

**CASTRO VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**Draft Minutes for August 28, 2006**  
(To be approved)

**A. CALL TO ORDER:** The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Council members present: Dean Nielsen, Chair; Ineda Adesanya, Vice Chair. Council members: Jeff Moore, Andy Frank and Cheryl Miraglia. Council member excused: Carol Sugimura. Staff present: Steve Buckley, Shahreen Basunia, Bob Swanson and Maria Elena Marquez. There were approximately 10 people in the audience.

**B. Approval of Minutes August 14, 2006.**

Ms. Miraglia made the following corrections: page 2, first paragraph, delete “have” in front of “most” in second to last sentence and insert have after “units”. Seventh paragraph, first sentence should read “Ms. Miraglia said that it is a different outlook when you “address” a problem by simply providing statistics from a study. Page 3, third paragraph, last sentence, should say: “frankly regardless of where the parking problems starts on the street, the issue is the problem exists.

Mr. Frank made the following correction: page 2, eight paragraph, concern overall design 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph light of reference

Ms. Miraglia approved the minutes of August 14, 2006 as corrected. Mr. Frank seconded. Motion carried 5/0/1 with Ms. Sugimura excused.

**C. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS – None.**

**D. Consent Calendar**

None.

**E. REGULAR CALENDAR**

**1. VARIANCE, V-12016 – ALEXANDRU TET** – Application to allow conversion of accessory structure into secondary unit with A) 1 foot rear yard set back where 20 feet are required, B) 2 feet – 8 inches side yard where 6 feet is required, C) 8 feet between structures where 10 feet is required, in a R-1-CSU-RV (Single Family Residence, Conditional Secondary Unit, Recreational Vehicle) District, located at 18787 Carlton Avenue, in the unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, bearing Assessor’s designation: 084B-0420-004-03

Ms. Basunia presented the staff report. She indicated that any care facilities would be subject to the R-1 regulations which requires a minimum 20 foot set back with all the requirements of the zoning for that area is also exempt. The applicant does have a 14 feet wide driveway and a planter 4 feet. If he paves the planter, there should be sufficient parking. However, staff has received several letters and

---

phone calls from neighbors that are concerned with this proposal and with the construction that has been going on in this property for a while. Two work stop orders were issued due to the fact that work was performed within the hobby shop and the garage without the benefit of any building permit. The applicant had provided work prior to obtaining a building permit. Documentation shows the expired application additional work done without permit.

Mr. Frank asked staff if there is a comment law... Ms. Basunia said that the applicant holds these are the only permits that were available in the Building Department file... Mr. Frank asked staff if everything expired.

Mr. Frank asked if the patio has been covered or if it is still open. Ms. Basunia said that it is closed. Mr. Frank also asked if the family room is that final. Ms. Basunia said yes, it was final in 1964. In regards to the two bedrooms are part Ms. Basunia indicated that the applicant provided information 2002 The family room was converted to two more bedrooms. Another smaller family room and office room,

Mr. Frank asked staff if everything in the main house is final. Ms. Basunia found six bedrooms there it was final for 4 bedrooms family room and ...building official state we don't have permits for 6 bedrooms. Frank what about detached garages? Basunia that was permitted he applied in 2005 has not been final and this is attach detached garage part of the permit. Frank detached garage was permitted? Basunia if it a secondary unit ventilation and Frank what about the main house? Basunia: they don't.

Mr. Moore said that the use issue was not in question? Ms. said Basunia yes. He asked if the use of the house is not impacted by the fact that there are 6 bedrooms. The use was approved for a 4 bedroom house. Non-permitted remodeling bring the use issue into play. Ms. Basunia said that it may due to health and safety issues because we don't know if part of the conversion was not done with building permits the use into question and that is something that the care facility department and also the Building and Planning Department will look at it.

Mr. Moore said that the only reason he is speculating is based on the documentation that he has seen there might be comments from the neighbors on the use issue. Ms. Basunia said that the use is not in question here, we are only looking at the variance application for the set backs and possibly for the parking. Mr. Moore asked if the facility can operate if this variance is denied if there is no secondary dwelling. Ms. Basunia said yes, it can operate provided it has the proper license and permits.

