



## ***AZUSA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES***

---

**February 13, 2008**  
**7:00 P.M.**

**NOTICE:** *A copy of the following public hearing staff reports and Initial Studies, if applicable, for the Planning Commission projects will be available for review during regular working hours of 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday - Thursday at the Planning Division and during regular hours of the Azusa City Library. Any questions regarding any agenda item may be answered by the Planning Division at (626) 812-5299. The Planning Commission Meetings are held at 7:00 p.m. in the Azusa Civic Auditorium at 213 East Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, California.*

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Dierking called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Rosales led the flag salute.

### **ROLL CALL**

Members Present: RENTSCHLER, ALVA, DIERKING, DODSON and ROSALES.

Members Absent: NONE

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Director of Economic and Community Development, Bruce Coleman; Senior Planner, Susan Cole; BBK Attorney, Michael Torres; and Assistant Planner, Kim Pilmer.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Minutes of January 30, 2008

- Motion by Commissioner Alva to approve the minutes. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Dodson, and the minutes were accepted.

AYES: RENTSCHLER, ALVA, DIERKING, DODSON, ROSALES

NOES: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

ABSENT: NONE

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 2*

---

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

(Person/Group shall be allowed to speak without interruption up to five (5) minutes in compliance with applicable meeting rules. Questions to the speaker or response to questions or comments shall be handled after the speaker has completed his/her comments.)

1. Mike Lee: 636 Lee Place, Azusa, CA: Announced that on Saturday February 16<sup>th</sup> between 10 a.m. and 12 noon, there will be an event at City Hall to honor those serving our country. Mr. Lee stated that the Target scoping meeting held on Thursday of last week was a great meeting. Mr. Lee stated that he hopes to see a Target located in the city, and that he appreciated the opportunity to participate in that meeting.
  
2. Art Morales, city resident; stated that he has talked to several members of the community regarding the Vulcan mine operations, and that with a four to one vote made by the Commission, he believes Chairman Dierking was the only Commissioner who voted in favor of the community. Mr. Morales stated that some of the people he has talked to about the mine have kids with asthma, and that they feel the language used in the annual report, “substantial compliance” was a misrepresentation of actual conditions at the site. Mr. Morales stated that the Target scoping meeting of last week was a well-attended meeting. Mr. Morales stated that there is a meeting coming up in March regarding the armory, and what the community wants to be placed in the armory. Mr. Morales stated that some suggestions include an exercise pool for the public, tutoring, music appreciation, basketball, etc. Mr. Morales stated that the new sub-committee that was approved for economic study is a good idea.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

No Public Hearings.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

No new business.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

No unfinished business.

**REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

1. **SPORT FACILITY/GOLF COURSE FENCING REPORT:**

Susan Cole, Senior Planner presented the staff report. Mrs. Cole stated that at the last Planning Commission meeting Mr. Jack Sun of Acme Potable Machines located at 1330 Mountain View Circle, requested that the Planning Commission consider a Code Amendment to allow him to construct a 30’ (foot) tall fence along the east boundary of his property to protect his parking lot from errant golf balls. Mrs. Cole stated that the Planning Commission asked staff to look into this matter further and to bring back information about the sites. Mrs. Cole stated that the original Conditional Use Permit for the golf course did not require golf course fencing, and

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 3*

---

any fencing that was put up subsequent to the original construction was either a Condition of Approval for the residential uses, or was an agreement between the golf course and adjacent property owners. Mrs. Cole stated that Mr. Sun's property is located in the Mountain View Business Park, which did not have Conditions of Approval requiring a fence to be constructed either on that property or on any adjacent property. Mrs. Cole stated that staff's analysis is that Mr. Sun's request to construct a 30' (foot) tall golf course fence along the east boundary of his property is not consistent with the current Development Code, which only allows that on golf courses or where sports facilities are located. Mrs. Cole stated that if the Development Code was amended to allow this type of over height fence, it could lead to an inconsistent mix of fence types along the property lines. Mrs. Cole stated that Mr. Sun received a copy of the staff report as did Steve Belieu, the Golf Course manager. Mrs. Cole stated that Mr. Sun was not able to attend the meeting, but that she told him that she would let him know what the discussion was about. Mrs. Cole stated that a possible solution to help with block errant golf balls would be to supplement the existing landscaping located along the walking trail between Mr. Sun's property and the golf course. Mrs. Cole stated that the City owns that property and that although the landscaping would not be consistent with the existing low shrubbery, that it would be less noticeable than a 30' (foot) tall fence.

