CITY OF MORGAN HILL

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17555 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 779-7247 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

SCHEDULED MEETING **DECEMBER 9, 2003**

PRESENT: Acevedo, Benich, Engles, Escobar, Lyle, Mueller, Weston

ABSENT: None

LATE: None

STAFF: Planning Manager (PM) Rowe, Associate Planner (AP) Tolentino, Associate Planner (AP) Plambeck, and Minutes Clerk Johnson.

Chair Mueller called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Minutes Clerk Johnson certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Mueller opened the public hearing.

With no one present wishing to address matters not appearing on the agenda, the public hearing was closed.

NEW BUSINESS:

1) ZA-03-16: CITY OF MORGAN HILL-ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT/SIGN CODE

A request to amend Title 18 of the Municipal Code to modify the sign code to allow changeable copy signs for movie theaters.

AP Plambeck presented the staff report. He called attention to the 'new Exhibit A' which has been provided.

Commissioner Benich asked about the sign at the Granada Theater, noting it has always changed weekly. AP Plambeck explained that the Granada Theater was operating before the Municipal Code addressing copy signs for movie theaters was adopted. The issue for consideration this evening, AP Plambeck said, is crafted for the new theater, which will be opened following renovation by Cinelux Theaters of the Cinema 6 in the Tennant Station Shopping Center.

Commissioner Acevedo questioned why the proposed modification is limited? "Why not include Churches?" he asked. "Or the Community Playhouse?" AP Plambeck explained that other changes will be included in a zoning text Amendment to be considered in January, but this is suggested now for business purposes. Commissioner Acevedo continued by asking that if this change is being made for the movie theater, why is consideration not being given to the Trail Dust, where there is an 'interesting mural'. Commissioner Acevedo suggested it would be in order to look at 'creative design signs' for uniformity of enforcement. "If that occurred, the special consideration signs could be presented to the Commission on a case-by-case basis," he said.

Chair Mueller indicated that all aspects of the Sign Ordinance will be revisited in January.

Responding to a question, AP Plambeck said that the new Exhibit A will address non-flashing signs near the freeway.

Chair Mueller opened the public hearing.

With no persons present indicating a wish to address the matter, the public hearing was closed.

COMMISSIONER ACEVEDO OFFERED RESOLUTION NO. 03-104, RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF TEXT AMENDMENTS TO SUBSECTIONS 18.76.130A8, 18.76.205C SNF 18.76.250F OF CHAPTER 18.76 (SIGN CODE) OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF MORGAN HILL, ALLOWING CHANGEABLE COPY SIGNS FOR MOVIE THEATERS, INCLUDING 'EXHIBIT A' OF THE RESOLUTION. COMMISSIONER ESCOBAR SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH PASSED WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ACEVEDO, BENICH, ENGLES, ESCOBAR, LYLE, MUELLER, WESTON; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

2) UP-03-09: RAILROAD-FREDERICO ENTERPRISES

A request for approval of a conditional use permit to allow the use and expansion of an existing industrial building for a wholesale seafood distribution facility. The subject site is located at the northeast corner of Barrett Ave. and Railroad Ave. in the MG General Industrial Zoning District.

AP Tolentino presented the staff report. The request is being made because in the City of Morgan Hill, 'food processing and packing plants' and 'perishable food storage' uses require approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the MG, General Industrial Zoning District. AP Tolentino explained the findings required for the CUP.

In referencing the (revised) Mitigated Negative Declaration, AP Tolentino said there were concerns about potential odors, although these should not be significant and there will be refrigeration for all products.

Commissioner Benich cited the former use of the site – Napa Auto Parts Distribution Center – and asked if there would be more trips generated for this operation than the former? AP Tolentino noted the application which indicates there will be no more

than 73 trips during the peak P.M. hours, and that, she said, "Would be the worse case scenario.'

Commissioner Lyle inquired as to Architectural Review Board (ARB) consideration of this project. AP Tolentino responded that the ARB will review the plans as indicated in Section 4 C of the Resolution. Commissioner Lyle noted that the water and sewer uses are 'abnormal' and clearly above the standard for the City uses. AP Tolentino explained this is because of the need for increased ice and the amount of waste that must be cleared during the repacking; additional impact fees will cover these items.

