

CASTRO VALLEY MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
Minutes for April 23, 2007
(Approved as corrected May 14, 2007)

- A. CALL TO ORDER:** The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. Council members present: Dean Nielsen, Chair; Ineda Adesanya, Vice Chair. Council members: Jeff Moore, Cheryl Miraglia, Carol Sugimura, Andy Frank and Dave Sadoff. Staff present: Tona Henninger, Andy Young, Bob Swanson and Maria Marquez. There were approximately 20 people in the audience.
- B. Approval of Minutes of April 9, 2007**
Ms. Sugimura submitted minor changes. Ms. Miraglia moved to approve the minutes of April 9, 2007 as corrected. Ms. Sugimura seconded. Motion carried 7/0.
- C. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS – None.**
- D. Consent Calendar – No items.**
- E. Regular Calendar**

Mr. Young indicated that Ms. Miraglia requested to pass information regarding the Community Protection Policy Store Size Cap Ordinance. He presented copies of the Ordinance to each council member.

- 1. Social Host Ordinance Proposal – Kevin Dowling, Supervisor Alice Lai-Bitker (Continued from April 9, 2007).**

Kevin Dowling stated that he was previously before this Council at the April 9, 2007 hearing. He summarized the contents of the Social Host Ordinance, which is to hold individuals responsible for underage drinking on properties that they own or lease or otherwise control. He indicated that state law has prohibitions in place, but do not regulate drinking on private property, a gap which this law would fill, with fines. He described events leading to the development of the Ordinance, primarily loud parties at private houses. He recounted that the Council had previously indicated two concerns with the Ordinance, such as adding drugs to the Ordinance. For this issue, he contacted Lt. Erik Gulseth, from the Sheriff's Department, who said that they would arrest anyone seen [at a party] using marijuana and that state law was adequate in that regard – including drugs in the proposed Ordinance would not fill a gap as exists at the present time under state law with regard to alcohol.

The other issue was why loud and unruly parties were used as a 'trigger'. Nancy Beth (?) from the County Counsel's office said that the Sheriff's Office needs probable cause, such as loud and unruly parties. Going into a quiet party could

lead to a legal challenge. He said he would welcome the support of the Council, and that it is scheduled for a Board Committee hearing in early May. The Chair asked if a recommendation was being requested; he replied that was correct. The Chair then asked the Council for comments, and then stated that he still had concerns that drugs were being excluded. Mr. Dowling replied that there are other laws that are in place and which are being applied to address drug use at parties. Mr. Frank said that there is methodology used by law enforcement personnel to determine when drugs are present.

Lt. Erik Gulseth, from the Sheriff's Department, said that the Ordinance is intended to apply to the party giver or the homeowner that is having a party where alcohol is served. The Sheriff's don't go to that many parties where it would be just drugs. The Chair indicated that the exclusion of drugs from the Ordinance just appeared to leave a gray area. Lt. Gulseth said that there are other statues that could be enforced. This is also aimed at parents that go away for the weekend and do not secure their liquor cabinets. In his opinion, the party ordinance is fine.

Ms. Sugimura asked Mr. Dowling if the Sheriff's Department went over the whole document. Mr. Dowling said yes.

The Chair asked if the public had any comment. No public testimony submitted.

Ms. Miraglia moved to endorse the Social Host Ordinance. Mr. Frank seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

2. **SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, S-2086 – RJAILE** - Application to allow construction of a new single family dwelling in a PD (Planned Development) District allowing R-1, Single Family Residence Uses, located at 4403 Recreation Road, southwest side, north west of Five Canyon Parkway, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 417-0300-002-00. **(Continued from March 12, 2007).**

Mr. Young presented the staff report, and indicated that the site was part of Tract Map 7225 that required Site Development Review for each parcel. Such a review had been approved for all eight residences in this subdivision under S-1890, but the design for this residence was substantially different from those plans, and that was the reason it was being reviewed by the MAC. The Tract Map requirements did not require the MAC to review the plans, but because the MAC had reviewed it previously, it was being continued to get a recommendation. He stated that the MAC reviewed this application on March 12, 2007 and the Council had various comments as to how the project could be improved aesthetically. In response, the architect has revised the building design and provided color elevations. Also, in response to the Hayward Fire Department concerns about location of the existing fire hydrant, the building plan was essentially flipped, with the driveway moved to the right-hand side of the site. Various other design enhancements have been provided. Mr. Young said, that based on prior conditions of the tract and the

planned development, that we would require to limit the amount of landscape area of tree removal in the back yard to no more than 500 square feet unless the applicant or the owner comes in with a plan to be approved up to 1100 square feet, that would preserve most amount of mature trees in the rear area.

