



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Date: 7/13/2020

Time: 7:00 p.m.

GoToWebinar.com – ID #275-115-267

A. Call To Order

Chair Andrew Barnes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes (Chair), Michael Doran, Larry Kahle, Henry Riggs (Vice Chair), Michele Tate (left at 8 p.m.)

Absent: Chris DeCardy, Camille Kennedy

Staff: Fahteen Khan, Assistant Planner; Matt Pruter, Associate Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Senior Planner; Leo Tapia, Planning Technician

Chair Barnes noted that Commissioner Camille Kennedy was having some connectivity issues and was expected to be present. He said that Commissioner Michele Tate would need to leave the meeting at 8:00 p.m. He said with that they would move item F3 on the agenda to become item F2 and F2 would become F3.

Chair Barnes provided an overview of how he would conduct the meeting including that he would review the process for each agenda item.

Associate Planner Matt Pruter provided additional procedural information related to the Webinar meeting application and participation by applicants, staff and the public.

C. Reports and Announcements

Senior Planner Corinna Sandmeier said the City Council would meet Tuesday evening, July 14, 2020 at 5 p.m. to take action on the Climate Action Plan developed by the City's Environmental Quality Commission.

D. Public Comment

There was none.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of revised minutes from the May 4, 2020, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))
- E2. Approval of minutes from the June 8, 2020, Planning Commission meeting. ([Attachment](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Henry Riggs/Michael Doran) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of the revised minutes from the May 4, 2020 Planning Commission meeting and minutes from the June 8, 2020 Planning Commission meeting; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioner DeCardy and Kennedy absent.

Chair Barnes said Commissioner Kennedy would be recused from item F1.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Patrick Williams/709 Harvard Avenue:
Request for a use permit to perform interior and exterior modifications, including the addition of a balcony, to an existing nonconforming two-story, single-family residence and an existing nonconforming detached garage that would exceed 50 percent of the replacement value of each of the two existing nonconforming structures in a 12-month period. The project previously received a building permit for a more limited scope of work; however, the proposed revisions plus the original scope of work would exceed 50 percent of the replacement value of the two existing nonconforming structures in a 12-month period and therefore require a use permit. The subject parcel is located on a substandard lot in the R-2 (Low Density Apartment) zoning district. ([Staff Report #20-031-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planning Technician Leo Tapia said staff had no additions to the written report.

Questions of Staff: Replying to Commissioner Larry Kahle, Mr. Tapia said that the threshold for a two-story residential development was work that exceeded 50 percent of the replacement value and the threshold for a one-story residential development was work that exceeded 75 percent of the replacement value.

Replying to Commissioner Riggs, Mr. Tapia said the tree mentioned in the plan set was removed by the City prior to the site construction and was replaced with two City trees per the City Arborist. Commissioner Riggs asked if one of those trees died whether it was the City's responsibility to replace it. Mr. Tapia said it was his understanding that the City had some level of responsibility for trees in the right of way. Planner Sandmeier said that generally it was the property owners that maintained the trees in front of their properties and that they would then work with the City Arborist if one of those trees needed to be replaced. She said in this case if there was an issue with one of the City trees at this site that staff would bring the information to the City Arborist's attention but in this case, she did not think the tree's health was related to the project.

Applicant Presentation: Lori Lyons-Williams and Patrick Williams, co-owners of the subject property, introduced themselves. Mr. Williams said they bought their home in Menlo Park in July 2017 and to accommodate their family needs they pursued a remodel originally more limited in scope than what was now proposed. He said their contractor during the demolition process found water damage in the floorboards and dry rot and termite damage in both the internal and external framing. He said it was because of those issues that they expanded the scope of the project.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the two dormers added on the front were functional. Mr. Williams said the dormer above the door would be a skylight and the second dormer was decorative. Commissioner Kahle said he was looking at the second floor plan and it looked like the wall behind the dormers would remain so they were not providing any light to the bedroom or closet behind it. Mr. Williams said that was accurate for the one on the right facing the house but the one over the door would draw light into the entryway. Commissioner Kahle asked if there was any way to open up the wall to bedroom #4 noting he was concerned that it would not look right seeing a blank wall through a window. Mr. Williams said that they would be open to that but thought that was a technical

question for the architect. Commissioner Kahle said it was a suggestion as he was concerned with the view for those passing by.

