



**UNAPPROVED
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2009**

6:00 P.M.
City Hall
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California

Members of the Planning Commission

*Brent Daniels, Chair
Julie Kessler Solomon, Vice Chair
Doris Kavanagh
Bill Shelor
Jonny Wallis*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary
Tim W. Giles, City Attorney
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Acting Chair Daniels followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION

Present: Planning Commissioners Daniels, Kavanagh, Shelor, Solomon, and Wallis.
Absent: None.

Staff present: Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase, Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, City Attorney Tim W. Giles, Senior Planner Alan Hanson, Planning Technician Brian Hiefield, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

PUBLIC FORUM

No speakers.

AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

A. PLANNING COMMISSION ORGANIZATION

A.1 Chair/Vice-Chair

B. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

B-1 Planning Commission Minutes for the Design Review Board/Planning Commission Workshop on October 20, 2008, and for the Planning Commission Regular Meeting of November 10, 2008, and the Planning Commission Special Meeting of November 17, 2008.

Recommendation:

- A. Approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Design Review Board/Planning Commission workshop on October 20, 2008, and for the Planning Commission Regular Meeting of November 10, 2008, and the Planning Commission Special Meeting of November 17, 2008.

MOTION: Vice Chair Solomon moved/seconded by Commissioner Kavanagh to approve the Planning Commission minutes for the Design Review Board/Planning Commission workshop on October 20, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote. Ayes: Chair Daniels, Vice Chair Solomon, Commissioners Kavanagh and Shelor; Abstain: Commissioner Wallis; Noes: None.

MOTION: Commissioner Kavanagh moved/seconded by Vice Chair Solomon to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes of November 10, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote. Ayes: Chair Daniels, Vice Chair Solomon, Commissioners Kavanagh and Shelor; Abstain: Commissioner Wallis; Noes: None.

MOTION: Vice Chair Solomon moved/seconded by Commissioner Kavanagh, to approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting minutes of November 17, 2008, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote. Ayes: Chair Daniels, Vice Chair Solomon, Commissioners Kavanagh and Shelor; Abstain: Commissioner Wallis; Noes: None.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

C-1. 05-140-OA, -TM, -DP: Rancho Mobile Home Park located at 7465 Hollister Avenue; APN 079-210-058.

Recommendation:

- A. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 09-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Recommending to the Goleta City Council Approval of Various Actions Related to the Rancho Mobile Home Park Project; Case No. 05-140-OA, -TM, -DP, 7465 Hollister Avenue; APN 079-210-058".

Site Visits and Ex-parte Conversations: Chair Daniels, Vice Chair Solomon, and Commissioner Shelor reported site visits. Commission Kavanagh reported a site visit and noted that she lived in this mobile home park for two years in the early 1980's. Commissioner Wallis reported a site visit. She stated that has dealt with this issue for some time in another role.

Documents: 1) Letter from Richard Close, attorney, Gilchrist & Rutter, dated January 8, 2009, Re: Rancho Mobile Home Park Subdivision/Condo Conversion; 7465 Hollister Ave.; 079-210-0589; 05-140-TM (TM 32,030); and 2) Letter from Martin Johnson, Captain, County of Santa Barbara Fire Department, dated December 11, 2008, Subject: APN: 079-210-058; Permit #: 05GPC-140-OA,TM, DP.

Staff Speakers:

Senior Planner Alan Hanson

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

City Attorney Tim Giles

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase provided a general overview of the hearing process with regard to the proposed Development Agreement and various actions related to the Rancho Mobile Home Park Project.

City Attorney Tim Giles discussed the background and legal context of the issues that will be considered at the hearing.

The staff report and PowerPoint were presented by Senior Planner Alan Hanson.

Richard Close, of Gilchirst & Rutter, attorney for the applicant, stated that he believes the staff report is an excellent summary of the status of the proposed project. He stated that in the last couple of months, the applicant has focused on discussing with the City options to meet the desires and needs of the residents while at the same time allowing the applicant to exercise his rights under State law. He stated that the owner will work with the Fire Department with regard to recommended Condition of Approval #12 regarding the proposed Fire Department conditions in the letter from Martin Johnson, Captain, Fire Prevention Division, dated December 11, 2008.

