

July 27, 2005

**MINUTES OF AN ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF THE
TORRANCE PLANNING COMMISSION
GENERAL PLAN WORKSHOP #7
EVALUATING ALTERNATIVES, Res/Comm/Inds**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Planning Commission Workshop convened for an adjourned regular meeting for a General Plan Workshop on Wednesday, July 27, 2005, at 7:01 p.m. in City Council Chambers at Torrance City Hall.

2. FLAG SALUTE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Guyton.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Drevno, Fauk, Guyton, La Bouff, Muratsuchi, and Chairperson Uchima.

Absent: Commissioner Horwich.

Also Present: Planning Manager Isomoto, Senior Planning Associate Chun, Senior Planning Associate Lodan, and others.

4. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Chairperson Uchima explained policies and procedures of the meeting.

Senior Planning Associate Chun introduced Community Development Department staff members and announced upcoming meetings on the General Plan update, including the August 1, 2005 Traffic Commission meeting on the citywide traffic study; the August 4, 2005 Environmental Quality and Energy Conservation Commission meeting to discuss the conservation element and historic preservation; and the next General Plan Workshop on the land use element on August 24, 2005.

Planning Manager Isomoto advised that the purpose of this workshop was to explore some of the issues identified at previous workshops in greater depth, focusing on areas of potential change in the upcoming General Plan. She emphasized that this was the first step in an evolutionary process and that the final General Plan document would evolve as a result of feedback from Commissioners and the public at subsequent hearings.

She introduced Laura Stetson, Jeff Henderson, and Diana Gonzales representing Cotton Bridges Associates (CBA).

**5. PRESENTATION / DISCUSSION:
PRELIMINARY LAND USE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND FOCUS AREAS**

Ms. Stetson stated that the key objectives of this informal workshop were to present the preliminary land use classification system; to identify land use focus areas; to document Commission comments regarding the classification system/focus areas; to discuss land use alternatives for each focus area; and to receive community input.

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, she described how land use is distributed throughout a community. She advised that proposed changes were based on the existing General Plan, interviews with City Council, Department heads and members of the community, community workshops, the June 4, 2005 Open House, and City staff recommendations. She explained that land uses are generally classified as residential, industrial and commercial and then classified within these categories according to density for residential uses and intensity for non-residential uses. Other measures used to describe the extent of development on a parcel include total building square footage, building height, floor area ratio (FAR) and percent of lot coverage. She reviewed the standards for low density, low-medium density, medium density, medium-high density, and high-density residential uses.

Ms. Stetson discussed the current categories under the Commercial land use designation – Local, General, and Commercial Center – and the three categories under the Industrial designation – Heavy, Light, and Business Park. She noted that two other classifications are included in the General Plan, the Public/Quasi-Public/Open Space designation and the Airport designation.

Ms. Stetson advised that the current land use designations have worked very well for the City, but a few modifications were being recommended to address the need for higher intensity in some commercial areas and to recognize the importance of medical and medical-related uses. The first recommendation is to create a Hospital/Medical land use designation and to apply it to major medical facilities in the community. The second recommendation is to establish a Residential-Office designation, which would allow for the construction of small, less intense office uses, multi-family residential developments, or mixed-use developments combining both, to create a buffer between residential and heavier commercial uses. The third recommendation would eliminate the Local Commercial designation and apply the General Commercial designation to all commercial properties in the City except for the regional commercial centers. She advised that there is a preliminary proposal to change the FAR in the General Commercial category from 0.6 to 1.0 to create more flexibility for commercial/residential mixed-use developments, noting that the zoning code would have to be amended to implement this change.

In response to Commissioner Muratsuchi's inquiry, Ms. Stetson explained that mixed-use is generally allowed a higher FAR because it provides more flexibility to accommodate sub-surface parking or a parking structure.

Ms. Stetson emphasized that land use designations for a significant portion of the City would not change as a result of the General Plan update. With the aid of maps, she explained that areas of stability and areas of potential change were identified at the start of this process, and after further evaluation, seven focus areas were identified.

Ms. Stetson provided an overview of the seven focus areas: Crenshaw/Amsler, Western Avenue South, Cabrillo/Border, Western Avenue North, Redondo Beach

Boulevard, East Victor Precinct, and Jefferson/Oak. She advised that tonight's discussion would center on Areas 4, 2, and 6--Western Avenue North, Western Avenue South, and East Victor Precinct.