Mr. Frank said that often times when you retain a variance, the Council has discretionary power to bring

Ms. Adesanya asked for a secondary unit definition and a secondary unit single family dwelling and if can you have a secondary unit. Ms. Basunia said it would be secondary 6 beds are ....According to State regulations, that could be treated as single family residence.

Alexandru Tet, applicant, stated that he submitted an application for transforming the house, which is an assisted living facility. Because of limited space 6 rooms that requires license. The other house will be used by his son. He has crisis of space to have six rooms, now he has 2-3 residents. He is trying to fix that by requesting a permit to add one room and one new garage. By the time he was working on that, an inspector came and told him he could not link this together. He got a permit for the front, the roofing, the walls, the stucco, everything. He reframed everything. Now he has a permit for the detached garage and the shop. When he has more residents and caregivers, he will not have enough room to live in. He asked for conversion of that one bedroom. He was told that there is a possibility for a conditional secondary unit. He didn't know about the 20 feet from the street. He has 3 by 5 parking lots in the front. Another 4 feet on that side, project he applied for 18 feet wide in front of the garage, it means that it is going to be 2 cars in the front. finish according to the plan that he applied from at the beginning two parking lots and one in the attached garage. He met some of the requirements but not all of them. He is decided and determined to make it right trying to make it legally because he does not want to have problems in the future.

Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Tet to clarify if his son lives in the house. Mr. Tet said that his son is coming from Los Angeles with 3 kids. He has to move somewhere. 6 beds were approved. Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Tet if the license required that he has 6 beds. Mr. Tet said that that is the minimum.

Mr. Miraglia asked Mr. Tet for the name of the care facility. Mr. Tet said the name is Elim Assisted Living. Ms. Miraglia asked Mr. Tet why 6 beds and why the care givers live there.

Mr. Frank said that the use is not in question. Conversion is the matter in question and if the state requires 6 beds or less to have a care provider 24 hours in the property. Mr. Tet said yes.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Tet if he has talked with his neighbors and if they have had meetings or discussions. Mr. Tet said that they didn't say anything. Mr. Tet said that he was surprised that report was not good. Mr. Moore asked what was staff's recommendation. Ms. Basunia said that staff recommends denial.

Public testimony was called for.

Leigh Kimmelman, resident at 18847 Carlton Avenue, stated that when the work stop order was issued he saw a lot of work like roofing, siding, light inside doing work. Basically, the structure is a house it is not a garage, planned for it, it looks fully functioning. Great work has been done on this property, the vast majority without permits, without approval of the County and outside mandated zoning ordinances. This apply to both the main and secondary unit, permits and zoning ordinances apply to everyone, any exception to this needs to be done in writing

---

before the work is done not after. Mr. Tet has submitted an application to do a conversion and right now it has never been designated and approved as hobby shop. This really is not a conversion, the work has been done and it is already there. If he had pursued these permits they would have been denied through the local ordinances. Now he is asking the Council special permission because he sidestepped procedures and knowingly built an illegal structure. Approving Mr. Tet application set a very dangerous example. He asked if there will be legal consequences for Mr. Tet.

Ms. Basunia said that the applicant has paid double building permit fees, fines, Code Enforcement will have an abatement meeting and will ask Mr. Tet to tear down structures not permitted.

Sharron Bowen, resident at 18765 Carlton Avenue since September 1974. Mr. Tet bought the property in December 2002. She submitted a packet of correspondence to each council member which documents Mr. Tet's disregard for rules and regulations regarding building and construction. The subject property has been under continuous construction during the last 4 years. A copy of this packet was entered into the record. In conclusion, she would like to add that construction continues, construction noise rules are always violated, the work is done Monday through Saturday until very late at night. Mr. Tet has not played by the rules.

Vincent Villalobos, resident at 18785 Carlton Avenue, stated that when Mr. Tet first met his family he told them that he purchased the property for his son. This was the beginning of a long line of exceptions for the county of Alameda, for a community care license, this was almost four years ago. Since then, the residents of Carlton Avenue have noted and reported several instances of concern. Copies of two different letters sent to the Board of Supervisors in 2003 were entered into the record. Nearly three years have passed since that time and many of his initial concerns have not been addressed. Clearly, Mr. Tet and his family have a history of doing whatever they want with disregard of authority. It is the residents' hope that this council sets an example within your power to prevent Mr. Tet to proceed with the construction outside legal balance and granting him approval of the proposed variance. Mr. Villalobos requested the Council to deny this application.