Susie Forbath, of Gilchrist & Rutter, provided background information and an overview of the proposed project. She stated that both the rent provisions that have been put in place in the proposed Development Agreement for those residents who decide they want to rent instead of purchase their space, as well as the financing that the State will provide for all low income residents who want to purchase, will qualify as affordable housing. She clarified that the State financing will make loans available at 3 percent interest over thirty years based on the resident's income rather than the purchase price.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 7:10 P.M.

Speakers:

Elizabeth Mason, president of Santa Barbara West Park Association, and the representative of the residents from Santa Barbara West Mobile Home Park, addressed the possible impact of the proposed Development Agreement and condominium conversion on their mobile home park. She stated that the proposed conversion would set a precedent and expressed concern that the Santa Barbara West Mobile Home Park is not within the Coastal Commission jurisdiction and would not have the benefit of its various regulations. She believes that most of the residents in the Santa Barbara West Mobile Home Park would not be able to afford the loan payments along with mortgage, homeowner association fees and utilities. She commented that the maintenance of rent control is a necessity to preserve affordable housing for low and very low income residents in the City, and that mobile home parks help meet the state-mandate for affordable housing.

Trish Katje, representing Santa Barbara West Mobile Home Park, agreed with comments made by speaker Elizabeth Mason. After talking with her banker with regard to the estimated cost of a mortgage for a mobile park space at approximately \$200,000, she stated that she cannot currently qualify for a loan and also she would not be able to meet her monthly expenses with a loan. If rent control were eliminated, she stated that it would be a hardship for her to pay the monthly rent for a space based on the applicant's estimated value of rent between \$1,000 and \$1300 per month.

Ken Tatro, representing Monarch Country Mobile Home Owners Association, and spokesperson for the Goleta Mobile Home Owners Coalition, urged that great care be taken by the Planning Commission when reviewing the proposed project. He provided an overview of the applicant's ownership of the mobile home park, stating that the applicant purchased it in 1997 knowing that it was a rent control park. He believes that the proposed Development Agreement is a compromise and that it will set a precedent that will be looked at throughout the State. He expressed concern that the real numbers that the proposed condominium conversion will yield are not known nor is it known whether the proposed conversion will cause major economic problems for mobile home owners. He noted that the applicant currently has five lawsuits against the City. He believes that adequate water pressure is an important local Fire Department issue.

Martin Johnson, representing Santa Barbara County Fire Department, stated that the Fire Department, in a letter dated December 11, 2008, proposed that two conditions of approval be met prior to recordation of the tract map. He reported that the Fire Department's legal counsel has not had time to review a letter from the applicant's attorney questioning the authority of the Fire Department to impose these conditions, and requested a continuance of this item so that this issue can be vetted between the applicant's attorney and County Counsel's, or if that is not appropriate, the applicant be directed to meet with County Counsel and the Fire Department to address these issues. He stated that the request for hydrant infrastructure upgrades addresses the concern for public safety but the legal question regarding the legal authority to improve such requirements needs to be addressed through County Counsel. Martin Johnson stated that from his experience fighting fires for over twenty years in this community, rarely are fires in mobile home units contained just to that unit, noting that the units

tend to burn very rapidly and the type of construction is not the same as a typical home.

Dennis Shelly, past president of the Homeowners Association of Rancho Mobile Homes, presented a letter dated November 12, 2009, entitled "Issue – Single-Lot Condo-Conversion of Rancho Mobile Homes Parks". He pointed out that there are no fire hydrants in the park and that the closest fire hydrant that the Fire Department said it would use is located across Hollister Avenue from the entrance to the park. He noted that the park is approximately 3/8 of a mile long with no useable fire hydrants. He also pointed out that he believes 80% of the residents in this park do not approve of the proposed conversion, and that nearly the same number of residents would be unable to afford the loans to make the purchase. He expressed concern that after a certain grace period following conversion, the landowner can raise the price of the lots and that the homeowner would not be able to get any appreciation above the depreciated Blue Book Value of his home, which would result, in a worst-case scenario, in a major financial loss for a mobile home owner.