Mr. Henderson advised that the series of alternatives for the three focus areas to be considered were based on land use and economic development goals, as well as input from the Planning Commission, City staff, and the public. He noted that for each area, as few as one or as many as three alternatives were being presented, and that existing General Plan land use designations remain possible options within each area. He explained that following the consultant's presentation, questions would be entertained from the Commission, followed by brief comments from the public, after which the Commission would be asked to provide direction.

With the aid of maps, he discussed existing conditions, land uses and General Plan designations in Area 4, the Western Avenue North corridor, bounded by Artesia Boulevard on the north and 190th Street on the south. He noted that the corridor is characterized by older industrial and local commercial uses, with an influx of small residential developments. He stated that this area is an emerging employment corridor, with room for service and industrial uses, but there has been a lack of long-term vision.

He advised that in considering land use alternatives for this corridor, key objectives include encouraging the recycling of older, dilapidated industrial uses; intensifying commercial uses in order to spur recycling; and promoting desirable economic changes. Alternative 1 for this corridor would apply the General Commercial designation to all commercial properties along the corridor, with a maximum FAR of 1.0. He explained that this would allow a slightly larger building envelope to encourage a more flexible development style and provide some incentive for the recycling of commercial properties in the future.

Commissioner Muratsuchi inquired if the intent was to have Western Avenue, north of 190th Street, look more like Hawthorne Boulevard. Mr. Henderson responded that this would not happen because the lot sizes would not support that type of development, especially north of 182nd Street where the lots are fairly small, but conceded that some larger projects could be built south of 182nd due to the larger properties. He noted that provisions would be included to ensure that buffering is provided for residential areas located directly behind commercial properties along this corridor. He offered examples of businesses that might be attracted to the smaller lots, including restaurants and doctor/dentist offices.

Responding to Commissioner Muratsuchi's concern that longtime businesses, such as Okada Nursery and King's Hawaiian Bakery, might be lost. Mr. Henderson advised that existing businesses that do not conform to the new General Plan designation would still be allowed as non-conforming uses and that the zoning would continue to provide for the types of local commercial uses that are there today.

Ms. Stetson noted that the higher FAR might encourage people to partner on adjacent properties, with the possibility of developing a mixed-use project or a small retail center.

Commissioner Muratsuchi expressed concern that the increased FAR could open the door for massive commercial buildings right next to residential properties.

Mr. Henderson responded that the intent of proposing the increase in the FAR was mainly to allow for residential/commercial mixed-use projects and such projects would be the ones permitted a FAR up to 1.0 while traditional commercial uses would be limited to a FAR lower than 1.0.

Commissioner Muratsuchi stressed the need to establish guidelines to define the term "mixed-use development" because there have been claims in the past that residential projects were mixed-use simply because they included a walkway to an existing commercial development.

In response to Chairperson Uchima's inquiry, Ms. Stetson advised that height limitations are addressed in the zoning code, however, height limitation policies could be included in the General Plan land use element.

Commissioner Guyton expressed concerns that increasing the FAR to 1.0 would allow the construction of commercial buildings up to four stories tall along this corridor, which is currently comprised of mainly single-story buildings, and create privacy issues for adjacent residences.

Responding to an earlier comment, Planning Manager Isomoto clarified that the area encompassing Okada Nursery and King's Hawaiian Bakery is currently designated General Commercial so no changes are proposed for this area. She advised that the 1.0 FAR would not automatically be considered the FAR for the entire designation, noting that there would be a variety of zones that would implement the General Commercial designation, and the zoning for each would have some further delineation in terms of FAR, development standards, height, and setbacks.

Responding to Commissioner Muratsuchi's inquiry, Ms. Stetson explained that the definition of "mixed-use development," as used in the context of this recommendation, is largely commercial uses with some residential component. She indicated that stand-alone residential developments would not be appropriate on this busy corridor.

Planning Manager Isomoto noted that staff has asked the consultants to assist in the development of specific definitions/guidelines for mixed-use developments.

Tom Brewer, Evalyn Avenue, stressed the need for land use on the west side of Western Avenue to be compatible with usage on the east side of the street. He recalled that from 182nd Street to 178th Street, there is only an alleyway separating the residential units from the Western Avenue corridor.