Ms. Miraglia asked Mr. Young regarding the original plan that was proposed for this lot, what is the major difference between the foot print. Mr. Young said there were no changes to the footprint with the most recent changes, but there may have been some change since the original Site Development Review for this lot had a different configuration, and it may have been smaller.

Ms. Adesanya asked Mr. Young if this change to the originally approved site development review did not necessarily have to come back to the MAC, but that because it had come to the MAC, this hearing was essentially just to finish the process. She asked why would it not have come to the MAC necessarily if it was different. Mr. Young said that the change in policies in the last couple of years, we refer more Site Development Reviews to the MAC. Essentially, it says that only requires approval by the Planning Director.

Mr. Nielsen said that the Council requested that the option of whether the Council see it or not, has been tightened. If the Council feels that it is substantial enough, then the Council requests that it needs to come back.

Mr. Sadoff asked Mr. Young if the grading activities are going to be subject to best management practices given the proximity of surface waters. Mr. Young said that the Grading Department responded on this and they did ask for a site specific soils analysis. They would also need to do a preliminary grading plan. It was requested by the Grading section on the [response to the] referral. Mr. Sadoff asked Mr. Young if it will be subject to best management practices as per State guidelines. Mr. Young said yes, there are proposed conditions that address grading.

Mr. Rjaile, representing the applicant, stated that for the last couple of weeks he had been working closely with Mr. Young and some of the concerns have been addressed. He added that the color board shows a third color for the garage doors and the front door, but he just found out that Sherwin Williams does have a stain in the same palette [color scheme], so instead of painting the garage a solid color, it could be a natural wood stain, that would be similar to brown, as one option.

Ms. Miraglia said it was a great improvement, but asked why there are no windows on the sidewalls; it is a large area. This is what the neighbors are going to see on both sides. Mr. Rjaile said that because there are so many windows in the rear, he had to consider Title 24 for that. Too many windows were a concern to him. The Chair clarified that the extent of windows was limited to prevent heat loss, and continued, saying it was a great improvement.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony submitted.

Ms. Miraglia moved to approve Site Development Review, S-2086 with Planning staff recommendations. Ms. Adesanya seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

3. **SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, S-2107 – ZOU/HOANG** – Application to allow the remodel of an existing building to be used as a restaurant in the CVCBD, Sub-Area 3 (Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, Sub Area 3) located at 2688 Castro Valley Boulevard, north side, west of Lake Chabot Road, unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, designated Assessor's Parcel Number: 84A-0181-057-03 and 058-03. **(Continued from February 26, March 26, and April 9, 2007).**

Mr. Young presented various highlights in the staff report. The proposal would provide for landscape improvements along the frontage. However, it does not meet the criteria of the Castro Valley Boulevard Strategic Plan.

The Chair asked if the applicant had agreed to submit a landscape plan. Mr. Young confirmed that was correct, but that it would not provide the same level of improvements as proposed by the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Moore said that the site plan adjacent to the property line indicates that there is a gap between the property line and the back of the sidewalk. He asked if that was concrete or if it was a planter area. Mr. Young said he is not familiar with the site. Mr. Moore said that if it is a landscaped area, he would like to request that the applicant install that landscaping and maintain as part of their landscaping. Mark Woodburn, architect for the project, said that it is all concrete, just two sections.

Ms. Miraglia said that if Alameda County owns that property on the east side, along Lake Chabot Road, and we want to see it landscaped, she asked if it was not the owner's responsibility. Mr. Young said that is correct. Ms. Henninger said that the previous owner always took care of it. They can work with the County on landscaping it.

Mr. Moore asked if the Council can condition it and request that that be maintained.

Ms. Miraglia requested clarification about the difference between what is being proposed and the level of improvements required by the Strategic Plan. Mr. Young said he does not have that information. The Chair said they could request that it meet the Plan requirements, since we are already asking for improvements to the Alameda County property.

Mr. Moore asked about the landscape area where the existing condenser unit is shown, if it was concrete. Mr. Woodburn said it is asphalt. Mr. Moore said that it is such a prime corner, it was a good opportunity for a lot of landscaping on the side, because the new plant screening material would not mature for a while. Mr. Woodburn asked Mr. Hoang if he uses the condensing unit. Mr. Hoang said yes.