Chair Mueller opened the public hearing.

Fernando Frederico, 9548 Estates Dr., Gilroy, who is the owner of the business, explained that for 20 years his business has specialized in provision of fish to supermarkets. "This is a family operation and we are excited about the move from San Jose to Morgan Hill. We've wanted to move the business to the South County for a while and we finally found a location that matches."

Commissioner Lyle asked Mr. Frederico about the surroundings where the business currently is located. Mr. Frederico responded that he is on Julian St., in San Jose. There are residences on the east side, but in the 20 years we've been, there have been no complaints, he said. Mr. Frederico said that other buildings in the area are businesses.

Commissioner Benich asked if the applicant has plans to open a fish market locally? Mr. Frederico responded that he strictly sells wholesale now, including to some local supermarkets, but would not absolutely rule out a retail operation someday.

Chair Mueller inquired if there would be a possibility of new jobs for Morgan Hill residents? Mr. Frederico said that many of the current employees live in Morgan Hill and that there is a possibility of expanded business operations someday.

Commissioner Engles asked the range of wages in the operation? Mr. Frederico said his is a non-union shop, but that the pay rate is above that of union wages in this type of business. "A beginning worker averages about $15 - $16 per hour, with key personnel earning up to $200,000 per year," Mr. Frederico explained.

Randy Toch, 70 South First St., San Jose, is the Attorney for the business. He explained that Mr. Frederico has made it a practice to 'hire lots of kids' and promote whenever possible." Mr. Toch said the business will most likely hire students as entry level workers here. Referring to the (proposed) Resolution No. 03-103, Mr. Toch asked that Section 4, C be changed to read 90 days rather than 30 for the site application. Staff concurred with this request.

Mr. Toch introduced other Frederico family members who were present.

With no others indicating a wish to speak to the request, Chair Mueller closed the public hearing.

COMMISSIONERS ACEVEDO/ESCOBAR MOTIONED APPROVAL OF THE

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION PASSED WITH THE UNANIMOUS VOTE OF ALL COMMISSIONERS PRESENT.

COMMISSIONER WESTON OFFERED RESOLUTION NO. 03-103, APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE USE AND EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF BARRETT AVENUE AND RAILROAD AVENUE FOR A SEAFOOD DISTRIBUTION FACILITY, WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATION:

SECTION 4 C ~~30~~ 90 DAYS

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BENICH AND APPROVED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ACEVEDO, BENICH, ENGLES, ESCOBAR, LYLE, MUELLER, WESTON; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

OTHER BUSINESS:

3) GROUND RULES FOR ASSIGNING SUPPLEMENTAL MEASURE "P" ALLOTMENTS

PM Rowe presented the staff report and provided the basis for the resultant discussion, as he explained this will be a supplemental distribution if the City's Residential Development Control System Update is passed by the voters in the March 2004 election. If the amendments are approved, the total building allotment for FY 2004-05 and 2005-06 will be increased in each year from 182 to approximately 230 units. The increase should be awarded as supplemental allotments to those projects that participated in the most recent Measure P competition for the fiscal year 2004-05 and 2005-06 building allotment. The total distribution for FY 2004-05 was 182 units. Supplemental distribution could add *approximately* ~~41~~ *48* units for that time. The FY 2005-06 distribution was 182 units; supplemental distribution could result in *approximately* 48 more units.

PM Rowe noted several issues which needed to be addressed regarding the supplemental distribution:

- On going projects versus adding new projects
- Prioritization – would the highest scoring projects or those best positioned to use the allocations be given higher ranks
- Would those projects requiring allocations for completion be given preference
- The ABAG target numbers – and how the allocations for those developers pulling permits would be affected by that factor
- 2006-07 FY allotment
- Elimination of the east/west split
- Exceeding the limit for maximum distribution to no more than 25% above the single highest year allotment for the project to a maximum of 30 units
- Set-asides

Regarding small and micro competitions, PM Rowe said, if they receive qualifying scores, are requesting a total of 40 allocations in the small project set-aside and 14 allocations in the micro set-aside. "This is more than enough to meet percentage requirements for the small project and micro project set-asides with the current

applications," PM Rowe stated as he explained that staff does not see a need to reopen the micro or small project competitions to new applications.