Commissioner Kahle said the sundeck looked directly into the left side neighbor's rear yard and asked if they were open to providing screening through either a higher rail or landscaping. Mr. Williams said he thought they would be open to that. He said he shared the plan with his neighbor and he had not been concerned as the opening of the deck viewed a laundry room and utility area. He said he was willing to do a higher railing if that was deemed appropriate or some kind of foliage barrier. Commissioner Kahle said the site plan indicated the sundeck was not looking into the neighbor's house area but nearly directly was looking into the rear yard of the front structure. Ms. Lyons-Williams said it would look into the rear yard noting the back part of the neighboring house was the laundry room.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said the project was easy to support but he had two concerns. He said there was a lot of roof and having the dormers centered helped that a lot but he was concerned with what people from the street would see through those. He said something open or some light behind those would make a difference. He said his major concern was about the balcony noting he had walked the driveway on the left, which he thought was a rental, and the only private space the front house had was the yard that the balcony / deck would overlook. He said although the neighbor wrote a letter saying he acknowledged that the balcony / deck was there, he did not indicate approval or not. He said it was the Commission's role to protect privacy. He said he would like some privacy protection solution by the applicant for the neighbor's private yard.

Commissioner Riggs said he shared the concern about second level views into either back of house rooms or yards. He said a little planting would go a long way to address that. He noted a future owner of the neighboring property might find the balcony / deck an unfortunate situation. He suggested hearing from the applicant about something perhaps as simple as planting along the property line.

Mr. Williams said they were open to greenery to provide privacy in both directions as well as some plantings on the deck itself.

Commissioner Riggs moved to approve the use permit with the condition that plantings be added to the left side property line to be reviewed and approved by planning staff.

Commissioner Kahle asked if the railing was closed or open. Mr. Williams said they would not have glass in the railing and they would want a sturdier railing of either wood or wrought iron. Commissioner Kahle said he would prefer a solid railing but would not condition that. He seconded Commissioner Riggs' motion.

Mr. Tapia asked if the Commission had any particular plantings in mind for screening. Commissioner Riggs said he would like to leave that to the applicant to work with staff for plantings to provide screening between the sight line from the balcony to the rear yard to the left.

Planner Sandmeier said staff had some discussion with the City Arborist about problems of impacts to houses and roofs from trees planted in narrow spaces. She suggested that a tall shrub would work better than a tree. She said if the Commission was agreeable that staff could look at a combination of a higher railing and some greenery to block some of the view.

Commissioner Riggs suggested something like a vine that would grow on fences or walls to about 10 feet in about five or six years. He said also what was known as patio trees did not have abundant or deep roots. Commissioner Kahle suggested pittosporum or bamboo noting that although both had some issues that they could be made to work in a tight space.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Kahle) to approve the item with the following modification; passes 5-0-2 with Commissioners DeCardy and Kennedy absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by David Tamira, Studio 14, consisting of 19 plan sheets, dated received July 8, 2020, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 - b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
 - g. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following project specific conditions:

- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing plantings that are tall enough to provide privacy screening between the balcony on the left side and the neighboring residence, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.**

Chair Barnes noted that Commissioner Tate needed to leave at 8 p.m. and asked if she would be able to stay through item F3 which had been moved up to replace item F2. Planner Sandmeier reported that Commissioner Kennedy was continuing to have internet issues. Commissioner Tate indicated that she would stay for the item.

It was noted that Commissioner Kahle was recused from consideration of 795 Arnold Way due to a conflict of interest.

F32. Use Permit/Michelle Heeseman/795 Arnold Way:

Request for a use permit to construct first- and second-story additions to an existing one-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot area and width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The addition would be greater than 50 percent of the existing floor area and is considered equivalent to a new structure. The applicant is also requesting to maintain a fence greater than seven feet in height along a portion of the right property line. ([Staff Report #20-033-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Associate Planner Pruter said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Joel Knudson and Michelle Heeseman introduced themselves. Mr. Knudson noted that their home was slightly more than 900 square feet and that was tight space for the size of their family. He said they were seeking to increase their livable space. Ms. Heeseman said they used architect Fred Blome, another Willows resident, to make sure their project would fit within the feel of the Willows. She said he also paid great attention to maintaining a beautiful and landscaped yard.

Fred Blome said he was available for any questions noting Planner Pruter had done a great job laying out the proposed project.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Riggs said the project was handsome and would fit well into the neighborhood. He moved to approve as recommended in the staff report. Commissioner Doran seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Doran) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 4-0-1-2 with Commissioner Kahle recused and Commissioners DeCardy and Kennedy absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, "Existing Facilities") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed

use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by July 13, 2021) for the use permit to remain in effect.
 - b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Blome Architecture, consisting of 12 plan sheets, dated received July 2, 2020, and approved by the Planning Commission on July 13, 2020, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

Commissioner Tate left the meeting. Chair Barnes noted that in attendance were Commissioners Doran, Kahle, Riggs and him and that a quorum was maintained.