Ms. Miraglia asked what was proposed for this area (showing it in the map). Mr. Woodburn said that originally it was proposed for the garbage for the Chinese restaurant, but that was not going to work out, so it was moved to the regular parking lot side. It is going to be asphalt for now, because they do not know what it is going to be used for in the future. Ms. Miraglia said she did not like that plan. Mr. Woodburn agreed that it could be landscaped instead.

Mr. Woodburn said that they tried to comply with some of the requirements mentioned at the last meeting as well as with the Strategic Plan. He is trying to comply with the whole concept in landscaping. He thinks it will have the most landscaping of other lots in the area.

Mr. Nielsen said that in looking at the Master Plan for Castro Valley Blvd., the treatment they have proposed would exceed the Master Plan [criteria], but the void left on the opposite side, around the County property, because it is a prominent corner, that is his concern.

Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Woodburn if he talked with Waste Management about the trash. Mr. Woodburn said that he spoke with the Chinese restaurant's kitchen designer and he told him that they only needed 2 trash containers. It is big enough to put a couple of small dumpsters. It can be enlarged a little bit if it has to be. Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Woodburn if the trash area in the parking lot is at the same level. Mr. Woodburn said that the only area that is little bit higher is the handicapped ramp.

Mr. Moore said he is concerned if Waste Management will allow parking in front of that. Mr. Woodburn said that the pick up hours are between 4 or 5 a.m. and no one will be there, according to Mr. Hoang. Mr. Moore said sometimes, however, Waste Management simply will not allow parking spaces to be provided in front of trash storage areas. Mr. Frank asked Mr. Hoang what time the restaurant will be open. Mr. Hoang said it will be open between 9 and 10 a.m. Mr. Frank asked if there could be a condition that if there is any conflict with the time, they will have to make an adjustment accordingly.

Mr. Sadoff asked if there is going to be grease storage back there. Mr. Woodburn said no. He thought there was a company that came and took care of it. Mr. Moore asked where the grease is going to go. He wanted to be certain that it was not out on the road near Lake Chabot Road.

Public testimony was called for.

Ron Braun, resident at 20367 Summerpark Place, spoke in support of the applicant.

Ray Colison, resident at 17413 Rolando, spoke in support.

Brian Morrison, resident at 2544 Castro Valley Blvd., spoke in favor. He stated that the applicant met the requirements. He said he would like to see more plants on the Boulevard like fruitless pistachios and make sure that it is irrigated.

Public testimony closed.

Ms. Sugimura asked if signage was included. Mr. Young said it is his understanding that the China Bowl sign is ready for approval. Whether the Council wants to approve the sign for Tony and Ted Liquors is up to the Council. Ms. Sugimura asked Mr. Young if the signage is not part of the site development review. Mr. Young said the China Bowl sign *is* part of the site development review, but not necessarily the Tony and Ted's sign.

Mr. Sadoff said he is concerned about parking since some vehicles back out into the street and asked if there was any other way to mitigate that concern.

Mr. Nielsen said he agreed with the Traffic Department in making the entrance narrower. It will allow more landscaping.

Mr. Frank agreed with Mr. Morrison comments about fruit trees. It will maintain the consistency on what is going on down the boulevard. He asked Mr. Hoang if he wanted to put pistachio trees. Mr. Hoang said yes.

Ms. Miraglia asked if the Castro Valley Sanitary District does not approve that waste receptacle or if the grease has to be located outside, can the Council condition it if either those two things happen. Mr. Young replied that it can be conditioned to say that all grease requirements by Environmental Health should be met in the interior and any exterior changes. Mr. Moore said that to lose one parking space would be worst case scenario. Mr. Moore said that he would like to screen the condense unit with a wood fence the height of the unit or higher and add similar shrubbery around the Alameda County trees around the corner and let them go with the asphalt.

Mr. Frank said that in his opinion it seems unreasonable to bear the cost of maintaining public property without consideration. The taxpayer does not have to bear the burden of something he does not own.

Mr. Moore said that if it was a normal project it would be part of their development issue. He suggested putting a few more plants. Mr. Moore suggested to screen the transformers. Mr. Nielsen asked why the County owns this property.

Mr. Nielsen said it would be beneficial on the County's part to get rid of the maintenance issue.