Commissioner Rosales stated that the staff report makes reference to two terminologies, both "adjacent" and "congruent". Commissioner Rosales asked if the two terms are used in the same way to refer to site location.

Mrs. Cole stated that the two terms are used interchangeably.

Commissioner Rosales asked how staff defined the two terms.

Mrs. Cole stated that two properties that share the same property line are adjacent to or congruent with one another.

Chairman Dierking stated that there is a reference to a 1998 study of errant golf balls by the Perkle Association of Golf Course Architecture, and asked if he should have had a copy in his packet.

Mrs. Cole stated that there should have been a copy in his packet, and if he did not get a copy, she would make that available to him.

Chairman Dierking asked for a copy of that study for Commissioner Alva and himself

2. CONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS OF GENERAL PLAN CONFORMITY TO ALLOW THE ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF AZUSA- WATT DALTON PROJECT.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 4*

---

Commissioner Alva stated that he would remove himself from the dais because he has a potential conflict of interest due to the proximity of his residence (less than 500 feet) to the property that is a subject of agenda item I (2).

Bruce Coleman, Community Development Director presented the staff report. Mr. Coleman stated that this item is a request for a finding of conformity with the General Plan, for the acquisition of a portion of property on the Dalton/Foothill site for eventual mixed-use development purposes. Mr. Coleman stated that the item before the Planning Commission tonight is only related to the assembly of City owned property by the Redevelopment Agency, so that the entire Foothill/Dalton site will be under the ownership of one entity. Mr. Coleman stated that the Redevelopment Agency would be coming back to the Planning Commission with a development project application in which the Redevelopment Agency would need to have the entire project as a single parcel under the ownership of the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Coleman stated that the only item before the Planning Commission tonight is recommendation number one, which deals with the acquisition of the property. Mr. Coleman stated that the Redevelopment Agency is not prepared tonight to ask the Commission to deal with the disposition of the property or the General Plan Consistency issue on the disposition of the property because the Redevelopment Agency is still negotiating price and terms with the developer relating to disposition. Mr. Coleman stated that the proposed underlying project for the Dalton/Foothill Site is the 700 block of North Dalton. Mr. Coleman stated that the project would be brought to the Planning Commission at a public hearing in the future.

Mr. Coleman stated that the reason for the Public Hearing on this item, is to adhere to a Government Code which provides that a Redevelopment Agency must seek a finding of conformity from the Planning Commission relating to the acquisition of property prior to acquiring property. Mr. Coleman stated that the acquisition of this property would be consistent with a number of Goals set out in the General Plan, and that a mixed-use development at this site would promote those General Plan goals and provide for a high quality of life as well as support the economic development strategy for the city. Mr. Coleman stated that there are no substantial changes proposed by the underlying project that would change the evaluation that was done in the General Plan EIR.

Commissioner Dodson asked what the Development Code's density requirements are for this property.

Mr. Coleman stated that the Development Code allows 27 dwelling units per acre.

Commissioner Rosales stated that the staff report includes consideration of an amendment to the Environmental Impact Report that was done in 2004 for the General Plan, and asked if that is still applicable tonight.

Mr. Coleman stated that it was.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 5*

---

Commissioner Rosales stated that in section 5.1 of Exhibit D, under conclusions, there is a reference to the proposed buildings which would have heights of 55 ft. for the mixed-use development and 42 ft. for the residential. Commissioner Rosales stated that to his knowledge the Development Code has a height limitation of 35 ft.