Commissioner Acevedo asked about the possibility of appeals.

Commissioner Lyle said there may be additional information needed before March and asked that the next agenda include input time for the developers.

Chair Mueller suggested the Commissioners be prepared to go through the issues which PM Rowe raised 'point-by-point'.

Chair Mueller opened the public hearing.

Chair Mueller said he is concerned that no developers were present at the meeting, "Usually when there is an item like this, the room is packed."

With no one in attendance indicating a wish to speak to the matter, the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Lyle said he had completed an informal analysis and agrees with staff regarding the numbers presented for 2004-05. As to 2005-06, he said, the ongoing projects may have the advantage over new projects. Commissioner Lyle ~~said that he estimates the on-going projects can 'beat out' others because of the scoring under new criteria.~~ *stated that starting in 2006/07, if the "P" replacement initiative passes, the new criteria will likely result in a number of projects near the new core area outscoring the current ongoing projects*.

Chair Mueller said that under Measure P (which could be known as Measure C if passed in March 2004), the awards will still be allocated by point scoring.

Commissioner Lyle said that there may be a move to have *current* 2006-07 *allotments* 'move up' to Fiscal Year 2005-06 through the supplemental distribution.

Chair Mueller said that would certainly be the case if 2005-06 allocations were ~~reduced~~ *increased*. He indicated that he believes the on-going projects should be given priority.

Chair Mueller directed staff to provide for the Commissioners the 'cut-off date for the housing element'. Discussion ensued regarding the way the State counts the data for the housing element and how that could affect the developers scheduling as to willingness to begin building processes.

PM Rowe said the information from the development community would be solicited and given to the Commissioners regarding projects that can be completed or have received allocations.

Chair Mueller explained to the high school students present that the purpose of Measure P (the Residential Development Control System) is to control the number of housing units that can be allocated/built. He went on to describe the fundamentals of the update, which will be voted on as Measure C in March 2004. Chair Mueller said

that when the Ordinance is changed, it will work against the population cap. He told the Commissioners that the 'technicalities' are being worked through and there is a possibility that more building could occur in order to meet the Housing Element requirements set up by the State. Chair Mueller said, "A six-year window has been provided as part of the obligation the State has set for us. The City needs to have enough allocations awarded to meet the letter of the law."

PM Rowe said there is a need to demonstrate to the Department of Community Housing and Development that the City can build as many units as possible to meet the ~~duty~~ *quota* set by the State for dwellings so the Housing Element can gain final approval. He reminded that ABAG has set a 'fair share' for the region then told cities and counties the number of dwelling units they must provide to meet the 'fair share'. PM Rowe continued that there is a time certain schedule for housing end dates – cut off dates for specified types of housing: market rate, affordable, etc. He said that the numbers set by the Department of Finance also play a part of the equation.

BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 1 (ONGOING PROJECTS VERSUS ADDING NEW PROJECTS).

Regarding highest scoring projects, Commissioner Escobar said this position (giving priority to highest scoring projects) appears to be the best. "We should not create a situation where developers scramble to be in the 'best position'," he declared.

Chair Mueller said the developers need to be informed of this position of priority to the highest scoring projects, if the Commission decide on that.

Commissioner Acevedo said that he continues with the same concern as before: the awards are always based on scoring. "I think that the high score should be considered first, the 'who's ready', the rankings given, and a money consideration, such as a positive letter from the bank.

Commissioner Benich said it is best to use the highest scoring criteria for allocations. "We continue to try to get the 'projects in process' finished. That has been stated many times," Commissioner Benich said.

Commissioner Lyle said those developers with the 'best position' should be considered first, and provided a couple of hypothetical examples to prove his point.

Chair Mueller said there is need to be careful, as under Measure P awards are made according to the score. "The supplemental allocations stay under the current rules," Chair Mueller proclaimed. "By rule, the highest score gets the number of allocations they want." He continued that if first consideration for scoring is financial, then a need for the developer to be honest about what they can do.

Commissioner Lyle said that documentation of commitments, such as when the project can be started, is essential.