Wayland Gandall, mobile home park resident, stated that he does not believe that the property owner should be allowed to provide the appraisal with regard to the worth of the property. He believes that most of the mobile home park residents on the property pay approximately \$200 per month for pass-through fees and do not receive any interest, for improvements that are made to the property.

Frank Arredondo, Chumash, stated that his goal at this time is to protect coastal archaeological resources that are Native American based. His main concern is if the property becomes a condominium conversion there be an opportunity for development on the property that includes grading and infrastructure. Also, he heard about the request from the Fire Department for the installation of new fire hydrant infrastructure. He presented a letter dated January 12, 2009, with regard to his review of the proposed project and his recommendations. He pointed out that the two most important recommendations are: #1) a site records search is done with a 1/2 mile radius to project site to determine the existence of any known sensitive archaeological cultural resources; and #2) contact be made with Known Tribal groups listed in the Thresholds and Guidelines Manual as well as but not limited to the Native American Contact list with the Native American Heritage Commission, and any Interested Native American parties that might come forward for any consultation request.

Olivia Uribe, Associate Director, Santa Barbara County Action Network (SBCAN), shared some general principles on behalf of the organization that she hopes will be considered when making a decision regarding the proposed project: a) We believe there is a crisis with respect to the availability of affordable housing for low-income, moderate, middle class and workforce needs; b) Rental housing should be a priority over home ownership in filling low-income housing needs; c) Affordable housing should stay affordable in perpetuity; d) Existing affordable housing occupied by low to moderate income households should be protected from gentrification; and e) Adequate infrastructure, for example, police, fire, and schools, must be part of a comprehensive planning approach to development, and guarantees for necessary infrastructure or mitigations for them should be enforced. With regard to this project, she noted that currently financing is not easily and readily available, especially for

mobile homes. She pointed out that the City will not be having as much revenue as in the past due to current economic conditions.

James Webster stated that he has sold mobile homes in the area for many years and has observed a significant increase in the monthly rent for the spaces over the years. He noted that along with a condominium conversion, there is the potential that mobile home park residents would be displaced and that other places for them to live would need to be found. He noted that it would be difficult for some mobile home residents to qualify for a loan to purchase the property. He commented that he does not believe something should be fixed until it is broken.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 7:40 P.M.

RECESS HELD FROM 7:40 P.M. TO 7:50 P.M.

Staff responded to questions from the members of the Planning Commission.

Senior Planner Alan Hanson clarified that the language in Exhibit 1, Section 1.0 CEQA Findings, 1.1, paragraph 5, with regard to pass-throughs for capital improvements, is specific to State statutes as they currently exist, and that the Development Agreement as proposed would not allow for those pass-throughs.

Senior Planner Alan Hanson stated that typically CC&Rs are prepared by the subdivider and reviewed by the local jurisdiction. City Attorney Tim Giles stated that there are no provisions that require participation in the initial preparation of the CC&Rs by the tenants in the proposed Conditions of Approval and proposed Development Agreement.

Commissioner Wallis stated that she hopes that the City will confer with the tenants with regard to the preparation of the CC&Rs, stating that it would seem unfair for just the applicant and the City to work together on CC&Rs that would govern the future buyers who are currently tenants. She does not believe that it is appropriate for the City to have a role in the enforcement of CC&Rs.

Commissioner Wallis requested that staff check that the language in the proposed Development Agreement in Section 4.01.01.E. Rent Increases, on Page 7, includes all of the protections listed on Page 6 of the proposed Development Agreement.

Commissioner Wallis requested that staff consider whether it would be appropriate to better define the language "during the early period" in Section 4.01.03 Common Area Facilities and Major Components, on Page 55 of the proposed Development Agreement.