Michael and Michelle Evans, residents at 18765 Carlton Avenue, stated that according to the staff report, this is a huge deviation from local encroaching a little bit is OK, but when he purchased the property there was a little shop in the corner in the back of the property but now he has built a new garage in front of that and wants to convert that to living quarters. He ran the utilities before he put the garage in the front. As far as his business needs go, it is unfortunate that the facility can not be big enough caregivers. His website advertises for independent living unit for somebody not for caregivers. He seems to get permits after he gets the stop work orders. There is limited parking in this area. Potentially there can be 8 or 10 people living in this complex, associated with service vehicle, visitors, employees. It is not a street, it is a driveway.

Lynn Gipe, resident at 18790 Carlton Avenue, stated that when the Tets moved in they cleared out the property, they bought the main house. The state allows six clients, it has been quiet, they are old people. The building in question has been there for 50 years, he is encroaching his own house which is next to it. As far as parking, he has half an acre of land, plenty of space. There has been construction in the wee hours of the morning but that has ceased because he stopped working.

Ms. Adesanya asked Ms. Gipe if she was affiliated with the facility. She said no. Ms. Adesanya asked Ms. Gipe if the building in question is a secondary unit and if she remembered when the building got larger. Ms. Gipe said that she lives across from the main house. The building has always been there, caregivers live there because there has to be somebody at night. She supports the project.

Glenda Villalobos, resident at 18785 Carlton Avenue, stated that the buildings in question the ones that were there, were totally demolished. New buildings were built. She knew from former owner that the buildings were torn down and rebuilt. They are not the original structures.

Public testimony was closed.

Ms. Adesanya asked Sharron Bowen about the pictures that she submitted. Ms. Bowen said that she is the actual source. Without permits being issued and there actually covered in and buried in by the time the permit was issued.

Samuel Tet, applicant's son, stated that he used to live in the property. Most of the work was done with permits, all of the lines including plumbing and electrical was done under permits to build a hobby shop. It was not done illegally. Besides to use the existing line which would have been used to build a hobby shop, they wanted to change use of shop to something else, they decided the fact that lines were laid in with the intent to build a hobby shop. Their intentions was not to deceive.

Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Tet if the original building in the back of the property was totally torn down. Mr. Tet said yes. Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Tet how many rooms in the hobby shop. Mr. Tet said that the idea of the kitchen and the idea of creating a dwelling space was added later. The original plan was to build a shop area, with a closed area, ancillary rooms with the garage in front. Mr. Nielsen asked staff if the original description was that the permit was or after that and if the hobby shop was torn down and rebuilt. Ms. Basunia said yes.

Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Tet if there is any construction remaining to be done in the event this is approved. Mr. Tet said they are waiting approval for the hobby shop idea. In the meantime, they thought why not change idea and apply for a conditional use permit so a person can live there. The way it is right now nothing needs to be changed. It was built to the best of their abilities according to the

---

plans. Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Tet if there is gas and electrical installation. Mr. Tet said that originally there was a bathroom there with gas and electric for bathroom and boiler, the only thing that needs to be done is to take the gas and electric from that bathroom and also extend to the kitchen. All utilities for the original bathroom for use as a hobby shop is there already.

Richard Villalobos, resident at 18785 Carlton Avenue, stated that when Mr. Tet built that hobby shop he put a leaded glass door in the side, you don't do that for a hobby shop.

Public testimony was closed.

Alex Tet said that neighbors are confused about the permits, he has all the permits. Ms. Basunia didn't see them until this morning, This building and all the structures are done by permits and can function as a hobby shop, closet and one half bedroom and garage, we can do nothing just having that room as one bedroom , perform some work for kitchen. Two dimensions one is set back on the side, that building was there for 50 years. He asked before for remodeling 100% of the back shop, roofing, stucco, electrical, drywall.

Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Tet if he had permits in 2003. Mr. Tet said stop doing something structure was for retaining wall two retaining walls, he is not 100% correct but he is determined to make no more mistakes from now on.