- F23. Use Permit/Sai Zhang/1051 Menlo Oaks Drive:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. ([Staff Report #20-032-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Fahteen Khan said the staff report stated the property was to the east of Menlo Oaks Drive but it should state the property was to the west of Menlo Oaks Drive.

Applicant Presentation: Sai Zhang and a gentleman introduced themselves as the property owners and Ms. Zhang introduced Yingxi Chen as the architect.

Ms. Chen said the proposal was to demolish the two-bedroom, one bath home and build a two-story farmhouse in the modern style. She said the proposed four-bedroom, three-and-a-half bath home would have an offset second-story to reduce the mass. She said the property owners had shared the proposed plans with the two adjacent neighbors. She said to protect privacy they minimized glazing areas on both sides of the second floor and most of the window sill heights were about five feet. She said the left side neighbor was worried that the proposed living room window would overlook her bedroom. She said to relieve her concern they lowered the finished floor by six inches compared to the existing residence. She said they were also proposing to add one-foot lattice to the existing six-foot tall fence in the affected section. She said tree protection fence would be placed during construction.

Commissioner Kahle said on the left side the second story walls were set back and that helped provide privacy for next door but the master bedroom had two tall windows with sills at three feet. He asked if they would be open to reducing those windows to match the front bedroom's and putting the egress window in the back, in either the bay or to not have the bay.

Ms. Chen said they could raise the sill height to match the front bedroom windows. She said the property owners wanted the bay window in the back as a place to sit and read a book and look over the backyard.

Commissioner Kahle said anything they could do to help with the privacy would be great. He said the modern farmhouse was a simple design and often did not have any bay windows. He said he would be okay if the bay window went away.

Commissioner Kahle said he had concerns with proportions of the house. He said the one-car garage was prominent. He said generally it worked but the porch roof seemed to be really tall and out of proportion. He said by his estimation it was 11 to 12 feet off the ground whereas the existing one was about eight to nine feet. He said he was thinking about the street view. He noted that an easy way to improve that was not only to drop down the porch roof but also the roof over the garage as there was a lot of wall above the garage door. He said he thought that would help with the overall massing of the house and asked if they had considered that or were interested in that.

Ms. Chen said the porch roof was continuous to the back matching the kitchen and living room. She said perhaps in some way they could break the one roof to two roofs and lower the front porch's roof from 11-feet to 10-feet. Commissioner Kahle said 10-foot would be great. He noted he appreciated how the hip came off the corner of the second floor bedroom but still the roof was so tall that it needed to be lowered. Ms. Chen said they were willing to do that noting the height was 12-feet in the patio area.

Commissioner Kahle asked about the window selection noting what was proposed were vinyl sliders. He said the modern farmhouse style already made great use of inexpensive materials with the board and batten and he requested that they upgrade the windows to a wood window noting the neighborhood supported that type of product. He asked if they were interested in upgrading all the vinyl windows up to wood windows. Ms. Chen said she would need to talk to the clients as they had decided on vinyl windows for now due to budget.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing and closed it was there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kahle said the project was easy to support. He said regarding the neighbors' concerns the second-story wall was a considerable way back from the property line and efforts would be made to preserve the tree so he did not quite share the concerns

that the sunlight would be blocked. He moved to approve with the condition that the front porch and garage roofs were lowered one foot and that the master bedroom window sills on the left side were raised up to provide more privacy to the neighbor.

Chair Barnes asked if the site plans could be presented for Commissioner Kahle to show the areas being referred to. Commissioner Kahle said it was the top two elevations on sheet A3. He said it was the porch roof and that this and the garage roof needed to be lowered a foot which would require a solution for the hip. He noted that something needed to be done to break up the massing. He said his other condition was that the two second-story windows on the left side have the sills raised four inches to protect privacy.

Chair Barnes noted the hip over the porch area and asked if it was the plate height that went down as well. Commissioner Kahle said the columns would need to be shorter and that would probably affect the plate height at the front wall. Chair Barnes asked if was the top of the roofline, the ridge, and the roof associated with the porch area that would drop one foot. Commissioner Kahle said that was correct. He said the line where the porch roof met the second floor wall noted a window and with the proposed modification one more foot of wall would be seen under that window. Chair Barnes confirmed with Commissioner Kahle that how to drop the porch roof would be the applicant's discretion. He referred to the gable over the garage door and asked if the peak of that would drop one foot as well. Commissioner Kahle said he would drop that part of the conditions as that might cause a problem for the entry to the house. He said it was a one-car garage and not that massive although it was prominent but he would leave it alone. Replying further to Chair Barnes, Commissioner Kahle said the sills of the windows on the second story would be raised another four inches or to the maximum sill height allowed for egress windows.

Chair Barnes asked if the applicant understood the conditions. Ms. Chen said raising the window sill height was an easy change and the porch roof could be dropped one foot and was doable around the corner.