Mr. Coleman stated that when the Redevelopment Agency brings the project back to the Planning Commission, it will include a series of entitlements which would include Development Code amendments with regard to a Development Code overlay zone for this particular transit area. Mr. Coleman stated that this would be one of the things for the Planning Commission to consider at the time the entire project is presented before the Commission.

Chairman Dierking asked if the Addendum in Exhibit "D" contemplates Development Code changes that are not currently in existence.

Mr. Coleman stated that it anticipates the project as it's being proposed which will include Development Code setback and other revisions, which are elements that are being worked on at this point.

Commissioner Rosales stated that he wanted to clarify that the decision before the Planning Commission today will not be an approval of future Development Code amendments for higher building heights and the like.

Mr. Coleman clarified that the Planning Commission would not be taking any action on the project at this time, and that the information included in the packets are for background information only, and that the only action made by the Planning Commission tonight would be concerning General Plan consistency issue.

Commissioner Rosales stated that Exhibit "D", the Addendum alludes to a General Plan change for the designation of public-civic use into commercial residential mixed-use.

Mr. Coleman stated that this is simply background information

Commissioner Rosales stated that in section 5-15, the traffic impact analysis makes reference to the traffic study. Commissioner Rosales asked if the traffic study refers to the Foothill Blvd. and Dalton intersection.

Mr. Coleman stated that the study does mention the Foothill Blvd. and Dalton intersection, but that the Planning Commission would be considering these issues when the project is brought before the Commission.

Chairman Dierking stated that he did not see a reference in the amended Addendum EIR to the following information contained in the staff report. The language includes, "Dalton Ave. will be realigned and narrowed. The median will also be removed. Ultimately the Dalton Ave. right of way will be 60 ft. rather than the current 80 ft. to promote traffic calming." Chairman Dierking asked how much of a

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 6*

---

narrowing that was going to be in terms of length. Chairman Dierking stated that he was concerned because of its relevance to the Circulation Element of the General Plan.

Mr. Coleman stated that he could not go into the details of the project but that there is an opportunity for traffic calming on that particular street due to the location of the Senior Center and the library along that street, which make traffic safety measures on this street consistent with the General Plan. Mr. Coleman stated that what the Planning Commission is considering tonight is the issue of the finding of conformity with the General Plan relating to acquisition of the property on the north side.

Chairman Dierking asked if the Planning Commission is being asked to consider the EIR Addendum, which does contemplate certain changes.

Mr. Coleman stated that the Planning Commission is not being asked to act on the Addendum, and that it is simply there for informational purposes and that when the project comes forward, it would be attached to the project documents.

Chairman Dierking stated that he understands the Planning Commission is not considering the Disposition of the real property tonight and asked if normally the city would acquire the property and then deed it to the Redevelopment Agency.

Jose Ometeotl, Tierra West Advisors stated that generally an agency can acquire property but that it must receive a finding of conformance from the Planning Commission, that the land acquisition is in conformance with the General Plan. Mr. Ometeotl stated that in this case the Redevelopment Agency is acquiring the land for a project (as defined by CEQA), and if that the addendum is a CEQA document which has been included to help the Planning Commission in making its decision.

Chairman Dierking asked if the Planning Commission would need to make a finding of Conformance with the General Plan in regards to the property acquisition prior to the Redevelopment Agency taking ownership.

Mr. Ometeotl stated that yes, the Planning Commission would need to make that finding for the Redevelopment Agency to acquire the property.

Chairman Dierking stated, that regarding the property with APN number 8608-029-910; his record shows that the city acquired it then deeded it by quick claim deed to the Redevelopment Agency April 26<sup>th</sup> of 2007.

Mr. Coleman stated that the property was quick claimed to the Redevelopment Agency by the City, and that on the advice of the City Attorney, for all future cases, the Redevelopment Agency would need to come before the Planning Commission and get a finding of conformance with the General Plan prior to property acquisition.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 7*

---

Chairman Dierking stated that the background information for phase one of the project identifies 164 automobile parking spaces anticipated for the project. Chairman Dierking asked what would be required under the Development Code.

Mr. Coleman stated that he knows the project meets the code and exceeds the code, but that he does not have that information with him today, and that that information would be provided when the project is brought before the Planning Commission.

