

CASTRO VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes for January 23, 2006

(Approved as amended on February 27, 2006)

A. CALL TO ORDER: The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Council members present: Dean Nielsen, Chair. Council members: Andy Frank, Carol Sugimura, Karla Goodbody and Ineda Adesanya. Council members excused: Jeff Moore and Cheryl Miraglia. Staff present: Steve Buckley, Jana Beatty, Bob Swanson and Maria Elena Marquez. There were approximately 30 people in the audience.

B. Approval of Minutes of January 9, 2006.
There were no minutes available.

C. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Mr. Nielsen announced that there will be a special meeting on Monday, January 30th, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. at the Castro Valley High School Cafeteria, sponsored by Supervisor Miley, County staff, HARD and EBMUD, to discuss park land for Castro Valley.

D. Consent Calendar

The purpose of the Consent Calendar is to group routine items that may be approved by one motion, unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from a member of the Council or a member of the public. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed and considered separately before Regular Calendar items on the agenda.

E. Regular Calendar

1. Overview of the Redevelopment Strategic Plan Update – Eileen Dalton

Eileen Dalton, Redevelopment Agency Director, gave a brief update on the Castro Valley Strategic Plan. For those interested, there will be a meeting on Wednesday, February 8, 2006, from 7 to 9 p.m. at Eden Medical Center. They are culminating a year and a half planning effort for strategic vision of the retail corridor. It has been a long but interesting process and they are near the end. The purpose of the Castro Valley Strategic Plan was to create a strategy for retail enhancements primarily on Castro Valley Boulevard, what we call down town Castro Valley. Physical improvements along the boulevard and those efforts have culminated in the preparation of a plan and the paper document which is not finalized. It includes not only some retail strategies to improve the business district but also a street master plan to beautify the boulevard. Through their retail analysis, they found that there is a lot of retail in Castro Valley. They found that Castro Valley can support another 15,000 square

feet of retail like general merchandise, specialty grocery, restaurants, home furnishing, book stores, etc. The goal of the plan was not just to include new retail but help the existing businesses which are strong and vibrant in this area. What they did with the urban design team, their Castro Valley Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee, they basically came up with areas that would have the most potential for success for the retail in downtown Castro Valley. Those areas are around the Castro Village Shopping Center. The second area is where the new library will be located. There is a lot of potential for development around the new library. The third area is around the existing Chabot cinema; they feel it could be a good anchor for retail in downtown. There are obviously more areas, but they thought those are the ones with most potential down town. Another big part of this effort is looking at C.V. Blvd. streetscape. They know from all the community meetings, that there is a lot of traffic along the boulevard. The streetscape strategy tried to address that. It was a real challenge for the advisory committee and the consultants to come out with a plan that can work now and also that can be flexible for the future. They came up with a really beautiful plan that has wider sidewalks, improved intersections, trees, lighting and all of the beautiful amenities you see in a downtown district. On street parking will be part of this plan. The number one priority for the community and the committee was to focus investment under new retail in and around the Castro Village Shopping Center. Redevelopment is relying on cooperation with property owners and businesses and opportunities as they arrive for timing implementation. There are a couple of items that the MAC should consider as they move forward: the strategic plan and the funding plan. Redevelopment understands the complexities there. Redevelopment is also looking very strongly at parking, lack of it and right location. Redevelopment Agency is pushing for shared parking because there are so many businesses that have common parking areas in the back of their lots that can be shared. They are moving forward evaluating shared parking. They will be working with the Planning department in design guidelines and circulation impacts in Castro Valley, along with Public Works, and all of the various circulations improvements that will be happening in the community. Once the plan is approved, the Agency will be given funds to start investing in some of the projects.

2. **VARIANCE, V-11979 – TED POLYZOS** – Application to allow construction of a detached accessory structure (garage) to be located in the first half of the lot where otherwise not allowed, in an R-1-CSU-RV (Single Family Residence, Conditional Secondary Unit permitted, Recreational Vehicle) District, located at 18426 Pepper Street, east side, 225 feet north of Seven Hills Road, unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 084C-0840-010-01.

Ms. Beatty presented the staff report. She stated that it should be noted that several neighbors on the street are in support of this application. Staff included also conditions of approval. Staff recommends denial.

Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
Draft Minutes January 23, 2006

George Polyzos, representing his father, Ted Polyzos, who also owns the house. They are building two homes to the rear of this property. They have built many homes in this area and have many satisfied clients. One thing that they are trying to do is to alleviate parking on Pepper Street. They are considering the idea of building a garage or car port. In either case, they will need a variance. The levels of the property are uneven in many spots. The house sits 6 to 7 feet above a natural grade where they want to put the garage. To push the garage to the back part of the house, not only they will cut half of the back yard, they will have to remove two trees. The garage will sit 6 or 7 feet below the existing house which means space constraints there to create above a safe path to the house, or actually connect the garage to the house (which will not require a variance at all). They want to create a secure area for the residents of the home and also securing the vehicles. There was, at one point in time, a water storage tank where they were told the garage should go. They removed the tank because they found a lot of water in the tank. The tank is 5 or 6 feet below ground level. All that has been removed and back filled with the surrounding soil.

Public testimony was called for.

Bob Conklin, resident at 18425 Pepper Street, spoke for himself and representing four additional property owners, in support of this variance. Their concern is parking on Pepper Street, which is a private road; it is not a County road. It is only 23 feet wide the entire base of the road. If the contractor is not allowed to have a garage on his property, the people that live on the home will have to park on the street. By parking on the street, the thoroughfare of the street is reduced by 25% assuming that a car is 6 foot wide; if you park a truck, it is a higher percentage. He lives across from the property, and if someone has to park in front of his property, you cannot get through. The garbage truck could not get through that street because it is not wide enough. There is a highway road easement on the property allowing everybody who wishes to traverse Pepper Street, to go up and down that street. By reducing the amount of available thoroughfare on the street, you are encroaching on the easement basically. These are their basic reasons for requesting that some form of off street parking be allowed.

Lee Andersen, resident on Pepper Street since 1959, stated that there has been continuous increase of cars and uses of that road and if you go there, most of the day, every evening there are 2 or 3 cars on the street in front of every house. As a private street, they are supposed to keep this up and this is very expensive. She disagrees with having any more cars parked on that street. People turn on Seven Hills and they don't want to go down to the light, so they come off Pepper Street and make a detour. The County has tried to measure the amount of cars that go through that corner. She is concerned about what is going to happen in that street. Those people need to be responsible for resurfacing the road.

Public testimony was closed.

Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
Draft Minutes January 23, 2006

Ms. Adesanya indicated that the staff report and findings referred to the site as being able to sustain conforming development. The applicant described topographical changes that would make it difficult because of the location of the garage would be lower than the elevation of the home, thus making it difficult to attach. If that is the case, there is a chance of making the findings for this variance. She asked if there were photos available. The topography of the map is cut off in the graphics included in the staff report. Ms. Adesanya said that Ms. Goodbody had a chance to see the site. Ms. Goodbody said that the garage would be situated 5 or 6 feet below the home if approved as is. If that is the case, maybe there is physical raising justification.

Mr. Frank said that one of the reasons people live there is because it is pleasing to the eye and it is a nice place. Maintaining the aesthetic values, there is an argument for us to review the surrounding area. Ms. Goodbody said her concern was granting special privileges that would be consistent with the zoning ordinance. We wouldn't have grounds to grant simply because of the slope of the property and it would be physically feasible to attach it to the main structure.

Ms. Nielsen said that he has seen the site and there is a tremendous difference between the front of the property and the site next to the house. Aesthetics is very important to justify to grant a variance.

Ms. Adesanya asked about the condition of the existing patio, whether or not one portion or all of it will be removed, and if the applicant is willing to do that. Also, whether or not any potential ordinance that supports saving these trees will help make these findings. She does not object to what they want to do, but she cannot make the findings.

Ms. Adesanya asked if the Council could recommend approval without sufficient findings.

Ms. Beatty said that the BZA will be making that decision. Really there is no system to override the required variance findings. As far as saving the trees, the County does not have any ordinance or any mechanism for protecting trees on private property. Regarding the patio, if they were to attach it to the house in the rear of the lot, it looks like the patio would have to go.

Ms. Goodbody asked Mr. Polyzos how many cars are in the property and how many are utilized by the residents of the property. Mr. Polyzos said there are two cars. Mr. Polyzos stated the finished floor line of the house as opposed to what the finished floor of the garage would be. Mr. Nielsen said that the house is elevated anyway. Mr. Polyzos said that the finished floor of the garage would be approximately 6 feet, and the finished floor of the house would make it difficult to attach the structure. Mr. Nielsen said that the porch is elevated so it is the way the house is constructed.

Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Polyzos if he is the builder. Mr. Polyzos said yes. She asked him if it would be possible to attach in such a way where the stair led up to the house from the garage. He said that with such small structure, no and a car would not fit in the depth of the garage in that corner of the house where it is situated, by the kitchen.

Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Polyzos if stairs could come down from the deck around the house instead of stairs in the garage. Mr. Polyzos said that they have to go into the garage, 3 foot wide staircase coming into the garage, the depth of the garage would not allow a normal size vehicle to park in the garage. Mr. Nielsen said that as you come down the stairs to the ground level and use the same stairs at the end of the garage. Mr. Polyzos said you would not have the head room, on the finished floor you need 6 to 8 feet. If they can attach the garage to the house, there will be no need for a variance.

Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Nielsen if it has been discussed with the applicant different ways of attaching the structure to the home. She has seen, particularly in the rural area, homes with attached accessory structures; they are attached in different ways. Mr. Polyzos said that that type of home would not go there.

Ms. Goodbody moved to approve Variance, V-11979 with County recommendations. Ms. Sugimura seconded. Motion carried 3/1/1/2 with Council member Adesanya abstaining; Chair Nielsen opposing and Council members Moore and Miraglia excused.

3. **TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP, PM-8874 – LUCIANI** – Application to subdivide one parcel containing 0.34 acres into two lots, in a R-1-CSU-RV (Single Family Residence, Conditional Secondary Unit, Recreational Vehicle) District, located at 4518 Heyer Lane, north side, approximately 169 feet east of Schlosser Avenue, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's designation: 084C-0780-036-00. **(Continued to February 27, 2006)**
4. **TENTATIVE MAP, PARCEL MAP, PM-8849 – SABANIVIC** – Application to subdivide one parcel containing 24,568 square feet (0.56 acres) into three lots, the CVCBD, Sub 11 (Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, Sub Area 11) District, located on 21112 Tye Court, north side terminus, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel designation: 084A-0024-001-02.

Ms. Beatty presented the staff report. Staff analysis found that lot sizes in the area are consistent with the proposal. From the site plan, it appears that all set backs will be able to be met. These new lots to the rear would be accessed over an easement, and a portion of the existing home would be removed in order to avoid a variance.

Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
Draft Minutes January 23, 2006

Mr. Frank said there was a discussion about increasing that area to a higher zone use to allow for more density.

Ms. Beatty said that as far as she is aware, that was just a discussion that is still on the table.

Mr. Nielsen said that density in some areas has been increased, in this area has not been increased and it is not part of the Master Plan, but said that it has been discussed.

Zoran Milenkovic, from Belcan Engineers, representing the applicant, stated that the owner is proposing to subdivide the existing parcel with approximately 24,000 sq. ft. into 3 parcels ranging from 7600 sq. ft. to 8800 ft. Parcel one has an existing structure on it, with a single family home for most part proposed to remain except for that corner that is intruding into the proposed easement for parcels 2 and 3. The proposed parcels 2 and 3 are to be developed also. With this tentative parcel map, they tried to meet the code requirements with minimum lot widths. Also, you talked earlier in this meeting about variances, and he heard discussion that private roads can complicate traffic for neighbors. They also provided a visitors parking for each parcel hoping that there will not be any traffic issues. He personally drove around Castro Valley to see different projects so he is aware of that and he can see that it can be an inconvenience for neighbors. What we have here is a tentative parcel map that addresses the code requirements but also addresses future neighbors, the owners of parcels 2 and 3 concerns with other neighbors regarding the visitors parking.

Ms. Adesanya told Mr. Milenkovic that on the map he stated that the existing house structure proposed for removal, does that include the 10 foot side yard set back next to the road. Mr. Milenkovic said yes, the house, as shown in the front left portion of that house, sits completely within the set back corner, also sits into the easement parcel one is dedicating for this development. The owner has agreed to alter this existing residence; he does not know if he has a proposed design for it yet. What he has heard is that this tentative parcel map will impose as a requirement on this residence, the owner is willing to accept as a condition of improvement and he is willing to completely remove the portion of the building within the set back in order to honor the 10 foot set back without requesting any variances.