Mark Chen, Talisman Street, stated that objectives and terms need to be clearly defined so that developers would not misinterpret the intent of land uses. He urged that traffic impact be considered.

June Armstrong, Wayne Avenue, inquired if there were any customers or demand for 1.0 FAR development.

Mary Anne Reis, Engracia Avenue, expressed concern about the future of existing businesses along the Western Avenue North corridor.

June Lee, Vanderhill Road, stated that there was need to landscape and beautify the area to create a more professional look.

Planning Manager Isomoto advised that there are no plans to upgrade the streetscape on Western Avenue at this time.

Responding to audience members' comments, Chairperson Uchima stated that he doubted that any existing businesses that are currently thriving would be demolished. He noted the considerable demand for housing and suggested that mixed-use projects could help reduce traffic and satisfy this demand.

Commissioner Guyton expressed concern that an increased FAR would create a demand for properties along this corridor and eventually lead to the demolition of existing uses. He stressed the importance of better defining the term mixed-use so that it was not open to misinterpretation.

Commissioner Muratsuchi voiced his opposition to increasing the FAR to a maximum of 1.0 in this area.

Senior Planning Associate Lodan provided examples of recently approved mixed-use projects with a FAR 1.0 and .85. Chairperson Uchima recalled that these projects did not appear particularly dense, and Commissioner Drevno pointed out that they do not back up to residences.

Planning Manager Isomoto noted that there will be a variety of commercial zones to ensure compatibility.

Chairperson Uchima stressed the importance of maintaining some level of consistency along this corridor and better defining what the mixed-use would be. He suggested that the impact on schools and public safety needs to be addressed if there are to be more residential components.

Ms. Stetson thanked Commissioners and residents for their input. She noted the general feeling that the 1.0 FAR was too intense for this area and that if mixed-use was proposed it needed to be clearly defined. She stated that she would like to bring back alternatives, perhaps a consideration of FAR overlays. She emphasized that there is nothing inherent about mixed-use developments in the commercial designation and a discretionary permit would likely be required for this type of development.

Mr. Henderson discussed existing conditions, land uses, and General Plan designations in Area 2, the west side of Western Avenue South, which is bounded on the north by Plaza del Amo and on the south by 228th Street. He reported that the area has a corridor of older offices to the south, with more industrial uses to the north of Lincoln Avenue. He noted that there are underutilized sites in this area, which is one of the City's major transportation corridors, and that it is surrounded by residential development, particularly south of Lincoln Avenue.

Mr. Henderson advised that existing land uses between Plaza del Amo and Lincoln Avenue fit the City's Business Park designation, but south of Lincoln Avenue, there is a vacant lot and some additional Business Park uses and approaching 228th Street there is a development that would fit the Local Commercial category. He reported

that Business Park uses were envisioned for the entire corridor under the existing General Plan.

Mr. Henderson explained that the objective for this area is to encourage transition of older industrial and office uses to accommodate housing for future Torrance residents. He advised that this recommendation was based on the location of the corridor, the residential uses on the other side of the street, and the residential uses directly behind those industrial/office uses.

Mr. Henderson presented two alternatives for consideration, noting that the difference between them was a difference in density. In Alternative 1, the Business Park designation would transition to the Low-Medium Density Residential category, which would accommodate 9 to 18 units per acre, while Alternative 2 would transition to a Medium Density Residential category, which allows 18 to 28 units per acre.

Commissioner Muratsuchi asked why the Business Park designation has not worked in this area; Mr. Henderson indicated that there has been no formal analysis.

Planning Manager Isomoto advised that some properties in this area were developed 60 or 70 years ago; that the area is comprised of a variety of uses; and that it has never developed cohesively as a Business Park.

Commissioner Guyton noted that there is great demand in the South Bay for small business warehousing and not much space available and expressed concern that a conversion to residential usage would negatively impact small businesses.

Responding to Commissioner Muratsuchi's inquiry about the basis for the recommendation, Ms. Stetson stated that because this is an industrial area surrounded by residential uses, it was determined that it would be an appropriate location to create additional opportunities for housing. She advised that multi-family housing was recommended due to the area's location along a major traffic corridor and while single-family residences could be an option, multi-family residential projects would be easier to develop due to the size of the parcels.

Robert Thompson, Madrona Homeowners Association, expressed concerns that the General Plan update would create zone changes and not protect existing commercial and industrial areas.