Michael Torres, City Attorney stated that staff provided the Planning Commission with an over abundance of information to assist in the conformance determination, and that the project will eventually come before the Planning Commission again. Mr. Torres stated that if the Commissioners have specific questions about the project, they will have the opportunity to address those questions when the project is presented to the Commission at that public hearing.

Chairman Dierking stated that language in the second paragraph of page 2 of the Staff Report relating to the Library site, (the Development Code) states that the site will be used for a future public library, however the library use is not mandatory.

Mr. Coleman stated that that is what the Development Code says, and that it is simply illustrative in terms of where a library could go, but it does not mandate that a library go on that property.

Chairman Dierking stated that normally the purpose of the Development Code is to provide an enforcement mechanism of the General Plan, which is division for the community. Mr. Dierking asked if in Mr. Coleman's experience whether Development Codes typically provide illustration.

Mr. Coleman stated that this is the first Development Code he has had experience with that provides such illustrations, and that it is a unique code in that it shows the suggested layout of blocks, but in many cases the Code indicates that it is an illustration of what could happen, and not what must happen.

Chairman Dierking stated that at a density of just under 27 dwelling units per acre the new housing should be affordable to a wider range of Azusa residents. Chairman Dierking stated that the 2000 census showed that the local median income was \$39,000 per household. Chairman Dierking stated that he understands this would be a market rate project, but he would like to know when the Planning Commission is going to see some projects with affordable housing components.

Mr. Coleman stated that this project could be a project that includes an affordable housing component. Mr. Coleman stated that there have been ongoing discussions with the developer and a draft agreement that does call for affordability covenants.

Art Salcido, 811 N. Soldano Avenue, asked what the plan is for the north side of the Senior Center.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

Page 8

---

Chairman Dierking stated that the project plans would be brought before the Planning Commission at a later date, and that the item being considered tonight is whether to allow the Redevelopment Agency to acquire property that is currently owned by the City.

Dick Cortez, 5508 Conwell Ave. Mr. Cortez stated that it seems that the Redevelopment Agency never had permission from the Council to do what they did. Mr. Cortez asked if there would be a penalty involved, and if so, who owes that penalty?

Mr. Coleman stated that the City Attorney recently advised the Redevelopment Agency that there is a provision in the Government Code that does in fact call for when a Redevelopment Agency acquires or disposes of property, that they must go to the Planning Commission and deal with the issue of General Plan conformity. Mr. Coleman stated that the Redevelopment Agency has now started doing that, now that they understand the provision in the Government code. Mr. Coleman stated that there is no penalty for anything that was done previously.

Art Morales, city resident stated that the Commissioners are doing a good job of informing the citizens about future projects.

Commissioner Dodson stated that Mr. Cortez had the same questions that he had about the previous actions of the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Dodson stated that it seems as though the Redevelopment Agency should have known what was required for the acquisition of property.

Mr. Coleman stated that this item has not gone to the City Council yet, and that this is the first step in the acquisition of the property.

Chairman Dierking stated that he believes the amended EIR and the proposed project is so embedded in what the Commission is being asked to do, that he can't consider a vote with that in mind. **Chairman Dierking entertained a motion to consider the finding of General Plan conformance to allow the acquisition of property by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Azusa.**

Commissioner Rentschler motioned that the Planning Commission accept the consideration of findings of General Plan conformity to allow the acquisition and disposition of property by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Azusa- Watt Dalton Project, and find that the acquisition of real property located at the parcel numbers 8608-028-901, 8608-028-903, 8608-029-904, 8608-029-900, 8608-028-905, **is in conformance with the General Plan.**

**Chairman Dierking stated that it has been moved to consider the finding of General Plan conformance to allow the acquisition of the property by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Azusa, the Watt Dalton project, and find that the acquisition of the real property located at the parcel numbers**



**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 9*

---

**enumerated by Commissioner Rentschler, is in conformance with the General Plan.**

Commissioner Rosales seconded the motion. The vote is as follows:

**AYES: RENTSCHLER, ROSALES**  
**NOES: DIERKING, DODSON**  
**ABSTAIN: ALVA (DUE TO CONFLICT)**  
**ABSENT: NONE**

Michael Torres, City Attorney **stated that under that vote, the item would fail, and that he** recommends to the Planning Commission that if the Commission is leaning towards a denial in the finding of General Plan conformance, that the Commission continue this item to allow time to prepare a resolution with the appropriate findings of the Planning Commission.