Mr. Moore moved to approve Site Development Review, S-2107, with staff considerations and the following proposed modifications and conditions of approval:

- That the applicant contact Waste Management and get a confirmation that the proposed trash [pick-up location] configuration is acceptable, without any modification or potential loss of parking stalls. If one parking stall must be eliminated, it would be acceptable unless a variance is required.
- There should be a clarification that the grease interceptor be installed in accordance with Alameda County Environmental Health requirements, and not on the exterior of the existing condenser units. All reasonable, best possible efforts to avoid locating the grease interceptor on the building exterior shall be pursued.
- That the applicant be requested to construct a wooden screen around the condenser units.
- That the proposed tree species be modified to be consistent with the upcoming boulevard street improvements, so that they are the same.
- A clarification that an irrigation system be installed.
- That the plants to be installed have a longer life-span (more than 3 years, preferably 5 to 10), and to use fruitless pistachios, to be consistent with other boulevard street trees. The landscape architect or contractor shall consult with the County to confirm the longevity of the trees.
- That the landscape palette be extended all the way around the parcel including through the Alameda County-owned parcel.

Mr. Frank seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

- 4. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, C-8567 – SPRINT PCS SPRINT PCS –** Application to allow continued operation of a cell site, in a CVCBD Specific Plan – Sub4 (Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan Sub-area 4 (Hospital/Medical Oriented Office and Retail) District, located at 20103 Lake Chabot Road, west side 600 feet north of Congress Way, Castro Valley area of unincorporated Alameda County, bearing Assessor's Parcel Number: 084A-0279-005-10.

Mr. Young presented the staff report. This application would be subject to standard conditions of approval for a telecommunication facility.

Mr. Frank asked when the new Eden Hospital facility will be completed. Mr. Moore said that his understanding of the revisions, they are looking at retrofitting the building probably outside the life of the use permit.

Rachelle Swanson, representing the applicant, stated that she is requesting renewal of the existing conditional use permit for the 10 year period. They have had no complaints or concerns. It is a nice installation for a proposed use than what is actually being installed.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony submitted.

Mr. Sadoff moved to approve Conditional Use Permit, C-8567 with staff considerations. Ms. Sugimura seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

5. **VARIANCE, V-12068 – MAXWELL BEAUMONT/KUO** - Application to allow construction of a second story living room addition with a 13 foot front yard setback where 20 feet is required in a “R-1-RV” (Single Family Residence, Recreational Vehicle) District, located at 17012 Robey Drive, east side, 49 feet south of 170th Avenue, in the unincorporated Castro Valley area of Alameda County, and designated Assessor’s parcel number: 080A-0233-018-00.

Mr. Young presented the staff report. The staff planner recommends approval, based on findings related to special circumstances.

Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Young if he has visited the site. Mr. Young said no, but that he was familiar with the vicinity. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Young to verify that the original design was for a 10 foot setback and now they are making it 13. Mr. Young replied that was correct. It is better than it was originally allowed for and a variance was granted for that in the past.

Mr. Nielsen said that this is typical of the type of home that is there because of the topography and because what has been allowed in the past. There are 4 parcels on the same street that are in the same situation.

Maxwell Beaumont, architect for the project, stated that one of the major issues pertinent to this lot is that the rear right hand portion of the lot is in a slide zone. As a result, almost any construction on the lot has to push towards the front of the lot. He has made every attempt to make this design fit into the neighborhood. The house next to the right is actually farther [forward towards] the sidewalk. Someone changed the design of the existing house. You will not see much of the house in the back. The front entrance to the house is now moved to the second story addition on the front. He moved the front entrance, which is substantially further back, maybe 30-40 feet. He pushed that set back close to the front of the building. All materials will be similar to what is there now. He has met all the planning setbacks except for the front setback, which he is asking a variance for. Also, they have met the side yard setback requirement.

Ms. Miraglia said that this is a huge improvement. There are still a whole lot of weeds all the way back and she asked if there were plans for landscaping there

and if there is going to be a fence for that side portion of the yard. Mr. Beaumont said yes, eventually there will be a fence, and he is also planning some landscaping, although it is not required by planning.

Mr. Nielsen said that there is space between the existing house and this addition. He asked if the space was to preserve the present foundation so they do not have to disturb the existing house. Mr. Beaumont said yes.

Mr. Moore made a clarification for the record, that when the Council grant variances, normally money is not allowed to be considered, but because they are making a pre-existing variance condition better, this is a justification for allowing the 3-foot separation to remain. This is why it is an acceptable solution for this design.

Public testimony was called for. No public testimony submitted (other than the applicant).