Commissioner Wallis requested that staff consider whether the language in Section 7.01.04 Reference is too narrowly written with regard to the specific qualifications for a referee who shall hear all legal actions.

Commissioner Wallis requested that staff review Section 8.02.02 Lawsuits of the proposed Development Agreement, with regard to whether it would be more

appropriate for the language to designate the time period as ninety days; and if not, to check that the language Section 8.02.02 (iii) clarifies the desired intent with regard to the statute of limitations.

Commissioner Kavanagh requested that staff add language in Section 4.01.02 Above Moderate Income Households, D(3) to clarify that the Above Moderate Income Household tenants shall not be required to pay homeowner association dues.

Commissioner Shelor commented that it would seem that the replacement of smaller mobile units with larger units potentially would affect parking, energy, water use, creation of wastewater, etc. He noted that the City cannot mandate additional parking spaces. He suggested consideration with regard to whether the proposed Development Agreement could be modified to restrict only one-story residences.

City Attorney Tim Giles stated that currently the mobile home park is not limited to one-story residences, and that consideration of this type of restriction would need to be addressed with the applicant.

Commissioner Wallis commented that she believes that the project has been reviewed by the Planning Commission with the intent to ensure that there are some provisions in the proposed Development Agreement and other related documents that extend a greater level of protection to the residents who are mobile home tenants than the State provisions.

Chair Daniels commented that it would seem appropriate for the applicant, the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, and County Legal Counsel to conduct a meet and confer to find a resolution with regard to Condition of Approval #12 prior to the City Council review.

City Attorney Tim Giles clarified that City staff will participate in the meet and confer process between the applicant, the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, and County Counsel.

Richard Close, attorney representing the applicant, stated for clarification with regard to the letter from the Fire Department, dated December 11, 2008, that their issue with Condition of Approval #12 is not whether or not the park is safe, but whether or not this park, because of a change in the method of ownership, needs to upgrade their system legally to comply with the 2009 Uniform Fire Code, rather than to allow it to remain as is, which is in compliance with all State and local codes.

Commissioner Kavanagh commented that from her personal experience having been a mobile home owner, she can understand some of the concerns of the tenants. She stated that she would support the proposed project which would allow for tenants to own their mobile home space. She noted that when the mobile home park on Ward Memorial was converted, a lot of people who did not think they would be able to make a purchase were able to do so with financing options presented at that time.

Commissioner Shelor commented in his opinion that the proposed Development Agreement attempts to address many of the issues raised. He believes that it also

provides varying levels of protection for current residents above and beyond State requirements, and it represents a good faith effort by the City. He noted that these protections are provided to the resident and not to the residential site, thus they may not be long-term, and eventually all these residences will become market rate, and a source of low-income housing in the City will be permanently eliminated. Therefore, he believes it might be advisable for the City to plan for these eventual changes, incorporate the changes into RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) calculations, and be prepared to explore other methods of promoting and providing low income and workforce housing for its residents. He also stated that the proposed Development Agreement appears to set a precedent and may spur other mobile home parks in the City to begin the conversion process.

Chair Daniels commented that from the information presented he has a good understanding of the project and the perspectives of some of the tenants. He stated that he is comfortable with the many inclusions in the proposed Development Agreement. He suggested that the City Council review might find additional items that may be added to the proposed Development Agreement.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Vice Chair Solomon, to: 1) adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 09-01 entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta Recommending to the City Council Approval of Various Actions Related to the Rancho Mobile Home Park Project, Case No. 05-140-OA, -TM, -DP, 7465 Hollister Avenue"; 2) direct that the applicant and Santa County Fire Department meet with regard to Condition of Approval #12 prior to the City Council hearing; and 3) direct staff to be responsive to comments made by the members of the Planning Commission during this hearing and discussion.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following roll vote: Ayes: Chair Daniels; Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Kavanagh, Shelor, and Wallis.

RECESS HELD FROM 8:55 P.M. TO 9:00 P.M.

