional's point of view and there are criteria that have to be met, which is then reviewed by staff. However, he understands the public's point of view.

Developer Gabee stated that they will work with the adjacent properties to accommodate as best as possible. In terms of the topography of the property, the lot tapper from one end to the other quite significantly and there is approximately a 35 feet difference between Atlantic and Mabel. Mabel and Atlantic are quite steep and access is challenging. Also, 444 parking spaces will be provided, which is quite significant. Income from the parking is negligible. The income will come from the occupancy of the spaces, but resources have to be spent to build the parking. To some degree the project will have some benefits such as buffering noise from Atlantic and there have been issues with the slope sliding on the adjacent properties. They will work with the adjacent properties to lessen the impacts as much as possible.

Chair Sullivan closed the public hearing. A 10 minute recess was taken.

Director Huntley stated that on Mabel, going westbound, there are elevation changes. The Mabel grade is approximately 40 feet above Atlantic. The properties located south of the project are on a higher elevation than Mabel.

Commissioner Garcia stated that traffic is going to increase no matter what. There has to be a master plan to address all the issues.

Director Huntley replied that the city has commissioned a traffic engineering firm to evaluate Atlantic from Newmark to Hellman. The city understands that there are issues associated with queuing, signalization and the age of the switch boxes that have the timing. The traffic engineering firm is looking at the timing and better ways to move those intersections. The engineering firm has already started the work and a final draft is anticipated sometime within the next month. When that is finished, another engineering firm will take a look at it to make sure they concur with the findings of the evaluation. The evaluation will help to provide some guidance for other improvements along Atlantic and some of the side streets.

Commissioner Garcia stated that it is good to hear that the city is being proactive. It does not mean that it is going solve all the issues, but it will help considerably. The project will help to generate revenue to invest into the infrastructure.

Commissioner Hamner stated he is in favor of responsible development. The investments by the development team seem to show there is some commitment. Newer people may be coming into the city and it is important for the traffic engineer to fairly inform the city that the standards are not what they were; this is not a suburban

community. The project needs to be more self-responsible. National engineering guides for traffic do not understand the phenomenon that is the San Gabriel Valley, the change and dynamic that tourism has, and what Monterey Park will be in the bigger picture. He inquired if the project can accommodate that phenomenon and public transportation and about the benefits versus the costs. He stated the project should engage the tour bus businesses and to put it on the city to give a cut-out on Garvey is irresponsible. The rest of the building is well designed, but there is some room to make the project better.

Commissioner Choi stated that he did have some concerns about the project, but the applicant has made efforts to address many of the concerns. He hopes the applicant takes into consideration some of the items brought up by the residents who spoke. He inquired if the Commission would consider adding a mitigation measure to incorporate a sound blanket or some kind of sound barrier to aid the residents during construction.

Chair Sullivan expressed concerns about Mabel Avenue and the traffic patterns and timing on Garvey Avenue.

Commissioner Garcia inquired if there was a public meeting conducted by the developer. Outreach is important.

Director Huntley replied that if the project required an environmental impact report there may have been more opportunities to make comments. Developers are encouraged conduct outreach for larger scale projects.

Action Taken: The Planning Commission after considering the evidence presented during the public hearing adopted **Resolution No. 09-14** approving Precise Plan (PP-13-01) for the construction of a new mixed-use development at 808 West Garvey Avenue.

Resolution No. 09-14, entitled:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND APPROVING PRECISE PLAN (PP-13-01) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION A NEW MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT 808 WEST GARVEY AVENUE

Motion: Moved by Commissioner Lam and seconded by Commissioner Garcia, motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Sullivan, Choi, Garcia, and Lam
 Noes: Commissioners: Hamner
 Absent: Commissioners: None
 Abstain: Commissioners: None

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

Director Huntley stated that there are two upcoming meetings: one for the South Garfield Specific Plan and the second is a presentation from MTA on Gold Line Extension project.

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION

1. Commissioner Choi stated that he would like staff to look into the matter of recommending changes to providing information and encouraging opportunities to follow development projects in the city and neighborhood and to actively participate in the land use decision making process. Currently, the California Code provides guidelines regarding sending public hearing notices to within a 300 feet radius of a project. He would like to look into expanding the radius from 300 feet to 500 feet and include notification to tenants. Public outreach and early notification helps the process and greatly enhances awareness of the project in the community, promotes public engagement and improves an overall understanding of the project. Effective and timely communication results in projects that harmonize with the community. It alleviates misconceptions, addressing any concerns ahead of time and gets all interested parties involved and talking. Projects range in complexity, scope, size, and controversy. There can be different levels of engagement based on the type of project.

Commissioner Lam inquired about the relationship between the recommended change and the state law.

Assistant City Attorney Berger replied that the Planning Commission acts in an advisory capacity and make recommendations to the City Council with regards to adopting a new ordinance that would be effective only within the City of Monterey Park with regards to extra noticing. The state law provides a baseline that must be complied with, but the city would impose an additional requirement for noticing. The state law would not be amended. The Planning Commission would be making a recommendation to the City Council to adopt a local law to require additional noticing.

Commissioner Garcia inquired if staff had an opinion.

Director Huntley replied that cities have been taking a more proactive approach. There are a number of ways in regards to how to notify the public. Some cities will notify on site instead of the newspaper. Notifying the tenant is also important. He stated that 500 feet may be a more appropriate way to go instead of 300 feet and inquired if there are additional things that should be looked at and then come back with some ideas and recommendations. Staff would agree with the 500 feet and inquired about notifying tenants and the preferred method of notification.

Commissioner Hamner stated that Commissioner Choi's request is very valid. He stated that he supports Commissioner's Choi's request to expand the radius to 500 feet, tenants should be notified at the site with a 4 feet by 4 feet board that describes the application.

Director Huntley stated that the responsibility will be on the applicant.

2. Commissioner Hamner stated that something needs to be brought back on parking for multi-unit residential developments.

Chair Sullivan inquired if parking on the street is a Traffic Commission item.

Assistant City Attorney Berger stated that the matter should be agendaize for a future meeting.

3. Commission Lam inquired about the matter of homelessness.

Assistant City Attorney Berger replied that the City's Housing Element was recently updated which addresses the matter of homelessness. The information can be provided to the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business for consideration, the meeting was adjourned on May 13, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. to the next regular meeting on June 10, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Michael A. Huntley
Director of Community and Economic Development

Approved on at the regular Planning Commission meeting.