Mr. Nielsen asked if owner will entertain adding one or possibly 2 parking spaces to the inner lots. This project will remove one parking place and if the owners of the future homes have more than a couple of cars, it will pose a problem. Mr. Milenkovic said that with respect to the guest parking, with parcel 2 and parcel 3, the frontage of these two parcels will have only one visitor parking. He does not see this parking being functional.

Mr. Nielsen said that if additional parking spots would be a possibility, it would

Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
Draft Minutes January 23, 2006

be an advantage for the developer. It would enhance the project. Mr. Milenkovic asked Mr. Nielsen where does he propose the parking. The problem that he already sees is the fact that he is removing a significant portion of that existing building. He needs to find space elsewhere working with the design. Mr. Nielsen asked if he will consider that. Mr. Milenkovic said yes.

Public testimony was called for.

Christine Reis, resident at 21153 Tyee Court, stated that there was a petition they wanted to put 20 to 40 units in that area, and that was denied because the density was too much. The problem on Brandon Court is that those people park up and down on Koho; there is no parking right now because the people live up Koho and Brandon Place come down. If you do the same thing there on Tyee, every house has 3 to 4 cars. The problem is if they open a driveway, there are only 2 cars that can park. You cannot come in and make a U turn on weekends when everybody is there. Coming up on Norbridge, it is only one way out, so there is traffic, with people backing up and they almost hit cars because they cannot turn around. Two parcels would be more feasible. Another problem is that they have no sidewalks. That is a consideration. She is not opposed to 2 lots but does not support 3.

Nabil Wahbeh, resident at 21132 Tyee Court, stated that in 2002 he came before this Council to change the zoning so he could build more than one unit. The Council denied his application simply because the zoning does not allow to do that. He is surprised to see what staff went so far to study this without even checking the zoning. He said that it looks like the zoning developing plan has not been approved, basically is now zoned one unit residential. That is one of his concerns. If the Council grants this, it will have to allow everybody else. His recommendation is to have the whole area to build more than one unit. Also, parking is a problem. Visitors park on the street in front of the neighbors property, no cars parked in that curb area, they have garages, they have front porches, but there is no parking in that area.

Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Wahbeh which parcel did he own on Tyee Court. Mr. Wahbeh said 21132 Tyee. Mr. Nielsen asked if the zoning there is 5,000 sq. ft. Mr. Nielsen asked Ms. Beatty if the square feet is 5,000. Ms. Beatty said yes. Mr. Nielsen stated that this was not a rezoning application.

Public testimony was closed.

Ms. Adesanya said that she likes the idea of adding two more parking spaces on this court. She asked the applicant, Mr. Sabanivic, if he would be willing to add one or two additional guest parking spaces above and beyond the minimum required by the ordinance so guest and additional cars from this development would have more opportunity to park off the street. She sees an area that she thinks it is possible to do that at the rear lot.

Mr. Nielsen asked if it can be worked out, if he is willing to consider adding more parking. Mr. Sabanivic said yes.

Ms. Adesanya moved to approve Parcel Map, PM-8849 with the understanding that the applicant would see if is feasible to add one or two additional guest parking spaces on site, with the other Planning considerations. Ms. Goodbody seconded. Motion carried 4/1/2 with Mr. Frank dissenting; Mr. Moore and Ms. Miraglia excused.

5. **2214th ZONING UNIT – CAHILL** – Petition to reclassify one 27,412 sq. ft. (0.63 acre) parcel from the R-1-CSU-RV (Single Family Residence, Conditional Secondary Unit, Recreational Vehicle) Zoning District to a PD (Planned Development) Zoning District, allowing ten residential units (seven new and three existing), on a property located at 3629 Lorena Avenue, south side, 180 ft. east of Santa Maria Avenue, unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, designated County Assessor's Parcel Number: 084A-0075-004-00.

Mr. Buckley presented the staff report. Proposal to rezone property.

Mark Stoklosa, architect for the project and representing Graig Cahill, indicated that the project is located north side of Castro Valley Blvd. It is surrounded by predominantly multiple residential projects, with single family housing, west of the property. Currently on the site, there are 3 duplex units that will be modified to reflect the new development and a single family house that will remain as is and it will be rented as currently occupied by tenants. He is proposing 7 units, two story with garages, main floor, kitchen, dining, and 3 units of the same configuration with one bedroom design. The duplex with two units will be modified to reflect what he is doing with the new project. The entire development will need some work. There is one thing that he can not accomplish with the existing duplex and that is to install concrete terrace similar to the units behind, because of the nature of the existing structure which its design will not support heavier wall coverings. He has to move it as is or substitute it with some kind of lighter material.

Mr. Frank asked Mr. Stoklosa how many units are on the property. Mr. Stoklosa said two units, they could do that if they raise the duplex and a single family house and configure the whole site but he thinks they do not have the budget for that and also it would entail a much larger scope of work for the client. Mr. Stoklosa said that there is also another factor: they would like to maintain a single family frontage for the project. There is another house next to the existing single family home. They will have single family configuration at the street, and then behind those houses, they have two story buildings. It will be a good design.

Graig Cahill, stated that he is the property owner and lives at the property. There were originally two single family houses and a duplex. They divided the one

single family house. They have 8 apartment units within 10 feet of their property line. Essentially, about 75% of the dwellings are apartments or condominiums, and about 25% single family. They are more in line, looking at the property. They also made a satellite image where the property sits, and the multi units that surround their property. They are trying to stay in tune with the neighborhood. They also have a view of the project's existing houses. He mentioned some photographs of custom homes on Lake Chabot Road. He lives on the property and he will manage the property. What they are trying to do is to maintain the streetscape. The Planning Commission seems to be very much in favor of that, so they can keep what is existing. Basically, they want to make the duplex look similar to what they are doing in the back of the units. He also agrees with Mr. Frank that as he has lived in the property, he watches people carrying grocery sacks from Safeway and letters to the post office within walking distance. He thinks that is very important. Also, the fact of proximity to BART makes it very convenient location to have multiple units.

Ms. Sugimura asked if the existing structures are all single level. Mr. Cahill said yes, the two single houses and the duplex are single level and then heading east the single level apartments and then from there they go into two story apartments, town homes and condominiums like wise across the street the same occurs there. Walking around the property on Lorena, most of the existing apartments and condominiums have maintained a 10 foot set back on the property lines. They are proposing twice that, they are proposing 20 feet side yard set back, so they are trying to provide green space for what is existing and what they are trying to do. Eventually, they reduce the size of the units and they are providing a lot of parking.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony submitted.

Mr. Frank moved to approve Zoning Unit, ZU-2214, with the County recommendation. Ms. Goodbody seconded. Mr. Nielsen said that increasing the set backs will allow more yard space, complimented the owner and said that this is a good plan. Motion carried 5/0.

6. **PARCEL MAP, PM-8738 7&VARIANCE, V-11952 – TAM, TAM, YU & KUAN** – Application to allow a 18' wide driveway where 20' is the minimum and a 6' side yard setback where 10' is the minimum with subdivision of the site into 3 lots, in a R-1-CSU-RV (Single Family Residence, Conditional Secondary Unit, Recreational Vehicle) District, located at 18332 Carlton Avenue, east side 200 feet north of Dominic Drive, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's designation: 084B-0472-039-00.

Ms. Beatty presented the staff report. She stated that this project was heard in October 10, 2005 and after receiving public testimony and discussion, the Applicant agreed to continue the proposal in order to explore other options. MAC concerns were density and also justification for approving the variances. We also

had quite a bit of public testimony. The Applicant has submitted a revised plan. The sizes of the 3 parcels have been modified, the turnaround area has been relocated. They will not require a turn around area if the new homes are sprinkled.

Ms. Adesanya asked if the only change is the relocation of the turnaround/parking spaces. Ms. Beatty said that the lot sizes have been modified a little bit. Page 2 of the staff report indicates what lots have been modified.

Mr. Yev Philipovitch, project civil engineer representing the applicant, stated that the lot sizes were really not issues because they were properly sized. The big question was about the driveway going 18 feet versus 20 feet required and also the set back and the length of this driveway from the street to the end of the driveway is only about 160 feet. It really is not the type of driveway that will create congestion or problem. In fact, from the street to the first driveway is about 70 or 75 feet, that is the area where the set back is 6 feet. He personally has done a lot of these projects in Castro Valley and he does not see a problem with such a short driveway being an issue. Lot sizes are OK. The big issue was the driveway. The Fire Department does not require a turnaround, probably move the turnaround which was at the end of the driveway closer to the street, so the garbage trucks or emergency vehicles or somebody on the street by mistake has adequate turnaround space. He requested consideration from the Council for this project.

