Minutes

Planning Commission October 1, 2012
City of Orange Monday 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners Buttress, Gladson, Grangoff and Steiner
ABSENT: Commissioner Cathcart

STAFF
PRESENT: Leslie Aranda Roseberry, Planning Manager
Chad Ortlieb, Senior Planner
Dan Ryan, Historic Preservation Planner
Gary Sheatz, Assistant City Attorney
Sandi Dimick, Recording Secretary

REGULAR SESSION:

Chair Steiner called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Commissioner Grangoff led the Flag Salute.

Roll Call

Commissioner Cathcart was absent.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

None

PLANNING MANAGER REPORT:

Planning Manager, Leslie Aranda Roseberry, stated there was nothing additional to report.

Chair Steiner provided an overview of the City's appeal process.

Consent Calendar:

(1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2012.

Commissioner Gladson made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the September 17, 2012 Planning Commission meeting as written.

SECOND: Commissioner Buttress
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Gladson, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

New Items:

(2) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 2835-11 - ULIVI PROPERTY

The applicants are proposing a shared parking agreement for two parcels located at 369-377 S. Glassell.

LOCATION: 369-377 N. Tustin

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities) because the project involves a shared parking agreement and no new construction is proposed.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 39-12 approving a new shared parking agreement for the two parcels located at 369-377 S. Glassell.

Historic Preservation Planner Dan Ryan presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner asked if there were any questions for Staff or any additional information received on the item. There was none.

Chair Steiner opened the meeting for Public Comment and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Nicole Ulivi, address on file, stated she was available for questions.

Chair Steiner asked if there were any questions for the applicant. There were none.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commission for further discussion or action.

Commissioner Buttress made a motion to adopt PC Resolution No. 39-12, approving CUP No. 2835-11-Ulivi Property, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report and noting the item's categorical exemption from CEQA.

SECOND: Commissioner Grangoff
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Gladson, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

(3) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 28672851-12 AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE NO. 4615-12 - AMERICA'S TIRE

The applicant proposes to establish a tire sales and installation business in a vacant building. The proposal includes adding five bay doors preceded by a trellis with vines on the north building elevation where glazing currently exists, new signage, and other minor site modifications.

LOCATION: 1542 E. Chapman

NOTE: The proposed project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 and 15303 (Class 1 – Existing Facilities and conversion of Small Structures) because the project proposes to lease space in an existing building and complete minor modifications to the building to accommodate the use.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Adopt Planning Commission Resolution 38-12 approving a tire sales and installation business and associated building and site modifications.

Planning Manager Leslie Aranda Roseberry stated it would be an appropriate time for any Commissioner who had met with the applicant prior to the meeting to disclose that information. Chair Steiner and Commissioner Grangoff stated they had met with the applicant, at the applicant's request.

Senior Planner Chad Ortlieb presented a project overview consistent with the Staff Report.

Chair Steiner opened the item for any questions for Staff.

Commissioner Gladson asked if Mr. Ortlieb could go a bit deeper into the General Plan issue that had been raised during the Design Review Committee presentations and specifically to the Gateway entry to the City.

Mr. Ortlieb stated the area of the General Plan he believed she was referring to was the Urban Design element. There were certain nodes identified in the City that the desire was when a project came to the City that it would be an inviting or enhanced node that gave the "Welcome to Orange" corridor appearance. That particular statement had not fallen into the goals and policies statement, but there were also goals and policies that were a bit subjective. Some of those pertained to new development, such as a brand new complex or some of them may go toward the use or specific to a bay door feature. It was a little subjective. He could read the individual goals and policies if that would help.

Commissioner Gladson asked if it was fair to state that because that was a higher level directional phrasing that it essentially established a vision for that corridor without the actual implementation component that would come later, maybe even sometime at a future date when there would be time to figure out what the Gateway vision would be?

Mr. Ortlieb asked if she was stating that the General Plan looked to future development with a bigger statement to occur, maybe in the form of City streetscape improvements or a design theme for a corner area; something in that regard, and when a City had a better ability to work cooperatively with a developer to implement such features.