Mr. Moore said that maybe the permit issue is a secondary use issue is granted technical issue bigger issue whether or not ...focus on issue of variance findings Ms. Basunia said that staff has not findings to approve a variance, what is the special circumstance looking at the wrong side to grant this secondary unit, it is an accessory structure.

Mr. Nielsen asked staff if a lot line adjustments be made on the other properties in order to assist in the finding. Ms. Basunia said yes, he does have a concurrent application for a subdivision, and is doing a lot line adjustment.

Ms. Miraglia said that if the Council denies the variance today, possibly an accessory structure would have, would not have bedrooms. Ms. Basunia said that the zoning ordinance does allow...that would be allowed, the rest the kitchen items will have to be taken out. (Sharheen, please check this Thanks).

**Mr. Frank made a motion to deny Variance, V-12016. Ms. Miraglia seconded. Motion carried 5/0/1 with Ms. Sugimura excused.**

- 
2. **VARIANCE, V-11978 and SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, S-2051 – HERNANDEZ** - Petition to allow the conversion of an existing attached one car garage to living space and provision of two uncovered spaces in the rear, in the R-1-CSU-RV, (Single Family Residential, Conditional Secondary Unit, Recreational Vehicle Parking Restrictions) District, located at 4421 Alma Avenue, south side, 770 feet west of Brickell Way, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor's Parcel Number: 084C-0820-014-00.

Mr. Buckley presented the staff report. He stated that the proposal is to convert the one car garage to a master bedroom and bath with interior access and eliminate the existing parking space. The County has an ordinance for garage conversions, process for approving garage conversion, because of the 7 findings, not many garage conversions. The first finding is that there is no other alternative this was formulated by the Ordinance Committee and the Board of Supervisors needs to assure preservation specially one car garages prevent overflow parking on the street. That was the intent, because of that is there justification. However, we still need to make specific findings staff basically concluded that the design and the frequent of the project is feasible however we special circumstances on the property as variance we find in this The Planning Department has several applications pending like this one, ordinance language, clean up In the mean time, the applicant is very interested in pursuing...it is a matter of no alternative site for addition, so as this site is currently developed as an accessory structure. Mr. Buckley said that staff recommends denial.

Mr. Frank told Mr. Buckley that he mentioned 7 requirements. Mr. Buckley said that the other six replacement of the parking on site, so this project has that, that is feasible internal connection main residence. Mr Frank just one matter in question. Buckley site currently developed as an accessory structure. Mr. Buckley said that staff recommends denial of the variance.

Mr. Nielsen asked if the applicant is making a concrete pad for the parking area. Mr. Buckley said that it can be all weather surface. One of the conditions of approval is that paved both for the driveway and the parking pad and the exiting driveway

Ms. Adesanya asked if the existing lot rear have access and what does is serve. Mr. Buckley said that it serves the rear of this property. He said that the second page of the staff report has photographs, gravel access driveway you can see rear of property only serves

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Buckley what was the use of the one story auxiliary structure and asked if it was a dwelling unit. Mr. Buckley said he did not believe so. Mr. Moore said that this property was recently subdivided, the subdivision issue came up, one of the comments was that an auxiliary structure be removed to provide better lay out if this occur, one of the comments was that it should not be

---

a dwelling unit. Mr. Buckley said that the conclusion is we are not sure whether is being used that way.

Ms. Adesanya asked if the veranda is the attached porch.

Ralph Edward Pettit, owner of the subject property, said that with regards to the definition in the first section of the seven requirements, no other conforming space. He said council members to notice on the existing building structure in the area where you can build on to that structure, a conforming square footage for a second bathroom and a fourth bedroom. Also, going up on the second floor foundation would not support a second floor without a lot of investment. According to the project to get the structure integrity to go to the second floor, looking at the set backs everything is where is supposed to be, the two areas off to the back each side of the veranda, going through the kitchen or through the garage to get to a fourth bedroom and bathroom, on the southeast side of the building next to the enclosed veranda where he was going to put a deck and a jacuzzi, that is only 11.5 feet with a tree that he would like to keep, so he has to remove that tree 11.5 feet would be off the back of the existing master bedroom which is 14 feet wide at that point, so it defeats the purpose on the floor plan to try to put an extra bedroom and a second bathroom in the dwelling. He has no other alternatives. There is no other conforming building space for the fourth bedroom and a second bathroom.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony submitted.