Chairman Dierking stated that it has been recommended by Counsel **Chairman Dierking entertained a motion to consider the finding of General Plan conformance to allow the acquisition of property by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Azusa.**

to continue this matter for a preparation of a Resolution for a finding of non-conformity.

Mr. Torres stated that the Planning Commission would need to make the finding that the property acquisition is not in conformance with the General Plan. Mr. Torres stated that he has advised the Commission to continue the item so that staff can have time to consult with the Commission, or for the Commission to give direction now, on what it believes is not consistent and not in conformance with the General Plan.

Mr. Coleman stated for the Planning Commission's information, that if there is a finding on non-conformance, the Dalton project is probably dead. Mr. Coleman stated that they can't really bring the project back to the Planning Commission because you can't assemble the property under one ownership. Mr. Coleman stated that it appears that if the assembly of the property is non-conforming to the General Plan, then the Redevelopment Agency probably could not proceed any further with the Dalton/Foothill project.

Chairman Dierking asked Mr. Torres if the decision of the Planning Commission could be called up by the City Council.

Mr. Torres stated that any decision made by the Planning Commission could be appealed to the City Council. Mr. Torres stated that it is important that if the Planning Commission is leaning towards denial, that it needs to make it on facts and findings of non-conformance.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 10*

---

Commissioner Rentschler stated that from what she understands, those voting no must substantiate their vote by stating why the project does not conform to the General Plan.

Commissioner Rosales stated that the Commission was presented with more information than perhaps should have been presented with this report with respect to the consideration for the approval of the acquisition of certain properties. Mr. Rosales stated that he believes that this is what has led to a misunderstanding or misinterpretation by some of the Commissioners. Mr. Rosales stated that he feels confident that the action that was presented tonight was only that of assemblage of property without any consideration for a specific project.

Mr. Torres stated that he believes staff can prepare another resolution with essential information that will assist the Commission in making a decision, and leave out some information that may confuse, and that will come up at a later date.

Commissioner Rosales motioned to re-consider the consideration of findings General Plan conformity to allow the acquisition and disposition of property by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Azusa- Watt Dalton Project at the next Planning Commission meeting. Motion seconded by Commissioner Dodson.

AYES: RESTSCHLER, DIERKING, DODSON, ROSALES  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN: ALVA  
ABSENT:

3. CONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS OF GENERAL PLAN CONFORMITY TO ALLOW THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY BY THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF AZUSA

Mr. Coleman stated that this is an item for the consideration of a General Plan conformity finding that would allow the Agency Board of Directors (meaning the City Council), to acquire property in a portion of the city which is north of the railroad tracks in an area known as the Downtown North area. Mr. Coleman stated that the Agency Board would have the opportunity to consider the acquisition of property with regard to a potential future development of the transit village, north of the Metro Gold Line tracks. Mr. Coleman stated that it's the area generally bounded by 9<sup>th</sup> St. on the north, Azusa Ave. on the west, Dalton Ave. on the east, and the Metro Gold Line right of way on the south. Mr. Coleman stated that there is no defined project at this time with regard to this property. Mr. Coleman stated that this is simply an acquisition at this point for land banking purposes. Mr. Coleman stated that the project would consist of 812 N. Azusa, 801 N. Alameda, 826 N. Azusa, 832 N. Azusa, 858 N. Azusa, 810 N. Alameda, and 803 N. Dalton.

Commissioner Alva rejoined the Commissioners for the consideration of this item.

Commissioner Rosales asked about the property located at 830 N. Azusa Ave.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 11*

---

Jose Ometeotl, Tierra West Advisors stated that that property is currently under contract by Watt Genton for their own private acquisition.

Chairman Dierking asked if that property is one of the properties being considered.

Mr. Coleman stated that that property is not one of the properties being considered for land banking by the Redevelopment Agency.

Chairman Dierking asked if any of these properties are residential properties.

Mr. Coleman stated that the Redevelopment Agency can not buy residential property without a written request from a property owner stating that they wish for their property to be acquired by the Redevelopment Agency.

Chairman asked about how long these properties have been under consideration as part of the land bank.

Mr. Coleman stated that these properties have been considered for about two or three months.

Chairman Dierking stated that a couple of the properties have changed hands within the last year. Mr. Dierking asked if any of these properties may be acquired through eminent domain.

Mr. Coleman stated that it is possible that some of the properties may be acquired through eminent domain. Mr. Coleman stated that under Redevelopment Law, a fair market value for land acquired under the authority of Eminent Domain must be offered to the property owner.

Chairman Dierking asked if a Government Agency is empowered to use Eminent Domain Authority for the purpose of advancing a private economic interest.

Mr. Coleman stated that it is permitted to use it for a public purpose and Redevelopment is considered a public purpose under the law.

Chairman Dierking asked Council how "Public Interest" is defined by Eminent Domain Law.

Mr. Torres stated that he did not have that definition with him, however that at this point, Eminent Domain is not before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Dodson asked why that property was not included in the list of properties to be acquired by the Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Coleman stated that it was not included because the Agency has an agreement with Watt Genton, and if Watt Genton is able to acquire the property without the need

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

*Page 12*

---

of the Redevelopment Agency's involvement, then there is not need for the Agency's involvement.

Nick Rosales, 507 W. 10<sup>th</sup> St., asked the Commission to look at the fact that the current market value is different now than what it will be within the next eight years.

Art Morales, agreed with Mr. Rosales's statement.

Commissioner Dodson asked who could buy the property after the Redevelopment Agency has acquired the property.

Mr. Coleman stated that generally speaking it will sell the property to a developer.

Commissioner Rentschler stated that she believes the Redevelopment Agency is careful with City's money and that she supports the proposal.

Commissioner Rosales made a motion to approve the proposed resolution. Motion seconded by Commissioner Rentschler.

AYES: RENTSCHLER, ALVA, DIERKING, DODSON, ROSALES.

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

4. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 4<sup>TH</sup>, 2008- COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ITEMS:

Mr. Coleman discussed Community Development items from the City Council meeting of February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:**

Commissioner Rentschler asked about Urban Development Action Grants.

Mr. Coleman responded that Urban Development Action Grants have been superseded by Redevelopment Block Grants, and there is a city consultant that works on grants.

Commissioner Rentschler stated that Azusa's Sister City would have a membership meeting on March 6<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m.

Commissioner Dodson asked about the Bates Town homes.

Mr. Coleman stated that the City is encouraging these projects to proceed, and it is his understanding that the Bates Company has recently received funding for their property and plan to move forward.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
*February 13, 2008*

---

*Page 13*

Commissioner Dodson asked about an ABC license for Max's restaurant.

Mr. Coleman stated that staff would research this matter and would provide more information as soon as possible.

Chairman Dierking asked staff to report back to the Commission on general governing principles of ABC licenses in general.

Commissioner Rosales asked for an update on the impact of Block 36 construction on traffic on Foothill Blvd.

Mr. Coleman stated that the project would have an impact on Foothill Blvd. during rush hour during construction.

Commissioner Rosales asked about the status of the town homes in the Citrus Crossing Project.

Mr. Coleman stated that the developers plan to move forward.

Commissioner asked about the Arriaza project, and if she is planning to go forward with the project.

Mr. Coleman stated that it is his understanding that she is.

Commissioner Rosales asked about the progress of Jake's restaurant.  
Mr. Coleman stated that they are making good progress.

Commissioner Dodson asked about the progress of the Citrus Crossing sidewalk.

Mr. Coleman said that the proposed design of the sidewalk would go to the City Council for review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.