Chair Mueller reminded that the update of Measure P was initiated by the adoption of the new General Plan.

Commissioner Lyle explained that the update (supplemental) is transitional, 'not permanent'.

Commissioner Weston urged caution in making sure the developers know this is supplemental, and is not ongoing (permanent).

PM Rowe said that with the supplemental allocation, there is need for the developers to be cooperative and for the Planning Commission to have latitude in decision making.

BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 2 (PRIORITY TO HIGHEST SCORING PROJECTS).

As to additional allotments, priority to projects for which the additional allotments will complete the project, **BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 3 (SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOTMENTS: PRIORITY TO PROJECTS FOR WHICH THE ADDITIONAL ALLOTMENTS WILL COMPLETE THE PROJECT)**, with Chair Mueller commenting that the Commissioners and the City Council have always tried to complete projects.

PM Rowe asked if the Commissioners are concerned with giving special consideration to projects where permits can be pulled by June 30, 2005?

Chair Mueller said all the developers need to do is pull the permits by date certain, then the State will count those for the Housing Element requirement previously discussed.

Commissioner Acevedo said the first priority for awarding the supplemental allocations should be scoring, then the ability to pull the permits by June 30, 2005 should be the second consideration.

Commissioner Weston suggested that awards be given priority for pulling permits. "That would make the process easier," he said. "However, we have to wonder if we may be sacrificing better projects for developer progression (giving more units to developers who can agree to pulling the permits).

Commissioner Escobar said the Commissioners must rely on the developers for being candid about their ability for progress.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Weston, PM Rowe explained that the schedule outlined in the application(s) sometimes requires considerable staff time, as new developers need more 'hand holding', whereas experienced developers have been through the process and can be more realistic of the time demands. **BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 4 (SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOTMENTS: PRIORITY TO PROJECTS WHERE PERMITS CAN BE PULLED BY JUNE 30, 2005).**

Commissioner Escobar said the 2006-07 F allotments should be given to developers who can get finished. "If the developer has advanced the units, with the ability to reach some goal for this cycle, can the goal be defined for moving some of the units forward time-wise?" he queried.

Commissioner Lyle said the City is trying to get the units in to meet ABAG requirements.

Chair Mueller stated a belief that if a project can get allocations done before a date certain, then on-going project should be given priority.

Commissioner Escobar commented there seems to be some urgency to move projects along in meeting the ABAG directives.

Chair Mueller said a better goal would be to reduce the standard allotments for FY 2006-07 as much as possible. "The FY 2006-07 building doesn't count for ABAG," he said.

PM Rowe then explained that projects with ongoing permits need allocations for completion. Chair Mueller agreed, using the DiConza project as an example.

Commissioner Acevedo asked if Measures C and P would be overlapping? PM Rowe explained how the Ordinance would juxtaposition should the update be passed.

Commissioner Lyle said effort will be made to 'clear the board with allocations given in 2006-07. Citing that it would be possible to move eight of the 2006-07 units to 2005-06, (but not all of the 24 allocations intended for 2006-07) to give 16 total for 2005-06, Commissioner Lyle offered examples to reinforce his theory.

Chair Mueller said that it appears in this case an on-going project would have a scoring problem looming. "We should minimize the allocations of 2006-07 if we possibly can," he affirmed.

Commissioner Lyle reminded that all second year allocations must go the City Council for approval.

Commissioner Acevedo said there is emphasis of continually giving priority to on-going projects. "Where does the Dempsey and Odshio projects fit? I was present at the City Council when they made it clear about those projects."

PM Rowe explained that with the new criteria under Measure C, these projects would 'leap frog' to the top and be given priority in ~~2005-06~~ 2006/07.

Commissioner Weston commented that under the rules of Measure C, those two projects will score well.

Commissioner Acevedo reiterated his presence at the City Council meeting when the appeals were heard and said he thinks the City Council said those two projects (Dempsey and Odshio) are to receive project allocations.

Commissioner Lyle informed that he was also present at that meeting and recalled that the City Council only stated that 'those projects should be CONSIDERED for allocations'.