Mr. Moore said that a test series of rules aggressively difficult, item 1 where it says: "any other alternative", he said that the easy way to solve the problem is to give Mr. Pettit what he wants and convert his auxiliary structure into a garage , one car garage is in the back, he has his lay out the way it was and that would be a way to have a covered garage.

Mr. Frank said that the intent language of that clause, that is the problem, there are ways to go about and make it right , has to be modified, he would suggest to go ahead with the variance, we learned I thing prefer to try to correct .

Ms. Miraglia said that the language was put there for a reason. She is a member of the Ordinance Review Committee and they spend a great amount of time, is not by chance that they that there need to be any other space for them to add not only with a lot of time spent between the Planning staff and the Review Committee but it also went to the bodies to review the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors. Her question was if there is any other space on that property that Mr. Pettit can put a master bedroom.

Mr. Moore said that from the applicant's standpoint, money is an issue here and he has no objection if Mr. Pettit puts a garage in the back, there is plenty of room in the back to go ahead and build a garage or to convert one story structure that he

---

thinks is not used as dwelling unit, and give him what he wants, he likes the floor plans, he should enjoy the use of his house, it is such a new ordinance and is there for a reason really reviewed by a lot of people. Mr. Pettit has several options here.

Ms. Adesanya told Mr. Buckley that in his explanation he talked about the intent in regards to the first criteria, particularly covered garages, her question is if staff feels that the intent of the criteria # 1 could be met if Mr. Pettit replaces with a covered structure or an enclosed garage versus this car port and also if he could read that one criteria.

Mr. Buckley said that the intent includes a whole list of findings in terms of storage, street parking and preservation, the intent could be met by the other six, but the first one is in even necessary question about the garage conversion just leave it alone, there is a garage to have storage, have parking,

Ms. Adesanya

Ms. Miraglia said that if this application included a double car garage as part of the application and then convert it in her opinion...still finding.

Mr. Nielsen said that there is no question that behind the garage and the rear kitchen he can put a master bedroom and that would solve the master bedroom question. The intent of the ordinance was to look at improvements of properties, he agrees with Ms. Miraglia if they put a two car garage...for the residents but also for the neighbors. His concern in doing this just like the condo conversion, we might as well He really has a problem with this. It is going to be Castro Valley master plan, somebody is going to ask for a PD. He said he can not support this.

Ms. Miraglia said that if Mr. Pettit is doing a single car garage because he would be moving the garage, he would be converting a room into a garage.

Mr. Frank asked Mr. Pettit if he considered putting the garage. Mr. Pettit said that he wanted to put a two cars garage but when he came to the Planning Department they said he might be able to avoid the variance issue if he just put slab on it. He wants to put the two car garage, he has a 15 passenger van and his garage is worthless, he can not put any trucks or vans or anything in the garage as it stands. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Pettit what was he thinking of wanting to put a two car garage. Mr. Pettit said that he actually wanted a 3 car garage, with the boat off the street, he does not park anything in the street. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Pettit if he would consider converting a part of the one story structure 20 feet driveway in front of the garage if he put it right there, 20 feet deep, if he makes it part of this one story structure. If he could make this a little bit bigger detached structure, no need for a variance

Mr. Frank told Mr. Pettit that he would like to see what he can work out.

---

Mr. Nielsen asked staff would that meet the criteria for the regulation. Mr. Buckley said yes, the idea Mr. Nielsen said that if the Council approve condition garage with gravel and the Council would leave the ordinance Mr. Buckley said that there can be no other conforming addition to the bedroom Mr. Nielsen said that they are not complying with the first part Mr. Buckley said that trying to restrict things...side effects

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Buckley if the wording is open for review ...after you process this one are you going to go back emergency amendment to clarify that. Mr. Buckley said that we have been debating the process, in terms of the Ordinance Review Committee. Mr. Moore said that the intent is never to say to go through a variance every time you want to convert a garage if you can divide an alternative design somewhere.

Ms. Miraglia said that we might need to add to "A" unless the garage can be located elsewhere on the property

Mr. Frank asked council members what was the function of this Council that require advisory arrangements to provide advise not the final say in a matter. The Council has the right to make recommendations to advise to correct the situations.