Mr. Moore moved to approve Variance, V-12068, with staff considerations. Mr. Sadoff seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

- 6. SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW, S-2116 JSJ ELECTRICAL/GREENWOOD & McKENZIE** – Application to allow a sign change improvement at an existing building, in a CVCBDSP-SUB 9 (Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan-Sub-area 9) District located at 21030 Redwood Road, east side, 540-feet north of Pine Street, unincorporated Castro Valley Area of Alameda County, designated Assessor's Parcel Number 084C-0615-006-02.

Mr. Young presented the staff report, including the staff recommendation that the sign location should be moved down by 5 to 6 feet. Mr. Nielsen indicated that he agreed with staff's assessment about the sign location, that the proposed position in the arch would be out of character with the rest of the development.

Ron Boatman, from JSJ Electrical and representing the applicant, stated that they are currently doing a sign for Castro Valley Advanced Medical Imaging. They have proposed a couple of different locations for the sign. One of their first locations was to put it on a couple of poles. They would be 4" x 4" steel posts that would come up and be in front of the trees. The landowner preferred that the sign go on the building. They have a tree problem there, and if the sign is on the building in the first architectural, pinkish-colored band [above the office entry], the sign would be completely hidden by the trees. They do not want to remove the trees, so they were trying to get good visibility, without interfering with the trees there. Castro Valley Medical occupies both sides of the building. They have two doors, one on the left and the other on the right. It is not two separate businesses. It is only one business. The CHP which is next door [has a sign] on that first band. The [medical office] business is hidden [behind a pair of walls]. They came up with this particular location because of the visibility.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Boatman why the landlord did not want the sign on a free-standing sign. Mr. Boatman said that was what they proposed originally, and he said he has illustrations to show the Council; Mr. Nielsen indicated that the Council had those available. Mr. Boatman explained that there was an issue with the power of getting it out and up to that sign. Where it is on the building the power can come directly into the sign.

Mr. Boatman said they tried to get around the trees and not have to cut branches. [Planning staff] are proposing it be lowered 6 feet. Ms. Miraglia said she thought it was 8 feet lower. She also asked Mr. Boatman if he knew how many feet it was down to the first scoring. He replied that it was about two feet from the bottom of the sign. Ms. Miraglia asked if they could make the sign a little bit bigger, because it looks out of proportion. She said it could also be moved 2-3 feet down.

Mr. Frank told Mr. Boatman that there are limitations and sometimes you can reconfigure, relocate or re-plant so you do have signage. The only alternative is to eliminate or relocate the tree. Ms. Adesanya asked if this side of the building was the only one that the sign would be visible from; Mr. Boatman said yes. Mr. Nielsen asked Mr. Boatman if there are two entrances to the business. Mr. Boatman said that there are two doors.

Katherine Snider, the Medical Center manager, spoke. It is over 7,000 square feet and they lease half of it or a little less than half of it to Doctor Abeles, who is an orthopedic surgeon. His door is 21030A and theirs is 21030B. He rents it from them. Mr. Nielsen asked why they do not put the sign over the doorway entry. She replied that there is nowhere to put the sign. It would be butted-up too close to the CHP sign that it would not work. Mr. Boatman said that there are two entrances going into two businesses. They are set back 20 feet deeper into the building from the front of the CHP to the CHP doors.

Mr. Nielsen said that when you look at it from Norbridge Street, people would see your sign over your door. Ms. Snider said no, there are trees covering it, and the parking lot is lower, so that when you drive in, or go by it, there is a big wall, that accommodates the ramp you need for handicapped access. Mr. Frank said the solution was simple based on the type of trees that you have. Ms. Snider continued, saying it was not just the trees, it was the wall that you cannot see [beyond] when you are down in the parking lot. Because of the ramp, and the design, when you look up, you cannot see clearly a sign down here [on the band].

Mr. Frank said, hypothetically, there is a tree that could be removed, and you replace it, then, what height could the sign be on the building? Mr. Boatman said on the first band it could be about 10', which would give them one foot above the score line to the bottom of the sign. Mr. Frank said he thought that would be more palatable.

Ms. Miraglia said that the CHP sign is not in this peach color [band], but it is in this mixed-color band. She would like to see the tree removed and the sign moved down to the same level as the CHP sign. Mr. Frank said the sign removal might have to comply with County requirements, but could be done. Ms. Miraglia said it applies on the County right-of-way. Mr. Boatman said an arborist could also prune back the tree.

Mr. Young said that it appeared the tree would keep growing over the front of the sign. Ms. Snider said they would attempt to remove the tree. She said it was a compromise that works for them as long as the public can see the sign.