C-2. 08-171-APP: Vandeman Appeal of the Design Review Board Preliminary Approval of 08-090-DRB, a Single Family Dwelling Remodel, located at 7837 Langlo Ranch Road; APN 079-600-030.

Recommendation:

A. Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 08-__ (Attachment 1), entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Recommending to the Goleta City Council Denying Appeal 08-171-APP of Design Review Board Approval of 08-090-DRB for 7837 Langlo Ranch Road".

Site Visits and Ex-parte Conversations: Chair Daniels, Vice Chair Solomon, Commissioner Kavanagh, Commissioner Shelor and Commissioner Wallis reported site visits.

Documents: 1) E-mail from William Campbell, dated January 9, 2009, urging that the request for an additional bathroom and garage extension be denied; 2) Letter from Bernie Schaeffer, dated November 18, 2008, in opposition to the proposed home expansion; and 3) Cover sheet with six letters of opposition to 08-090-DRB presented to the DRB before approval (submitted by the appellant).

Staff Speakers:

Planning Technician Brian Hiefield

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase

City Attorney Tim Giles

The staff report and PowerPoint were presented by Planning Technician Brian Hiefield. He stated that he did not find any zoning violations with regard to the property during his investigation of the project.

Gary Vandeman, appellant, presenting a drawing showing two rectangles next to the lot line which are noted as "parking spaces" that would need to be built and maintained if approved with the proposed project. He expressed concern that the parking spaces would be used as storage pads for items that would possibly include cars or trailers, and requested that the item be referred back to the DRB to remove the "parking spaces". He believes that the need for a bathroom can be provided without the partial garage conversion. He has provided two examples of alternatives and believes an architect and contractor could provide other alternatives. He expressed concern that in today's climate there is approximately a one hundred percent likelihood of a full garage conversion that would become an unpermitted unit. He believes that a seventh bedroom, or a second living unit in the house, are not warranted. He also believes it is a bad precedent to allow a garage conversion without a compelling hardship case, noting that in this case the partial garage conversion is a preferred choice. He presented a packet with of six letters in opposition to the proposed home expansion that were presented to the DRB before the approval. He stated that the nearby neighbors expressed concern that the building is too big and did not want additional space added.

Lawrence Thompson, agent representing the applicant, stated that the proposed plans are the best solution that the applicant could choose to fill the family's need. He stated that the proposed parking spaces are an offer from the applicant to provide for off-street parking to address concerns of the neighbors, and there are no plans to use the spaces for storage. He stated that the concern expressed by the appellant that the garage would be used as an unpermitted unit is speculation. He noted that the size of the addition has been reduced, having been through a lengthy DRB process, and that the proposed project is a design project to address simple, basic needs.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED AT 9:40 P.M.

Speakers:

Stew Baker, neighbor, neighbor, stated that his house directly looks at the applicant's house which he believes is an eyesore. He expressed concern that there has been a

minimum of fifteen cars in front of the house and inoperable automobiles on the property. He noted that there have been excessive renters on the property. He also expressed concern that if the project were approved the conditions on the site would become worse.

Bernie Schaeffer, neighbor on Langlo Ranch Road, spoke in support of the appeal, stating that he shares concerns regarding this home which has been expanded several times in the past. He stated that he was surprised that the DRB approved the current proposed project considering there was opposition from the neighbors and the project exceeds the maximum allowable floor ratio guidelines for this property. He stated that he opposes any changes in the home, but on the other hand, he understands the handicapped needs that have been expressed, and requested that any impacts on the neighborhood be minimized.

Louise Keeler, Goleta, neighbor on Wagon Wheel Drive, stated urged that the request be denied to increase the floor space of this house which has been previously remodeled twice and currently exceeds the maximum allowable floor area ratio guidelines. She believes that the house is currently too large for the neighborhood and would be more excessive if the additional floor space were allowed. She believes the approval of the request would set an unwanted precedent. She requested that any remodeled home in the City be compatible with nearby homes and maintain the neighborhood character.