Jackie Decker, Carlow Road, voiced objections to allowing homes in this corridor because they would be impacted by noise and poor security. She stressed the need for reasonably priced senior housing.

Rudy Jimenez, Patronella Avenue, expressed concerns about the impact of additional residences on local schools and suggested that developers be responsible for building new schools.

June Lee, Vanderhill Road, stated that the subject area should never be considered for residential development, noting the considerable truck traffic on Western Avenue. She expressed concerns that there might not be space available for small businesses in the future.

Kurt Nelson, JCC Homes, Torrance Boulevard, expressed dismay that any proposal to create areas for new residential development continues to be met with negative comments. He maintained that the subject area lends itself to residential development because it is underutilized and lies on the outskirts of the City, therefore, it would have less impact on local traffic. He explained that the existing demand for housing has driven prices to the point where small senior condominiums sell for \$500,000 and recommended creating some supply to go with the demand to bring the prices down and make housing more affordable. He noted that new developments are required to pay fees that infuse money into the school system and that statistics indicate that students generated by new developments would simply displace students who live outside of Torrance.

Mary Anne Reis, Engracia Avenue, voiced her opinion that commercial areas should remain commercial areas.

Tom Rische, Carlow Road, suggested that recreational vehicle storage be considered for this area.

Tom Brewer, Evalyn Avenue, asked if any decisions would be made tonight and was advised that this was a fact-finding process and decisions would be made at a later date.

Commissioner Muratsuchi noted that this area is an island, surrounded by residential uses, and it is not performing to its fullest potential. He stated that he saw an opportunity for some residential use, but expressed concern about high-density housing developments and indicated his preference for single-family homes.

Chairperson Uchima agreed that the area could accommodate residential uses, noting that a recent proposal to locate a business in this area was met with opposition from nearby homeowners due to concerns about cut-through traffic. He stated that he thought it was unrealistic to think that zoning should never be changed as there is a need to change with the times. He stressed the need to obtain information regarding the impact on schools, including the number of students who attend Torrance schools but do not live here.

Commissioner Drevno noted that the Commission has asked that the school district provide representatives when large residential projects are considered, but so far the district has not done so.

Commissioner Guyton emphasized the importance of determining the impact on each school that would be affected and not just the overall picture.

Planning Manager Isomoto indicated that she did not believe single-family residences would be appropriate at this location because multi-family housing could be designed to be more compatible with noise from truck traffic on Western Avenue.

Chairperson Uchima and Commissioner Guyton concurred with the idea that single-family residences would not be desirable on such a busy street. Commissioner

Guyton added that the area offered the least expensive property to meet the need for affordable senior housing.

The workshop was in recess from 8:54 p.m. to 9:08 p.m.

Ms. Stetson summarized that general direction received this evening was to look at residential use for this area, but to also examine impact on neighborhood schools.

Mr. Henderson added that the consultants would be considering a multi-family option where noise concerns could be mitigated largely through design, and would bring recommendations back to the third workshop.

Mr. Henderson discussed Area 6, East Victor Precinct, bounded by Del Amo Boulevard on the north, the backside of lots that face Hawthorne Boulevard on the east, Torrance Boulevard on the south, and Anza Avenue on the west. He noted that existing conditions include Industrial and Business Park uses transitioning more and more to commercial and residential uses. He reported that future expansion needs of medical facilities and the diverse mix of existing land uses were key considerations for this area.

Referring to maps, he described existing land uses and General Plan designations. He presented three alternatives that would accommodate the future expansion of medical facilities and allow for the transition of Business Park uses to residential uses already underway. He noted that residential densities would complement surrounding uses and residents would benefit from proximity to activity centers and transit on Hawthorne Boulevard. He noted that the alternatives differed from each other in their intensity of change.

In Alternative 1, the Hospital/Medical category, with a maximum FAR of 1.0, would be applied to the hospital itself, as well as the area on the west side of Earl Street between Torrance Boulevard and Spencer Street and the east side of Earl Street to approximately halfway between Emerald and Spencer Street. Business Park designations north of Spencer Street and east of Earl Street would transition to Medium Density Residential.