Ms. Miraglia said that if that is the case, if Mr. Pettit was agreeable to continue the item, the Council can make a recommendation and see if that could be changed.

Mr. Pettit said that he would be more than happy to go along with the Council's recommendation.

Nielsen in case of future consideration based on

Mr. Moore offered an alternative to Mr. Pettit if he was to continue it, modify the design, come back with a design for at least one car garage on the side, the Council can then grant a variance for the design while is going through the Ordinance Committee.

Mr. Nielsen said that if the Council continues it and give the Ordinance Committee a chance to modify the language, then come back with an approved project, the Council will not have waiting to go to the same process.

Ms. Miraglia said that it is not only the Ordinance Review Committee, the Council should make a recommendation do and then the Planning Director can do whatever he needs to do, it will go to the Board of Supervisors. It does not have thoroughly to go back to the Ordinance Review Committee.

Mr. Buckley said if we can get a few people

Ms. Miraglia clarified what she said was that unless the garage can be located elsewhere on the site and use that unless It does not make sense to not allowing if the garage can be located elsewhere but she thinks that A is very important.

---

Mr. Moore said just to move Mr. Pettit forward, he can come back with a satisfactory design for at least one car just to replace car garage to replace what he has, could the Council consider granting a variance.

Mr. Frank said the Council can make a motion with the members advise.

Mr. Nielsen said he is concerned about the language. Ms. Miraglia said to just add to A: “unless fully conforming garage space can be located elsewhere on the property”.

Mr. Buckley said that the reason he included D through G is because E addresses that conforming on-site replacement according to zoning language.

Ms. Adesanya said they would allow for non-garage, they would allow the parking spaces as opposed to  
Ms. Miraglia added: “Unless equivalent fully conforming garage space can be provided elsewhere on the site”.

Mr. Frank said that from the Brown Act, the Council can not recommendation on that, the Council can put it on the next committee hearing, we can condition approval based on this specific situation and

Mr. Moore said the Council can not do that, the council can not change the Ordinance, the Council can either continue it, vote in favor or against it. If Mr. Pettit is going to offer an equivalent design, there is no design. The Council can not approve something that it has not seen. The best thing is for Mr. Pettit to come back in two weeks.

Ms. Miraglia said that if Mr. Pettit comes back and the finding has not been changed by the Board of Supervisors, she will not vote for it.

Mr. Buckley said that we can not recommend approval because the ordinance has not been changed. It can be on the agenda for the Ordinance revision and take that.

Ms. Nielsen said that the item will be continued in a couple of weeks. Mr. Buckley said that we can bring back the Ordinance in a couple of weeks. The issue is going to be conforming in terms of set backs and veranda.

Mr. Frank said that what we need to do after we make a recommendation, based on our findings at that time Board of Supervisors and

Ms. Adesanya recommended Mr. Pettit to work with staff to make sure that he comes back with a solution that does not need additional variances on rear yard set backs, distances from the household because that is going to set a precedent situation.

---

**3. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, S-2076 – HUDSON** – Application to allow building façade improvements on one parcel containing approximately 0.69 acres, in the “CVCBD-SUB-7” (Castro Valley Central Business District, Sub-Area 7) District, at 3170 Castro Valley Boulevard, north side, approximately 330 feet east of San Miguel Avenue, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing County Assessor’s Parcel Number: 084A-0112-013-00. **(Continued to September 25, 2006).**

**F. Open Forum – None.**

**G. Chair’s Report – None.**

**H. Committee Reports**

- **Eden Area Alcohol Policy Committee**
- **Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee –.**
- **Castro Valley Parkland Committee**

Mr. Nielsen said that the Castro Valley Park Committee has asked that individual members of the MAC would endorse the bond issue.

- **Ordinance Review Committee**

Ms. Miraglia said the committee met and discussed the canopy ordinance. She will send a copy to council members.

**I. Staff Announcements, Comments and Reports –**

Mr. Swanson said that the Farmers Market has leveled off as the type of market for Castro Valley. They had a good turn out last week. It will sustain the market.

**J. Council Announcements, Comments and Reports**

**K. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

**Next Hearing Date: September 11, 2006**