Commissioner Riggs said he sympathized with Commissioner Kahle's comments. He said directing a change in height for a wraparound roof concerned him as the height mattered most for the interior space and not for the porch. He said this would lead to complications for the architect and the building. He said what would work for a ranch-style home to set back the second story would not work for a farmhouse style. He said he was also concerned that adjusting the porch roof would lead to complications with the garage roof. He said the hip was currently centered on a window and the break or ridge line at the right side of that front roof was somewhat fixed. He said lowered it might potentially no longer intersect the ridge line of the garage roof and that would create imbalance. He said an alternative to Commissioner Kahle's valid observation would be to have a taller garage door, for instance an eight-foot door rather than a seven-foot door. He said foundation plantings in particular in front of the porch would in a couple of years mask the space between the front window sills and grade.

Commissioner Kahle said he appreciated Commissioner Riggs' comments. He said a taller garage door would help and be a great solution. He said he still felt that the issue with the porch roof was it was too tall above grade. He said perhaps the lower wraparound roof could drop, continue on the left side until it met the first floor wall between the living room and the kitchen and then have an offset there or a rake. Commissioner Kahle said his motion was to approve with a condition for the garage door to be eight feet tall and the lower roof over the entry and along the side over the living room to drop one foot and the sills of the two master bedroom windows to be raised as much as possible to meet egress requirements.

Commissioner Riggs asked if they could check with the architect about dropping the lower roof over the entry and around the side and if that would create any difficulties with the garage roof. Ms. Chen said she just checked and it would work.

Chair Barnes seconded the motion and clarified that staff understood the proposed modifications.

ACTION: Motion and second (Kahle/Barnes) to approve the item with the following modifications; passes 4-0-3 with Commissioners DeCardy, Kennedy, and Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.
3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
 - a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by July 13, 2021) for the use permit to remain in effect.
 - b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Y. Chen Architecture, consisting of 9 plan sheets, dated received June 15, 2020, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
 - c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
 - d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
 - e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
 - f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - g. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.

- h. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by Nicholas Wages – Bay Area Tree Specialist, dated June 4, 2020.
4. Approve the use permit subject to the following **project specific** conditions:
- a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a revised arborist report indicating the removal of tree# 8, subject to review and approval of the City Arborist and the Planning Division.
 - b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing one, #15 container tree planted on the subject property as a replacement for the removal of a street tree (tree #8), subject to review and approval of the City Arborist and the Planning Division.
 - c. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing an 8-inch apron flare on each side of the 10-foot wide driveway, for a total width at the right-of-way of 11 feet, 4 inches, subject to review and approval of the Engineering Division.
 - d. **Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division, showing the following revisions:**
 - i. **the sill height of the two left-side master bedroom windows raised as much as possible while still meeting egress requirements;**
 - ii. **an 8-foot tall roll-up garage door; and**
 - iii. **the lower roof over the porch, entry and living room lowered by one foot and continued on the left side until it meets the first floor wall between the living room and the kitchen.**

G. Regular Business

- G1. Selection of Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair for July 2020 through April 2021. ([Staff Report #20-034-PC](#))

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said this was an opportunity for the Commission to select a Chair and Vice Chair to serve through the next year when the City Council would make new appointments, which was likely to occur in April 2021.

Commissioner Doran nominated Commissioner Barnes to continue as Chair for another year.

Chair Barnes thanked Commissioner Doran and noted that generally the Vice Chair became the Chair the next service term. He nominated Vice Chair Riggs to serve as Chair for the term July 2020 to April 2021. Commissioner Doran said he would withdraw his nomination and seconded the nomination of Vice Chair Riggs for Chair.

ACTION: Motion and second (Barnes/Doran) to select Commissioner Riggs to serve as the

Planning Commission's Chair for the term July 2020 to April 2021; passes 4-0-3 with Commissioners DeCardy, Kennedy and Tate absent.

Commissioner Riggs nominated Commissioner Doran for Vice Chair. After determining there were no other nominations for Vice Chair, Chair Barnes seconded the nomination of Commissioner Doran.

ACTION: Motion and second (Riggs/Barnes) to select Commissioner Doran to serve as the Planning Commission's Vice Chair for the term July 2020 to April 2021; passes 4-0-3 with Commissioners DeCardy, Kennedy and Tate absent.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: July 27, 2020

Planner Sandmeier said the agenda for July 27 would have two single-family development projects.

- Regular Meeting: August 10, 2020
- Regular Meeting: August 24, 2020

I. Adjournment

Chair Barnes adjourned the meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Commission Liaison: Corinna Sandmeier, Senior Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett

Approved by the Planning Commission on July 27, 2020