PM Rowe said the City Council said the Planning Commission is to give consideration to the two projects, but allocations for 2004-05 was not a requirement.

BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 5 (2006-07 ALLOTMENTS).

PM Rowe said that the staff recommends east/west split continue during 2004-05 and 2005-06, being averaged over the two year period, and that any new rules for the building allotment distribution apply only to the 2006-07 allotment. **BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 6 (EAST/WEST SPLIT).**

Regarding on-going projects, the maximum distribution in a subsequent year would be limited to no more than 25% above any single highest year allotment for the project to a maximum of 30 units. The question arose whether the 30 unit constraint should be lifted to maintain the East/West split percentages. Chair Mueller expressed strongly that the rule should be waived without penalty. "We need to get through the transition and meet the Housing Element/ABAG requirements," he confirmed.

Staff further recommended to allow a 1 time only excession of the 30 limit if required to maintain the East/West distribution split.

Commissioner Weston required explanation of the supplemental units available.

Commissioner Lyle mentioned that this made him a bit nervous and offered details of his concern.

BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ITEM 7 (MAXIMUM DISTRIBUTION LIMITS).

PM Rowe explained the staff recommendation for set-asides, saying that the additional units for micro and affordable categories were those affected by the set-asides. The Housing Element policy requires 20% of the total annual allotment be reserved for 100% affordable projects. "In order to maintain this percentage, 14 units in the 2004-05 supplement would need to be awarded to an affordable project(s). An additional 6 allocations would need to be awarded," PM Rowe detailed. "Now the question for you (the Commissioners) is whether to open up those competitions?"

Chair Mueller suggested opening the micro and affordable categories competitions. Commissioner Lyle urged the same. **BY CONCENSUS, THE COMMISSIONERS AGREED WITH OPENING THE ~~MICRO AND~~ AFFORDABLE CATEGORIES COMPETITIONS IN ITEM # 8.**

Having completed discussion of the matter, Commissioner Lyle informed that is essential to get the information regarding those eight issues out to the developers as soon as possible.

4) PLANNING COMMISSION CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING OVERALL PROJECT EXCELLENCE-QUALITY OF CONSTRUCTION CATEGORY

PM Rowe explained that Measure P evaluation criteria provides for one point to be awarded by the Planning Commission under the Quality of Construction Category (Subsection B.5) That criterion is reserved for the Planning Commission to judge the best overall projects in this category. "Now is the time for the Commissioners to decide that standard for the upcoming competition," PM Rowe said. He presented the five factors in last year's competition as a review for the Commissioners.

Commissioner Weston commented that he thought last year was somewhat chaotic but it worked. He continued that he didn't understand the convoluted point score. "Why not rank the projects #1, #2, and so on?" he asked.

Commissioner Lyle said he has been thinking about the system the City Council uses for ranking and thinks the Commissioners could use that method as well. "Last year was a big problem with big problems," Commissioner Lyle stated. "Many hours were spent doing the work by both the Commissioners and the staff. This year each applicant must be scored as well."

Chair Mueller said he has no desire to make it as complicated as it was last year. "Furthermore, a problem last year was that not all the Commissioners who could do so participated," Chair Mueller explained.

Commissioner Engles said that, in his opinion, there is far too much ado about the one point.

PM Rowe reminded that the Commissioners discussed at length they wanted some way to say 'this project is above the others' and wanted to give the recognition based on the five factors they jointly decided.

Commissioner Benich said he felt there was a missing factor last year and he suggested it for the upcoming cycle: ~~gauging~~ *evaluate* the developer's accuracy and ~~competency~~ *timeliness of submittals to the City Planning Department* . ~~, how well it is done~~.

Chair Mueller indicated the staff said how well the developers have performed in the past, and the criteria for developer performance have made a big impact. "It definitely needs to be visible on the matrix," he said.

Chair Mueller said he is satisfied with the way the scoring for the one point was done last year.

Discussion followed regarding items Commissioners find of concern:

- weighted scoring or rank order.
- Importance of public benefit, e.g., construction/completion of roads for the City infrastructure system – a value could be assigned to this

Commissioner Benich gave an example of total scoring based on seven categories totaling 100 points.

Commissioner Weston indicated he wants to look at the project in total rather

than having individual scoring.