Kris O'Leary-Hayes, stated that she does not believe that the proposed project meets some of the DRB Findings, including neighborhood compatibility and enhancement of the appearance of the neighborhood. She expressed concern that there have consistently been twelve vehicles associated with the property. She suggested that an option would be to consider making the extra bathroom handicapped accessible rather than adding a bathroom conversion in the garage which may have the potential to be an unpermitted unit in the future.

Thomas Smith, DRB Vice Chair, represented the DRB regarding review of the project and the DRB action granting Preliminary Approval. He stated that the approval was granted with the idea that the need for a handicapped bathroom for a family member would be met and that the garage would become a garage with parking to be provided on the side to alleviate some of the problems expressed by the neighbors. He stated that the DRB believed the action was in the best interests within the guidelines. He clarified that the DRB believed that locating the handicapped bathroom in the garage was the only choice without drastically redoing the interior of the house, and not the preferred choice.

In rebuttal, Lawrence Thompson, agent for the applicant, stated that the comments made by the DRB representative cover the situation. He suggested that consideration needs to be given in situations when a house currently exceeds the maximum allowable floor area ratio guidelines that would recognize that a small addition would be appropriate if justified during discretionary review.

Gary Vandeman, appellant, requested that the proposed project be returned to the DRB to confine the remodel within the envelope. He provided two options to meet the

bathroom needs that would eliminate the added garage space and the bathroom in the garage.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Commissioner Shelor to continue the Planning Commission meeting after 10:00 p.m.

VOTE: Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 10:03 P.M.

Commissioner Wallis commented that she is concerned regarding neighborhood compatibility because the neighbors have presented letters in opposition to the project and that no letters of support were received.

Commissioner Solomon commented that she believes that the neighbors need to be considered when making decisions with regard to neighborhood compatibility. She requested that ideas be included intact with the proposed project with regard to moving cars off of the street to address neighbors' concerns in the interest of neighborhood compatibility.

Commissioner Kavanagh commented that she has concerns with regard to situations when a project currently exceeds the maximum allowable floor area ratio guidelines.

Commissioner Shelor suggested that the proposed project be returned to the DRB for further exploration to determine whether there are other alternative locations within the envelope to meet the bathroom needs.

Chair Daniels commented that with the proposed addition to the property, the handicapped needs would be met and there will be room for a two-car garage and a parking space for another car in the rear yard setback. He suggested consideration of adding a Notice To Property Owner that would address the concern with regard to the potential for an unpermitted unit. He suggested that there may be a way to reconfigure the proposed design so that there is no communication with the garage into the washer/dryer, bathroom area.

Commissioner Wallis suggested that the applicant be directed to work with staff and the DRB representative to consider relocating the handicapped bathroom outside of the garage. She requested that consideration be given to whether some space from an existing room could be donated towards the bathroom.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallis moved/seconded by Vice Chair Solomon that: 1) the Planning Commission shall retain jurisdiction of the project; 2) the applicant shall be directed to work with staff, and coordinate with the DRB representative, to consider relocation of the handicapped bathroom outside of the garage; and 3) the item shall be continued to March 9, 2009.

VOTE: Motion carried by the following voice vote. Ayes: Vice Chair Solomon; Commissioners Kavanagh, Shelor, and Wallis; Noes: Chair Daniels.

C. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller reported: 1) On December 16, 2008, the City Council affirmed that the Planning Commission may hold up to two regular meetings per month, to be held on the second and fourth Mondays. 2) The City Council approved the request for the Planning Commission to conduct Conceptual review of applications that are mainly major discretionary projects. 3) The Planners Institute will be held on March 25-27, 2009, in Anaheim.

Director of Planning and Environmental Services Steve Chase reported that a Status Update on the General Plan Amendment Work Program will be presented to the City Council on January 20, 2009.

D. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

No comments.

E. ADJOURNMENT: 10:35 P.M.

Prepared by Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

GOLETA PLANNING COMMISSION