Mr. Nielsen asked if the 6 foot side set back would be along side the existing house. Mr. Philipovitch said yes. Mr. Nielsen asked if the existing house is only 6 feet from the property line. Mr. Philipovitch said yes, from the driveway. Mr. Nielsen asked if the owner will consider removing 4 feet of the house in order to eliminate the variance completely. The owner said he preferred not to cut the house. Mr. Philipovitch said that the width of the building on that area is about 28 feet so they are talking about 20 feet within 6 feet of the driveway. Mr. Nielsen said that if the condition of approval is to remove 4 feet without the variance, will you consider that. The applicant said that if he has to do it, he will.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony was submitted.

Mr. Frank made a motion that the Council eliminate the Variance, V-11952 and Tentative Map, PM-8738 with County considerations. Ms. Goodbody seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

7. **ZONING UNIT, ZU-2206, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP, TR-7592 – LANCAR DEVELOPMENT** – Petition to reclassify one parcel comprising approximately 31,115 square feet. (0.71 acres) from the R-S-D-20 (Suburban Residence, 2,000 sq. ft. minimum building site area per dwelling), to a PD (Planned Development) District, allowing subdivision into 10 parcels intended for single-family dwellings, located at 20345 Forest Avenue, west side, approximately 1,050 north of Castro Valley Boulevard, unincorporated Castro

Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
Draft Minutes January 23, 2006

Valley area of Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 084C-0724-083-00 & 084C-724-082-00 (**Continued from January 9, 2006**).

Mr. Buckley presented the staff report.

Nick Maggie and Allan Odell with Lancar Development, gave a quick description of the project. They are proposing to build 10 single family detached duets, which will be physically separated from the ground all the way up to the roof. They are going to do some stucco exterior with some stucco bending going around the decks, and pop outs to give some relief. Two of the units will be separate by themselves from the project. The lay out of the subdivision is two units facing Forest. They are trying to create a vision of the front, what you are going to see is a larger structure. These are 1800 plus square foot units. Sleeping areas will be on top, living area will be in the bottom. They are proposing two car garages, and they will have one guest parking spot for each unit. The back side of the subdivision is 20 foot rear set back. All the other rear yards will be from 15 to 18 foot rear yards. Mr. Odell said what they have done is comparable to other higher density projects in the area. They are not trying to put the maximum number of units. They try to create a pleasing, appealing environment. Also, there are other additional developments that are not shown on the graphic.

Public testimony was called for.

A person from the public asked if it will go out on Marshall or on Forest. Mr. Maggi said it will go out on Forest. Mr. Maggi said that ingress and egress is through Forest.

Douglas Berg, resident at 20397 Forest Avenue, said that this is a better way to go than apartments. He supports the project.

Elizabeth Berg, resident at 20397 Forest Avenue, stated that she sees a lot of development coming in. She was very dismayed with so many apartments that have been built. She is very excited about this development because it is a development where the people who own the houses will probably be living there. With ownership there is more responsibility to the neighborhood.

Judith Morrison, resident at 18768 E. Cavendish Drive, stated that her family has owned the property for 50 years. She said that she is unable to improve the property at this point. The property is in disrepair. It will be an enhancement to the neighborhood, sidewalks in Forest Avenue, because they really beautify the whole street. She has talked to property owners on the area across the street and agreed that it would be an enhancement and not be dramatic change to the density of the area.

Public testimony closed.

Mr. Frank moved to approve 2206th Zoning Unit and Tract Map, TR-7592 with Planning considerations. Ms. Sugimura seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

G. Chair's Report –

Mr. Nielsen informed that there will be a public hearing on Monday, January 30, 7:30 p.m., at the C.V. high school cafeteria regarding the new C.V. park.

H. Committee Reports – None.

I. Staff Announcements, Comments and Reports

Bob Swanson stated that there is confusion about the time that this hearing is going to start because there are two fliers with different times. Mr. Nielsen said that it will start at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Swanson said that there will be 7 microphones on stage and one microphone for the audience.

J. Council Announcements, Comments and Reports

Ms. Adesanya apologized for being absent in several past meetings, due to family reasons.

Ms. Beatty announced that this will be her last meeting for a while due to maternity leave. Steve Buckley will be the staff person in the mean time.

K. Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Next Hearing Date: Monday, February 27, 2006