Commissioner Lyle said it is important to look at the whole project and how it benefits the City.

Commissioner Escobar said his preference is to rank the best to the least. "Those projects that percolate to the top collectively can be considered top for the one point. We could have rankings, with seven top projects; those that score the highest, get the point, then other thresholds could be considered."

Commissioner Weston questioned Commissioner Escobar, asking if that the majority of the projects would not then be eligible?

Commissioner Benich said that proposal is very similar to one made by Commissioner Acevedo last year.

Commissioner Escobar indicated an inclination to ranking each project according to the criteria. "No debate," he said.

Commissioner Engles asked if having a workshop on the matter might help.

Chair Mueller maintained that ranking has disadvantages and stated that the Commissioners need to vote which is the best project. "If we took the seven categories as suggested, scored each between 1 – 15 or 1 10 then divided the total by seven, I believe it would be better. I don't want just a ranking 1 – 7," Chair Mueller explained.

Commissioner Acevedo reflected that once the scores are completed by the Commissioners, they should be turned in with the scoring looked at in 'purely numerical order without identifying the project. "Let's get the information from the score, not the project . We wouldn't know the range of scores (from each commissioner). We would just look at the numbers. There would be no identification or influence by the name of the developer or the project name," Commissioner Acevedo said.

PM Rowe observed that the Commissioners appear to favor using seven (7) weighted factors, and having categories to total 100 points.

Commissioner Weston said he would prefer rating the projects according to the qualities he likes.

PM Rowe explained the categories of all the allocations (market rate, affordable, etc.).

Commissioner Lyle said that whatever the process is decided on and set up this year needs to carry through to next year's cycle.

Commissioner Benich lamented the time consumed last year, stating it was very cumbersome,

Commissioner Lyle remarked that order ranking works for something few in number, but is difficult for 24 (the number of applications anticipated).

Commissioner Acevedo suggested a compromise: each Commissioner would rate as they wanted, e.g., placing the projects in numerical order according to preference.

Commissioner Weston said if there were a display as to top projects, a matrix could be used with necessary numbers affixed.

Commissioner Lyle worried that a system which ranked only the top 4 or 5 would be unsatisfactory as the City Council says all applications must be considered. Commissioners discussed several points:

- the east/west split issues
- criteria attached to staff scoring/recommendations
- need for City Council to understand the process used by the Planning Commission in case of appeal
- the need to make sure the one point is not 'appealable'
- need to try for an 'orderly process'

Chair Mueller conducted a straw poll of the Commissioners, which indicated the following:

Commissioners Acevedo, Engles, Escobar and Chair Mueller prefer scoring.
Commissioners Weston and Benich lean toward ranking.
Commissioner Lyle sits squarely on the fence ('1/2 and 1/2') on the issue

Commissioner Acevedo clarified that he would prefer ranking for categories.

Several other issues were discussed:

Architecture and aesthetics
Site layout and circulation (including traffic calming/appearance of safety)
Efficiency and competency of the developer
Value of public benefits (schools, parks, public works)
Report card for developers

Staff was directed to prepare a form with instructions for the Commissioner's consideration at the next available meeting.

The categories the Commissioners prefer at present are:

1. Efficiency and Utility of the Project Design and Landscaping
2. Architecture / Aesthetics / Artistic Qualities
3. Common Space and Its Usabilitiy
4. Project Design that Promotes Neighborhood Interaction
5. Circulation efficiency /traffic pattern efficiency
6. Value to public
7. Report card for developers

Commissioners discussed with PM Rowe the schedule for review of project applications for the upcoming Residential Development Control System (Measure P)

Micro and open/market rate competitions.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: PM Rowe reported the City Council actions at the November 19, 2003 meeting:

- set a special municipal election for March 2, 2004 (update of measure P)

ADJOURNMENT: With no further business to be considered, Commissioners joined together to wish all present a very 'happy holiday', as Chair Mueller adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

MINUTES RECORDED AND PREPARED BY:

_____

JUDI H. JOHNSON, Minutes Clerk

R:\PLANNING\WP51\MINUTES\PCminutes\2003\December\PC120903.Min.DOC