Alternative 2 would not apply additional Hospital/Medical designations beyond the hospital itself and the two lots on the west side of Earl Street, between Emerald Street and Torrance Boulevard, and the areas currently designated as Business Park would be transitioned to Medium Density Residential. Alternative 3 is the same as Alternative 2, except Medium-High Density Residential would be applied on Earl Street.

Commissioner Drevno expressed concern about the future of the existing Salvation Army facility, and Planning Manager Isomoto assured her that changing the General Plan designation would not automatically mean that it would have to leave.

In response to Commissioner Guyton's inquiry, Planning Manager Isomoto confirmed that both Little Company of Mary Hospital and Torrance Memorial Hospital have indicated that they will need to expand their facilities in the future. She noted that there is a growing demand for ancillary facilities, such as medical offices, outpatient facilities and convalescent homes.

Commissioner Muratsuchi asked if a study was done to determine whether there is sufficient demand for medical facilities to justify Alternative 1 and asked about the fiscal impact on the City should these parcels be converted for medical-related uses.

Planning Manager Isomoto reported that a detailed study on the demand for medical facilities has not been conducted. She noted that there are several older convalescent homes in this area and the new land use designation could facilitate their recycling at a higher density to address the increasing demand for this type of facility.

Ms. Stetson offered to provide information about the fiscal impact on this area at a future workshop and noted that a fiscal analysis will be performed citywide once the land use plan has been completed.

Commissioners briefly discussed the transition in this area from business to residential uses. Commissioner Guyton related his experience that there is great demand for smaller commercial buildings (under 20,000 square feet), while larger ones (over 20,000 square feet) tend to sit vacant and suggested that information regarding these two categories of buildings would help the Commission determine the viability of retaining the Business Park designation in this area.

An audience member, name not given, stated that the consulting firm should be fired because the changes being proposed are not justified. He maintained that the reason commercial property does not sell is because it is being priced for residential development and that the changes suggested would do away with commercial use.

Steve Fechner, Surf Management, stated that his family owns a lot of business property in this area and while he strongly opposed the rezoning of the southeast corner of Earl and Spencer Street for residential development, now that the area has been fractured, he thought it made sense to rezone it for residential use. He reported that his facilities have a vacancy rate of approximately 3% so there is demand for business park space, but there seems to be a greater demand for housing.

Tom Brewer, Evalyn Avenue, voiced support for Alternative 1 but questioned if the current northern Business Park area should be changed to Residential, noting that Spencer Street could be a natural boundary.

Jackie Decker, Carlow Road, agreed with Mr. Brewer, stressing the need to think about tax base and not always housing.

Kurt Nelson, JCC Homes, noted the high demand for residential opportunity and stated that this was one of the few pockets in the City that lent itself to further designation as Residential.

Mark Chen, Talisman Street, expressed concern about the recent Supreme Court decision regarding eminent domain.

Voicing support for Alternative 1, Barbara Riegel, Little Company of Mary Hospital, discussed the need for future expansion to comply with State seismic requirements and to accommodate population growth and the increasing demand for health care services.

Joe Arciuch, Kathryn Avenue, questioned the practicality of updating the General Plan if staff and the City Council fail to follow it. He noted that an airport use element was not included in the General Plan.

Mary Anne Reis, Engracia Avenue, reported that existing convalescent homes in this area are in good condition.

June Lee, Vanderhill Road, voiced her opinion that the area was ideal for senior housing and health care facilities.

A brief discussion centered on looking at Spencer Street as a dividing point between Residential and Business Park uses.

Commissioner Muratsuchi stated that it was potentially in the best interest of the City to keep the Business Park designation north of Spencer Street.

Chairperson Uchima noted that the area north of Spencer Street between Earl Street and Hawthorne Boulevard is predominantly industrial and indicated that he favored maintaining that use. He suggested that existing uses on Earl Street between Spencer Street and Emerald Street be "grandfathered in" if the land use designation is changed to Hospital/Medical so that they could be rebuilt should they be damaged by fire or earthquake.

Commissioner Guyton requested clarification on whether existing properties in the area, including two churches, would have the opportunity to rebuild in case of fire.

Planning Manager Isomoto advised that existing buildings could be rebuilt under the existing zoning. She emphasized that the General Plan is a long-term vision for the future and existing uses could continue to operate until they decide they want to do something with their property.

Commissioner Muratsuchi expressed concern that changing the General Plan land use designation was the first step to changing the zoning.