Mr. Young said Ms. Henninger suggested to continue this discussion since the applicant cannot get a commitment and the time from the property owner. Mr. Moore asked if they could just approve it with the condition that they make every reasonable effort to remove the tree. Ms. Miraglia said all the Council has to do is ask that they move the sign down into the same band as the CHP sign. It would then be up to the applicant to take the tree out, which would make sense, or trim it. We can just move it down, and we are done.

Ms. Miraglia moved to approve Site Development Review, S-2116 with the modification that the sign be moved down to the same level band as the CHP sign. Ms. Adesanya seconded. Motion carried 7/0.

F. Open Forum – None.

G. Chair's Report

Mr. Nielsen said that he received a referral letter concerning opinion on a minor Variance, V-12065. In this particular case, they want to build a 3 foot by 6 foot addition to the front of a building. He said for staff to prepare a regular staff report would be a waste of time. He suggested that this type of item be put on the Consent Calendar so everybody can see what the Applicant had in mind, and then if any council member wants to discuss it, it can be pulled from the consent calendar so everybody has a chance to see it. Ms. Henninger said that it will be heard by the WBZA so will require a staff report. She added that it could save time on the Council's agenda, but it could be pulled to be put on the regular agenda.

Mr. Nielsen said his second issue was that Castro Valley High School has a student that sits unofficially on the Board of Education as an intern. He received a call to see if this Council would be interested to have a high school student sit at the table and be able to make comments at the end of an item but not vote on it. It would give another perspective, involve a high school student in local government, and thirdly, obviously, it would be a qualified student. The Council has to explore who the student would be and if it would be a permanent situation

or not. Mr. Nielsen asked council members for their comments. Mr. Moore said it was a good idea. Ms. Henninger said they would have to research the Council's Charter.

Mr. Nielsen indicated that he attended a Redevelopment meeting with the owner of the Daughtry building. A loan was approved for interior improvements. The grant was for \$1,020,000, of which \$340,000 was a forgivable loan. Randy Papierniak is putting up \$2.1 million for interior improvements. The concept was approved, but the applicant still has to come back with the actual design. They do not know who the tenants will be at this point. The CAC felt that the building improvements would be a catalyst, and it would set a good example for what is going to happen on the rest of the street. He said he made a motion to approve it [at the CAC meeting] and it was approved. The CAC will work with the owner on who the tenants will be. We want to be sure it is not a 'Dollar Store' or that a level of tenant that would be detrimental to the street. He said it would come back to the MAC when the design review and sign review comes up. The grant is by far the largest given by the CAC. There will be monthly meetings and there was public notice.

H. Committee Reports

- Ordinance Review Committee: Ms. Miraglia informed Council Members that there will be a meeting tomorrow night and the discussion will be on secondary units. Ms. Henninger said the County is not meeting the State criteria that was established in 2003. There will be some enforcement pieces. There are size and ordinance issues that the County did not address when the state law was passed. The state allows a larger [secondary] unit. Mr. Nielsen suggested the state allows up to 1,200 square feet. Ms. Henninger said it will be only a preliminary discussion tomorrow night.
- Eden Area Alcohol Policy Committee. No discussion.
- Redevelopment Citizens Advisory Committee. No discussion.

I. Staff Announcements, Comments and Reports

Ms. Henninger said that on behalf of Supervisor's Miley, Clean Up Saturday will be this Saturday, April 28, at Cull Canyon Park in cooperation with the Castro Valley Sanitary District. There will be some planting at Cull Canyon. It will be from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. Lunch will be served afterwards at Lake Chabot. There are two sites – next to the KFC and at Cull Canyon Park. Registration would begin at 8:30 and start work at 9:00 a.m.

Ms. Sugimura spoke about the Eden Area Livability Initiative and said they are ready to ask for support from the MAC. There will be a leadership committee

meeting for Castro Valley and Fairview, on May 2, 2007, at 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at Supervisor's Miley's office. They have been working on it since 2004, and now is the point to 'leverage' it. There will be 3 meetings on 3 different dates. Each meeting will be the same, with the same information disseminated. She asked each member of the CVMAC to tell her if they would be able to attend one meeting, and which one. Ms. Adesanya asked Ms. Sugimura if they have a consultant. Ms. Sugimura said no, they are just in the interview process. They have interviewed two consultant groups. The decision is yet to be made.

J. Council Announcements, Comments and Reports – None.

K. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Next Hearing Date: Monday, May 14, 2007