Commissioner Gladson stated that would be one way of achieving that goal. There were a number of ways to get at the goal and a number of ways to getting to a Gateway entry. She had wanted to clarify the intent of that element. She asked if she was correct in stating that the City had not studied the manner of how the goal would be achieved for Chapman.

Mr. Ortlieb stated there were no municipal code standards or a node plan that spelled out how that would be accomplished.

Chair Steiner asked Mr. Ortlieb if he would speak to the Design Review Committee's recommendation as not being for or against the proposal.

Mr. Ortlieb stated there had been a lot of discussion and in the end there were two members that felt the bay doors facing Chapman were enough to merit a non-recommendation. The two other Committee Members felt they could get over the issue with a trellis treatment and recommended conditions. There had been a lot of discussion at prior meetings and a uniform thought that the design might not be optimum, but that there were ways to achieve an appropriate proposal.

Commissioner Buttress asked if there were any actual plans for the corner of Tustin and Chapman.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated the easiest way to answer that was the City had not received any submittals for any construction from an applicant or property owner. They received questions from the public, but there was nothing currently in house.

Commissioner Buttress stated, in reading the information, it was stated that the tire store was closed on Sunday, but during the presentation she had heard Sunday and not Saturday that the business would close at 5:00 p.m. She asked if it was Saturday that the store closed at 5:00 p.m. and Sunday that the store was closed.

Mr. Ortlieb stated that was correct, he had made an error.

Commissioner Gladson stated on the corner piece it was the same zone as for the proposal before them, from a zoning purpose was it C-1?

Mr. Ortlieb stated yes it was commercial uses in the C-1 district.

Chair Steiner asked if there had been any additional information or communication received on the proposal? There was none.

Chair Steiner opened the item for Public Comment and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Chris Pederson, address on file, stated they were excited to bring America's Tire to the City of Orange and into the space near the corner of Chapman and Tustin. The building was brand new and had been vacant for almost 3 years. America's Tire was proposing a business that would bring in revenues in excess of $3,000,000 per year. The America's Tire stores prided themselves on a clean and efficient work flow with a strong emphasis on customer service and safety. He appreciated having the chance to meet with some of the Commissioners last week and acquaint them with the company.

Mr. Pederson stated, just to recap briefly, they were America's Tire in California and Discount Tire in most of the nation. Their focus was on tires and wheels and the sales and service there of. Typical automotive repairs, mechanical work or oil changes were not part of their business. It allowed them to have a much cleaner store than most automotive repair facilities. Cars were not kept over night and most of their customers were in an out of the store in an hour. The America's Tire was a much better fit for the shopping center. There was pride in their extensive employee training program where they developed great attitudes and world class service. The anticipation was to open with 7 new jobs and as business grew, they would have 10 to 15 employees. Nationwide they had 800 stores and had been in business for over 52 years and proud of the fact that none of their employees had ever been laid off. In addition to the vibrant business that America's Tire would bring to the City, they also had an education program for their employees and also included scholarships for the employees and their children, there were 401K and great health care benefits. The company provided charitable donations to a wide variety of organizations in the communities where they had done business in.

He stated that America's Tire had the support of the City of Orange's Economic Development Department and his neighbor Ron Beard whole heartedly supported their use.

Chair Steiner invited the first Public Speaker to approach the dais.

Dan Slater, address on file, stated the reason he was present was fortunately as a neighbor he had been noticed and he was against the project, but he would be against the project whether he was a neighbor or not and only because it was not right for Orange.

The reasons were:

1. The City of Orange had expended a great deal of effort and he believed redevelopment money to redevelop the site and the City had done an admirable job, but to now capitulate to a use that was one step above a mechanics shop was

ridiculous. The buildings had been vacant for over 3 years and it was either due to the recession or Walgreens was asking too much money; or both. In fact the dermatology group to the west had committed to putting a skin care store in one of the buildings, but after being stalled by Walgreen's for 3 months, the skin care store took another location.

2. The location had been identified as a Gateway to the City and to Old Towne and even Mr. Ortlieb had stated in one of the DRC meetings that they were in a gray area as far as planning for the project and had stated the General Plan had a plan and a policy for creating certain nodes with a certain type of appearance and advanced planning had not envisioned the type of use that was being proposed. Mr. Slater stated the proposal had not complied with the General Plan.
3. Whether or not the CUP allowed a tire store to be followed by another tire store was probably irrelevant because Mr. Pederson had stated at a DRC meeting that they planned on being at the site for a long time.
4. Mr. Hatfield had stated at the July 18, 2012 that he had wanted to meet with the neighbors to make sure they understood the project and he had yet to be approached by the applicant.
5. Currently there was office professional across the street and to the west and the new OP Zoning had a residential option and he asked if that was compatible with a tire store?
6. The Vine covered Pergola in front, as one of the DRC members had stated, was just putting lipstick on a pig.

Mr. Slater stated as a past Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, he was pro business and the business before them seemed like a wonderful company; but he asked the Planning Commission to deny the project as it was wrong for a Gateway to Orange and to Old Towne.

Tony Trabucco, address on file, stated he was in agreement with what Mr. Slater had stated. It was a Gateway to Old Towne Orange and a lot of money and time had been expended to develop not only that parcel, but other quadrants to ensure a pleasing entry way. Although he empathized with the applicant, as well as the landlords, it had not seemed like the right type of development and it should not have been allowed in the initial approval project a few years back. Secondly noise, and there had been noise studies completed, but it was a tire store and air tools would be used. Even if the bays were not open to the back, he was sure there would be some ambient noise in that area he happened to work across the street and would be affected by looking at as well as hearing a tire store. He concurred that a trellis with vines was putting lipstick on a pig. He was also concerned with the additional traffic for the shopping center. He opposed the project.

Lana Lukas, address on file, stated she was a proud resident and business owner and she welcomed the revenue. She had done business with America's Tire and thought they were the cleanest and most professional tire store that there was. Their buildings were kept clean and she would be proud to do business with them.

Margit Allen, address on file, stated she had watched the redevelopment to that corner and the replacement of Drug Emporium with the building that was currently there. It had been previously mentioned that the location was a Gateway to the community. It was one of the first big intersections when coming off of the freeway and she was concerned with the industrial use. The City's General Plan had not been specific about land use, as it spoke of landscape and streetscape. She asked that the Commissioners look at the land use because the CUP ran with the land.

Glen Duncan, address on file, stated he was one of the few residents on the north side that was invited to the meeting. He was opposed to the tire shop and there were currently 3 tire shops on N. Tustin between Walnut and Chapman. There was a tire shop behind him and he was a sound specialist. The pneumatic tools and impact wrenches were quite noisy. The bays were facing away from him, but the new proposed bays would face right at him and he was opposed to that.

Jason Andrete, address on file, stated he was in support of the project and had been to the company many times, they were great and he had used their business. He was excited that America's Tire was coming to Orange it was a great company and he wanted to support them.

Chair Steiner asked for the applicant to address some of the issue that had been presented through Public Comment.

Mr. Pederson stated he had a sound specialist, Mike Dickerson, present and he wanted him to address some of the concerns of the neighbors.

Chair Steiner asked Staff what the distance was at the back of the building to the residential 15' wall.

Mr. Ortlieb stated it was approximately 40'.

Chair Steiner asked if the doors at the back of the building would be closed during business hours.

Mr. Ortlieb stated those doors were supposed to be closed, with one exception with the dead tire storage area that would be opened when the truck would come to pick up the tires. There was a completely separate compressor room in the back.

Mr. Pederson stated it was his understanding, in regard to the General Plan, that they were not in violation or was there anything that would prohibit America's Tire from occupying the space as proposed?

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated when looking at the General Plan Land Use element and the Zoning Ordinance they had conformed to one another; the type of land use the applicant was requesting was permitted via a Conditional Use Permit. There was a lot more to the General Plan. When people were speaking about the Gateway issue, those were things

that were laid out in policies and the General Plan was the governing document with all the other documents coming from that. There were no studies for the Gateways in the City, currently.

Chair Steiner stated they would now hear about the noise issue.

Mike Dickerson, address on file, stated he had prepared a noise study. He had gone out to the subject site and taken noise readings of ambient noise on several occasions to monitor the existing noise levels. The study covered three locations; behind the project and two locations across the street on Chapman. The ambient noise measurements indicated that traffic was the primary noise impact on the overall area. The noise study then reviewed the City of Orange's Municipal Code and related the project's potential impact with comparisons to those codes. In all cases when the pneumatic tools and potential impacts were compared to the code, it always fell below the thresholds with no impacts. The project proposes that pneumatic tools would be properly tuned and potentially equipped with silencers. The residential units behind the proposed project site were computer modeled and what occurred with all the doors closed was that the pneumatic tool noises were not heard, for the most part, to those residential properties at the back of the building. The noise was on a logarithmic scale and took an approximate 3 decibel change to be heard. The human ear responded to a 10 decibel change. To simplify, if there was a sound of 50 DB and another sound with 50 DBs was added at the same distance that was an increase in 3 decibels. For example, with traffic traveling at a certain volume with sound from 200,000 cars; to get an increase in sound, it would take 400,000 cars to notice a sound increase. For pneumatic tools and so forth, it would be measured in the same manner. He visited other tire stores in the county and measured there impacts and those were minimal.

Commissioner Gladson stated there were 4 recommendations in the noise study that was provided to them with mitigation for noise and many of those had been incorporated in the Staff's recommended Conditions of Approval. With noise impacts, it was sometimes subjective when measured against an ordinance for spikes and continuous noise and was it fair to state that there would be some noise generated when the bay doors were open, but that it would not trip the level above the ordinance decibel levels; but it could have a potential nuisance affect?

Mr. Dickerson stated the homes located directly behind the project site were the barrier of the building shell itself, as long as the doors were closed with weather and noise seals that would typically provide enough attenuation to noise impacts and would not emit any noise to those properties at the back of the building. If the doors were open, noise would penetrate and seep out to the back. There was a 15' wall at the back of the building that would provide additional shielding. For the bay doors at the front, due to the distance of those doors to the residential units to the north, the worst case scenario for the noise levels would not exceed the code limits; not to state that the noise would not be minimally audible occasionally, however, the predominant noise in that area was from traffic.

Commissioner Grangoff stated there was noise created by the traffic and would that traffic drown out what would occur at the tire store or was the tire stuff just at the same level?

Mr. Dickerson stated the traffic would actually mask any noise.

Commissioner Grangoff asked if any of the tire installation, such as an air compressor, would ever be audible.

Mr. Dickerson stated the air compressor's noise should not be present. The overall increases of noise as a result of the project would be .1 DB increase from certain statistical analysis. It would take an approximate change of 3 DB to hear a change in sound, or to be noticeable. According to the analysis, the noise generated from the tire store would not be audible. At the same time, if there was no traffic and ambient noise levels dropped, the masking affects might yield a slight pneumatic tool use sound. The shielding of the building with all equipment housed inside that building, even with the bay doors open, would limit any sound from penetrating beyond the building.

Mr. Pederson stated there were also tires stored, approximately 3000, within the building that would act as a sound absorption means compared to a repair shop with pneumatic tools, shelves and open space in a concrete or metal building where sound would be much more audible. The tires really dampened the noise.

Commissioner Buttress asked when the old tires were picked up, and would someone be coming in at 7:00 a.m.?

Mr. Pederson stated no, they would not open until 8:00 a.m. and the pick ups would be once, maybe twice, a week during normal business hours.

Commissioner Buttress stated she had the displeasure of having her first home behind a grocery store and there were noisy trucks that would come in. On the compressor room was there extra sound proofing or was it necessary?

Mr. Pederson stated there was no extra sound proofing and the building was concrete block construction with a solid metal door and no sound could penetrate that room.

Commissioner Buttress asked if the employees would be instructed to keep the back doors shut at all times, or as much as possible.

Mr. Pederson stated yes. On the back side of the building there were only two doors and they had not wanted to have the doors remain open.

Chair Steiner stated there were 33 Conditions of Approval and he asked if the applicant complied with the conditions.

Mr. Pederson stated yes.

Commissioner Gladson stated the Planning Commission had the benefit of having the minutes in their packets from the Design Review Committee, and although they had not provided a recommendation, could Mr. Pederson provide the alternative design for the bays that had been explored as it seemed that the bay doors had been the issue with the General Plan compliance. She had not seen a western entrance to the building with a drive through situation with the façade to remain as a store front.

Mr. Pederson stated they had looked at doors on the back of the building, but there were residential properties there. Toward the Mexican restaurant corner, that corner of the building was where the electrical and fire risers were housed and it was cost prohibitive to move those. There were a couple of other designs to have the building be a drive through type situation, however, more space in the building was taken up with limited space for storage and a reduction in the number of vehicles they could handle at one time; and a limit to their business growth.

Commissioner Gladson asked if a western entrance had been studied or to go from 5 bays to 3 bays as the bay doors had seemed to be a big sticking point with the Design Review Committee and with the public.

Al Hatfield, address on file, stated he was the regional vice president for America's Tire Company and he was responsible for having the stores look new everyday. He had the job of picking a location and there was a team that went through all the committees and such. America's Tire had explored other ideas; the noise was the biggest issue and they would have loved to place the doors in the back but with the neighbors, they had not wanted to do that. On the west side closest to Tustin it would have taken them to just 3 bays, having a horseshoe system inside would have reduced the bays to 3 with only 2 doors and had not made economic sense.

Commissioner Gladson stated she was asking about the western elevation that was near the Walgreen's drive through as an area that had not been explored.

Mr. Hatfield stated the drive through for Walgreen's was there and that would create a stacking situation with cars in the drive through. America's Tire representatives had gone through 3 meetings and had explored every option.

Chair Steiner stated it appeared that there was only 60' to deal with at the end of the building.

Mr. Hatfield stated yes that was what was there today. The doors on the back would be shut for security. The other issue was that they would be great neighbors and they were in it for the long haul and they were in it for keeps and they wanted to be the neighborhood tire store to service and provide for generations of customers. Traffic flow was an issue that he could briefly address. The tire store was able to monitor and control to a certain extent when customers arrived, they were not a McDonalds or Starbucks that had a morning and an afternoon rush. The America's Tire stores were steady business all

day long and with appointments, they were able to regulate that. There would not be a lot of traffic there.

Commissioner Gladson stated on the bay doors she understood that there was various designs that would give the doors a more glass like appearance.

Mr. Hatfield stated the doors could be all glass and their store in Huntington Beach had bay doors that were all glass. They were willing to entertain other ideas for design. The bay door would be open and there was nothing they could do about that, but from the street looking in, the car that appeared in the bay looked like a parked car. If there was a parking stall there, it would be a parked car that was there. The vehicles were only taken up 2' for tire changing.

Chair Steiner stated on the notification to the neighbors, how many feet within the subject site was the requirement for noticing?

Mr. Ortlieb stated 300' and they also noticed any persons who had spoken at previous DRC Meetings and those who had requested notification.

Chair Steiner stated he was reviewing the addresses of those who spoke and he asked the public speakers in attendance if they were immediate neighbors, across from the store or at the north of the project.

The public speakers provided their location to Chair Steiner.

Commissioner Gladson stated they had heard testimony from residents about not having a public outreach from America's Tire; and could the applicant provide information on what outreach had been done?

Mr. Pederson stated that they had considered an open house, but it had not taken place.

Chair Steiner brought the item back to the Commission for further discussion or action.

Commissioner Gladson stated the item before them was a bit of a challenge and the experts on visual things, the DRC, could not provide a recommendation and that made her do a bit of soul searching. There had also been treading in the Planning Commission's bailiwick, from a land use perspective and the noise perspective of the use. She was concerned that there were folks in opposition of the proposal before them and that the applicant had not completed their due diligence with those neighbors to work with them for solutions to their concerns. She was not certain that would have helped or not. There were parts of the application that, in looking at the findings, were particularly important in looking at the surrounding land uses. The General Plan gateway area was a bit undefined and that particular argument had not given much weight to her thought process and it was not harming that situation if the proposed use was permitted. There could still be a gateway and it was an important element to consider. What would help her with the proposal was if the bay doors appeared more commercial. She felt the use

before them was not industrial because tires were not being made but being sold and she could understand the noise concerns, those would not trip the noise codes but would be more bothersome. The store operated during normal day time hours and she would give the business lots of slack for that type of stuff, but she would have wanted those areas to be more defined. If she had her general wishes and desires, she would wish that there could have been a way to achieve all of it from an inside perspective, she had purchased tires from a store that had everything inside and from the outside, it was not visible. That was not what was before them and she got that. Those were her general first thoughts and they all needed to discuss where they were at with the proposal before them. She would want to find a way to get it over the hump and have the applicant work with the neighbors more. She was open to hearing what her colleagues had to state.

Commissioner Grangoff stated he was coming from a similar perspective and the use before them would work well for the area, he was concerned with the aesthetics and the gentleman that spoke last provided some information that the doors could be changed and it may be something that might assist the neighbors from an aesthetic point of view. From a sound point of view, if the noise became a nuisance and the noise increased above the decibels that were cited, it would be a reason to have their permit pulled.

Ms. Aranda Roseberry stated there were two factors with the noise issue; the impacts of the existing noise in the area and the threshold that the City had for noise and any changes that occurred. If for some reason there became an impact over the City's threshold, Staff would sit down with the applicant to come up with a means of resolution and compliance.

Commissioner Buttress stated she would want to view the alternate doors that had been discussed and a drawing that showed what the building would look like with the bay doors closed.

The Planning Commissioners reviewed the photos and drawings that were provided in their packets and drawings that had been placed on the walls of the Council Chamber.

Chair Steiner stated he was not certain what the applicant was able to do tonight as he was hearing broader concerns and not specific concerns. Most of what he was hearing was opposition to the type of business no matter what, at that location, and he was not certain what more the applicant could do to address those concerns with the neighbors and it was not the Planning Commission's position to redesign the project.

Commissioner Buttress stated she agreed with Chair Steiner's comments.

Commissioner Grangoff stated the applicant had mentioned that they were a good neighbor and with that possibly the applicant could meet with residents and come up with some solutions to their concerns and nothing that the Planning Commission would condition the project.

Commissioner Grangoff made a motion to adopt PC Resolution No. 38-12, approving CUP No. 2851-12 and DRC No. 4615-12 - America's Tire, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Report, and noting the item is categorical exempt from CEQA.

SECOND: Commissioner Buttress
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Gladson, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Gladson stated she wanted to discuss a few things and to add a couple of things to the conditions. The applicant had stated the hours of operation covered in Condition No. 28 were 8:00 to 6:00, but there was information that the hours were 8:30 to 6:00 and that needed to be adjusted; and to add to Condition No. 29 the following verbiage: Applicant shall make every effort to close bay doors during business hours when bay was not in operation. She also thought that the four recommendations of the noise study were not picked up and she wanted those pulled over into the Resolution and that would be to add those from page 2.1 of the noise study, the summary section numbers 2, 3 and 5 and Staff could clean that up in the final Resolution. To add into Finding No. 1, Selman Chevrolet and "My Car Agent" could be added as evidence or facts for the findings.

Chair Steiner asked the maker of the motion and the maker of the second if they were in agreement to add the information as requested by Commissioner Gladson.

Commissioner Buttress stated she agreed with the changes.

Commissioner Gladson stated there was one more thing, and it was just a pet peeve. There were bio swales out at the site, they were not the applicant's fault and they were designed the way they currently were. She understood that little could be done, but those areas needed some permanent fencing as there were poles and wires out there currently and one had been clipped by a vehicle and ideally it would be nice to have all of that cleaned up. The bio swales were low and trip hazard, but the current fencing was a poor execution of fencing, there were wonderful wrought iron elements on the building and if they could work on that to dress it up a little bit.

Chair Steiner stated there was a motion on the floor with a second and he asked the Commissioners to vote.

(4) ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Buttress made a motion for adjournment to the next regular scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission on Monday, October 15, 2012.

SECOND: Commissioner Gladson
AYES: Commissioners Buttress, Gladson, Grangoff and Steiner
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cathcart

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting Adjourned @ 8:15 p.m.