Planning Manager Isomoto stated that at some point an implementing zone may either have to be developed to address a specific General Plan designation or the General Plan designation may have to be changed to accommodate one of the existing zones.

Ms. Stetson assured Mr. Chen that changing the land use designation does not give the City the right to purchase or take someone's property through eminent domain.

Commissioners Drevno, Muratsuchi, Guyton, and LaBouff indicated that they were in favor of Alternative 1, with the Business Park designation preserved north of Spencer Street.

Senior Planning Associate Lodan noted that there are rental apartments on Emerald Street that would be designated under Alternative 1 as potential hospital expansion sites.

Commissioner Muratsuchi, with concurrence by Commissioner Drevno and Chairman Uchima, stated that there is a crucial need to preserve rental housing and he was opposed that aspect of Alternative 1.

Chairperson Uchima voiced his opinion that it made sense to open up the area for senior housing and to retain the existing convalescent facilities.

Commissioner Muratsuchi expressed support for the idea of having a concentration of senior housing in close proximity to medical services.

Chairperson Uchima noted that a community looks more cohesive when there are similar developments concentrated in one area, therefore, he supports the Business Park designation north of Spencer Street and providing an opportunity for the expansion of hospital/medical uses near Little Company of Mary Hospital.

**6. PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION:
LAND USE ALTERNATIVES WITHIN FOCUS AREAS**

To be continued at future Planning Commission workshops.

Ms. Stetson announced upcoming meeting dates. She advised that the remaining four Focus Areas would be addressed on August 24, 2005, and that they would come back on September 14 and 28, 2005 with answers to questions raised and a map reflecting the direction given by the Commission this evening.

7. COMMUNITY INPUT

Tom Brewer, Evalyn Avenue, discussed the need to look to the future when evaluating the status of the apartments behind Little Company of Mary Hospital in Area 6 and stated that he would like to see that area kept for potential expansion of medical facilities. He commented that he would like to see existing aging shopping centers modernized. He questioned whether the updated General Plan would supersede the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. He suggested a preamble to the General Plan update outlining what went into its development including the input generated by the public.

Charles Thacker, Palos Verdes Boulevard, suggested that the business park behind Torrance Promenade be considered as a focus area so that the possibility of allowing schools or preschools via a conditional use permit could be considered.

Robert Feldman, Cathann Street, commented on the need to better define what constitutes a "balanced community" and not to limit focus to seven areas. He expressed concern that, as land becomes vacant, it was going to the highest bidder and this was driving development rather than the City's vision. He stressed the need to retain and create open space.

Joe Arciuch, Kathryn Avenue, inquired when the Torrance Airport area, alternative land usage, and noise abatement would be addressed.

Ms. Stetson responded that earlier discussions determined that the Airport was a stable area in terms of land use, therefore, it was not chosen as a focus area. She noted that the Commission had the ability to add or delete focus areas and that future workshops would address public safety and noise issues.

Steve Fechner, Van Ness Way, referring to the area north of Spencer Street, expressed concern that it would be one little pocket of Business Park surrounded by condominiums.

Tom Rische, Carlow Road, echoed Mr. Feldman's comments about the need to define the appropriate balance of industrial/residential/commercial land uses and not allowing development to be driven by the highest bidder. He stated that he would workshops to focus more on vision and what the City should be. He expressed an interest in knowing the current status and viability of industrial land in Torrance and how many transfer students are attending Torrance schools.

Commissioner Faulk requested information regarding the percentage being lost/gained in each land use category as a result of the proposed changes

Commissioner Muratsuchi noted that the vision for the City was being defined collectively through the General Plan update process.

Commissioner Guyton stated that it was premature to realize a vision until hearing input from staff, consultants, and the public. He expressed concerns about losing the apartments adjacent to Little Company of Mary Hospital, noting that it is difficult for businesses to attract new employees when no housing is available, especially in view of rising gas prices.

8. SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Stetson stated that the consultants had received very good direction and would begin gathering data to bring back to the Commission.

Chairman Uchima suggested that it would be helpful to know how the proposed changes affect the balance between residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Ms. Stetson agreed to provide this information, and Planning Manager Isomoto stated that staff would look at historical data to see if they could come up with a starting point.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 10:46 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to August 3, 2005 in City Council Chambers at City Hall.

Approved as Written September 14, 2005 s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk
