

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**CAPITOLA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2013**

**7 P.M. – CAPITOLA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Chairperson Routh called the Regular Meeting of the Capitola Planning Commission to order at 7 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioners: Ron Graves, Gayle Ortiz, Linda Smith, and TJ Welch and

Chairperson Mick Routh

**2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

### Additions and Deletions to Agenda - None

## Public Comments - None

1. Commission Comments

Chairperson Routh noted that again this year during the Wharf to Wharf event, Whole Foods closed off its parking lot for an unpermitted event, which included blocking the exit/entrances on Capitola Road. He had expressed his concerns to staff prior to the meeting, and was told the Police Department said it only requires a permit for amplified music. Chairperson Routh said in addition to his concern about the impact on traffic from the center, which is forced to head north on 41st Avenue, he believes Whole Foods has a requirement to provide parking.

Commissioner Graves said this situation is indicative of similar concerns about unpermitted uses both on sidewalks in front of stores and in parking lots.

Senior Planner Katie Cattan clarified that she had only checked on the permit status and not on the question of needing to provide parking.

**D.** Staff Comments - None

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. July 18, 2013, Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Ortiz noted that under item 5B, she owns a business in proximity to the project, but not the property.

**A motion to approve the July 18, 2013, meeting minutes as amended was made by Commissioner Ortiz and seconded by Commissioner Smith.**

**The motion carried by the following vote: Aye: Commissioners Graves, Ortiz, Smith, and Welch and Chairperson Routh. No: None. Abstain: None.**

**4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A.** | **1840 Wharf Road      #13-090      APN:  035-031-40** |
| Emergency Coastal Permit for a slope stabilization system to be installed due to a landslide in the AR/R-1 (Automatic Review/Single-Family Residence) Zoning District. This project requires a Coastal Permit which is appealable to the California Coastal Commission after all possible appeals are exhausted through the City. Environmental Determination:  Categorical Exemption Property Owner:  Linda White, filed 7/8/13 Representative:  Jeffrey Dunton |

Commissioner Ortiz recused herself because she owns property in proximity to the project.

The item was pulled from the consent agenda for public comment.

Neighbor Steve Walsh said that an adjacent property had what appeared to be similar work done a few years prior, and asked if this type of work simply shifts an erosion problem, causing runoff on another property, rather than solving it. He also asked if there was a way to reduce the noise.

Contractor Jeff Dunton spoke to the project and explained the problem was not caused by water runoff, but because the soil had not been properly compacted previously. The correction has required two new retaining walls and numerous helix anchors, and he explained the noise was caused by drilling and the soil compressor.

Chairperson Routh closed the public hearing. Commissioner Welch said he had visited the project and since the retaining walls are next to the foundation, he did not anticipate it would cause runoff on other properties. Chairperson Routh noted the construction noise is within allowable hours.

**A motion to approve project application #13-090 with the following conditions and findings was made by Commissioner Smith and seconded by Commissioner Welch:**

**CONDITIONS**

1. The project approval consists of an emergency coastal permit for a slope stabilization system at 1840 Wharf Road. Storm damage caused by shallow seated debris flows on the hill below the single-family house has significantly reduced the lateral support for the existing piers that support the three levels of decks on the creek side of the house based on a technical report prepared by Tharp & Associates, Inc. dated October 1, 2011. The stabilization system will consist of a concrete retaining wall with wood supports and bracing secured to the slope with deep-seated anchors. The retaining wall is approximately 46’ in width, with a slope height of approximately 5’.
2. The applicant submitted a completed coastal permit application, plans, and required technical reports within seven (7) days of the issuance of the emergency coastal permit. Plans included an erosion control plan.
3. All work shall be completed per submitted plan and the erosion control plan shall be strictly followed. Erosion control and sediment management devices shall be installed and inspected by City Public Works prior to initiating work.
4. There shall be no work in Soquel Creek, nor any debris allowed in the creek. If any work is necessary within the creek, contact California Department of Fish and Game and submit evidence to the Community Development Department that appropriate permits have been issued or are not required prior to initiating any work.
5. There shall be no staging of construction materials in the road right-of-way.
6. Hours of construction shall be Monday to Friday 7:30AM – 9:00PM, and Saturday 9:00AM – 4:00PM, per city ordinance.
7. Any significant modifications to the size approved design must be approved by the Planning Commission.
8. The application shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions.

# FINDINGS

1. **The application, subject to the conditions imposed, secure the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan, and Local Coastal Plan.**

Community Development Department Staff and the Planning Commission have reviewed the project. The coastal permit for a slope stabilization reinforced concrete retaining wall conforms to the requirements of the Local Coastal Program and conditions of approval have been included to carry out the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan and Local Coastal Plan.

B. **This project is categorically exempt under Section 15304 of the California Environmental Quality Act and is not subject to Section 753.5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.**

Section 15304 of the CEQA Guidelines exempts minor alterations to land. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

**COASTAL PERMIT FINDINGS**

A. **The application, subject to the conditions imposed, will secure the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan, and Local Coastal Plan.**

Zoning Ordinance and General Plan

The project secures the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan by replacing a vital utility line that is in need of repair in order to provide service to the city’s existing uses.

Local Coastal Plan

*D. Findings Required. A coastal permit shall be granted only upon adoption of specific written factual findings supporting the conclusion that the proposed development conforms to the certified Local Coastal Program, including, but not limited to:*

* The proposed development conforms to the City’s certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP). The specific, factual findings, as per CMC Section 17.46.090 (D) are as follows:

*(D) (2) Require Project-Specific Findings. In determining any requirement for public access, including the type of access and character of use, the city shall evaluate and document in written findings the factors identified in subsections (D) (2) (a) through (e), to the extent applicable. The findings shall explain the basis for the conclusions and decisions of the city and shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record. If an access dedication is required as a condition of approval, the findings shall explain how the adverse effects which have been identified will be alleviated or mitigated by the dedication. As used in this section, “cumulative effect” means the effect of the individual project in combination with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects, including development allowed under applicable planning and zoning.*

*(D) (2) (a) Project Effects on Demand for Access and Recreation. Identification of existing and open public access and coastal recreation areas and facilities in the regional and local vicinity of the development. Analysis of the project’s effects upon existing public access and recreation opportunities. Analysis of the project’s cumulative effects upon the use and capacity of the identified access and recreation opportunities, including public tidelands and beach resources, and upon the capacity of major coastal roads from subdivision, intensification or cumulative build-out. Projection for the anticipated demand and need for increased coastal access and recreation opportunities for the public. Analysis of the contribution of the project’s cumulative effects to any such projected increase. Description of the physical characteristics of the site and its proximity to the sea, tideland viewing points, upland recreation areas, and trail linkages to tidelands or recreation areas. Analysis of the importance and potential of the site, because of its location or other characteristics, for creating, preserving or enhancing public access to tidelands or public recreation opportunities;*

* Public access and recreation will not impacted.

*(D) (2) (b) Shoreline Processes. Description of the existing shoreline conditions, including beach profile, accessibility and usability of the beach, history of erosion or accretion, character and sources of sand, wave and sand movement, presence of shoreline protective structures, location of the line of mean high tide during the season when the beach is at its narrowest (generally during the late winter) and the proximity of that line to existing structures, and any other factors which substantially characterize or affect the shoreline processes at the site. Identification of anticipated changes to shoreline processes at the site. Identification of anticipated changes to shoreline processes and beach profile unrelated to the proposed development. Description and analysis of any reasonably likely changes, attributable to the primary and cumulative effects of the project, to: wave and sand movement affecting beaches in the vicinity of the project; the profile of the beach; the character, extent, accessibility and usability of the beach; and any other factors which characterize or affect beaches in the vicinity. Analysis of the effect of any identified changes of the project, alone or in combination with other anticipated changes, will have upon the ability of the public to use public tidelands and shoreline recreation areas;*

* No portion of the project is located along the shoreline or beach. The purpose of the project is to abandon sewer lines and relocate them within city streets.

*(D) (2) (c) Historic Public Use. Evidence of use of the site by members of the general public for a continuous five-year period (such use may be seasonal). Evidence of the type and character of use made by the public (vertical, lateral, blufftop, etc., and for passive and/or active recreational use, etc.). Identification of any agency (or person) who has maintained and/or improved the area subject to historic public use and the nature of the maintenance performed and improvements made. Identification of the record owner of the area historically used by the public and any attempts by the owner to prohibit public use of the area, including the success or failure of those attempts. Description of the potential for adverse impact on public use of the area from the proposed development (including but not limited to, creation of physical or psychological impediments to public use);*

* The proposed project will be primarily within the city owned right-of-ways.

1. *(2) (d) Physical Obstructions. Description of any physical aspects of the development which block or impede the ability of the public to get to or along the tidelands, public recreation areas, or other public coastal resources or to see the shoreline****;***

* While temporary delays will occur on certain city streets, the project will not impede the ability of the public to access the shoreline.

*(D) (2) (e) Other Adverse Impacts on Access and Recreation. Description of the development’s physical proximity and relationship to the shoreline and any public recreation area. Analysis of the extent of which buildings, walls, signs, streets or other aspects of the development, individually or cumulatively, are likely to diminish the public’s use of tidelands or lands committed to public recreation. Description of any alteration of the aesthetic, visual or recreational value of public use areas, and of any diminution of the quality or amount of recreational use of public lands which may be attributable to the individual or cumulative effects of the development.*

* While temporary delays will occur on certain city streets, the project will not impede the ability of the public to access the shoreline.

*(D) (3) (a – c) Required Findings for Public Access Exceptions. Any determination that one of the exceptions of subsection (F) (2) applies to a development shall be supported by written findings of fact, analysis and conclusions which address all of the following:*

*a. The type of access potentially applicable to the site involved (vertical, lateral, bluff top, etc.) and its location in relation to the fragile coastal resource to be protected, the agricultural use, the public safety concern, or the military facility which is the basis for the exception, as applicable;*

*b. Unavailability of any mitigating measures to manage the type, character, intensity, hours, season or location of such use so that agricultural resources, fragile coastal resources, public safety, or military security, as applicable, are protected;*

*c. Ability of the public, through another reasonable means, to reach the same area of public tidelands as would be made accessible by an access way on the subject land.*

* The project is not requesting a Public Access Exception, therefore these findings do not apply

*(D) (4) (a – f) Findings for Management Plan Conditions. Written findings in support of a condition requiring a management plan for regulating the time and manner or character of public access use must address the following factors, as applicable:*

*a. Identification and protection of specific habitat values including the reasons supporting the conclusions that such values must be protected by limiting the hours, seasons, or character of public use;*

*b. Topographic constraints of the development site;*

*c. Recreational needs of the public;*

*d. Rights of privacy of the landowner which could not be mitigated by setting the project back from the access way or otherwise conditioning the development;*

*e. The requirements of the possible accepting agency, if an offer of dedication is the mechanism for securing public access;*

*f. Feasibility of adequate setbacks, fencing, landscaping, and other methods as part of a management plan to regulate public use.*

* No Management Plan is required; therefore these findings do not apply

*(D) (5) Project complies with public access requirements, including submittal of appropriate legal documents to ensure the right of public access whenever, and as, required by the certified land use plan and Section 17.46.010 (coastal access requirements);*

* No legal documents to ensure public access rights are required for the proposed project

*(D) (6) Project complies with visitor-serving and recreational use policies;*

*Policy 17, Pg. 15 of the 1989 City General Plan, states that, “Areas designated as visitor serving and/or recreational shall be reserved for visitor support services or recreational uses. Permissible uses include, but are not limited to hotels, motels, hostels, campgrounds, food and drink service establishments, public facilities, public beaches, public recreation areas or parks, and related rental and retail establishments. Residential uses are also permitted on dual designated visitor-serving/residential parcels; specifically, a portion of the El Salto Resort, and in the Village area. Development can be accomplished through private or public means.”*

* The project complies with visitor-serving and recreational use policies in that it replaces and upgrades an existing public facility that provides utility service to existing visitor serving and/or recreational uses.

*(D) (7) Project complies with applicable standards and requirements for provision of public and private parking, pedestrian access, alternate means of transportation and/or traffic improvements;*

* The project will not permanently affect public or private parking, pedestrian access, or alternate mean of transportation as the construction will be temporary with nearly all of the resulting infrastructure being located underground.

*(D) (8) Review of project design, site plan, signing, lighting, landscaping, etc., by the city’s architectural and site review committee, and compliance with adopted design guidelines and standards, and review committee recommendations;*

* The project was reviewed by the City Public Works Director, as the majority of the work will be taking place within the City of Capitola right of way. The work in the right of way will meet the applied street design guidelines and standards.

*(D) (9) Project complies with LCP policies regarding protection of public landmarks, protection or provision of public views; and shall not block or detract from public views to and along Capitola’s shoreline;*

* No public landmarks are affected by the project. Impacts on views are temporary, limited to the presence of construction equipment and disturbance during work, as the improvements are largely underground. Therefore, the project will not block or detract from public views to and along Capitola’s shoreline.

*(D) (10) Demonstrated availability and adequacy of water and sewer services;*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

*(D) (11) Provisions of minimum water flow rates and fire response times;*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

*(D) (12) Project complies with water and energy conservation standards;*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

*(D) (13) Provision of park dedication, school impact, and other fees as may be required;*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

*(D) (14) Project complies with coastal housing policies, and applicable ordinances including condominium conversion and mobile home ordinances;*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

*(D) (15) Project complies with natural resource, habitat, and archaeological protection policies;*

* A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and adopted by the applicant. The proposed mitigation measures ensure that the project complies with the natural resource, habitat and archaeological protection policies.

*(D) (16) Project complies with Monarch butterfly habitat protection policies;*

* The project is outside of any identified sensitive habitats, specifically areas where Monarch Butterflies have been encountered, identified and documented.

*(D) (17) Project provides drainage and erosion and control measures to protect marine, stream, and wetland water quality from urban runoff and erosion;*

* The project will comply with all applicable erosion control measures.

*(D) (18) Geologic/engineering reports have been prepared by qualified professional for projects in seismic areas, geologically unstable areas, or coastal bluffs, and project complies with hazard protection policies including provision of appropriate setbacks and mitigation measures;*

* The project is not located within a geologically unstable area or on a coastal bluff.

*(D) (19) All other geological, flood and fire hazards are accounted for and mitigated in the project design;*

* The project is not located within a geologically unstable area and due to be located underground, will not be a cause for a fire hazard.

*(D) (20) Project complies with shoreline structure policies;*

* The proposed development is not located on the shoreline and therefore does not require compliance with shoreline structure policies.

*(D) (21) The uses proposed are consistent with the permitted or conditional uses of the zoning district in which the project is located;*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

*(D) (22) Conformance to requirements of all other city ordinances, zoning requirements, and project review procedures;*

* The project conforms to the requirements of all city ordinances, zoning requirements and project development review and development procedures.

*(D) (23) Project complies with the Capitola parking permit program as follows:*

* The project is replacement of an existing sewer service, therefore this finding does not apply.

B. **The application will maintain the character and integrity of the neighborhood.**

The proposed project will be primarily within the city owned right-of-ways. The project involves replacement of an existing sewer service that will be placed underground, therefore the character and integrity of the neighborhood will be maintained.

C. **A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and adopted for this project based upon the completion of an Initial Study.**

An Initial Study was prepared and circulated per CEQA requirements, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration with mitigation measures addressing potential impacts adopted based on the determination that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

**The motion carried by the following vote: Aye: Commissioners Graves, Smith, and Welch and Chairperson Routh. No: None. Abstain: Commissioner Ortiz.**

**5.** **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A.** | **2001 41st Avenue      #13-083      APN:  034-511-16** |
| Design Permit to remodel an existing commercial building, master sign program, and tree permit to remove a tree in the CC (Community Commercial) Zoning District. Environmental Determination:  Categorical Exemption Property Owner:  Joel and Priscilla Brown, filed 6/19/13 Representative:  Steve Thomas |

Commissioner Ortiz rejoined the meeting. Senior Planner Cattan presented the staff report, noting the lot is unusual in that it has two street corners and three street frontages. She explained the project includes removing a tree that has displaced pavement and is not healthy, and that the landscaping requirement calls for a minimum of 30 trees.

She reviewed the signage, noting that code does not allow for both a wall sign and a monument sign along 41st Avenue. She added that the proposed wall signage for that location is two separate sections, a logo and wording, but their combined size is significantly smaller than the permitted size for a single sign. She also explained that the lettering extends beyond the permitted distance from the wall because it is attached to the canopy, not the wall. The Commission can allow that.

Steve Thomas represented the applicant. Mr. Thomas noted the business has been in Capitola since 1980. He shared images of recent remodels in the Monterey Bay area and visibility on 41st Avenue. He requested that Burger King be allowed to keep the monument sign along 41st Avenue and exchange the permitted wall sign facing 40th Avenue for one facing the restaurant parking lot.

The commissioners clarified the size, location, and styles of desired signs and discussed replacing the tree to be removed.

Chairperson Routh opened the public hearing. There was no public comment and he closed the hearing.

Commissioner Graves said the remodel will be improvement. He appreciated the staff recommendation that adheres to code for signage, but said he could support a trade for a north elevation parking lot sign. He does not like the monument sign.

Commissioner Ortiz concurred. She also would like to keep a tree along 41st Avenue, but leave the location up to the applicant. She said she checked with the Santa Cruz Water Department to confirm that drip irrigation was permitted, and was told that the City does have jurisdiction to make that determination.

Commissioner Welch also said he could support a sign facing the parking north elevation in lieu of 40th and removal of only the monument sign along Clares.

Commissioner Smith agreed and added she is comfortable determining the logo and “Home of Whopper” lettering constitute one sign for the 41st Avenue frontage.

Chairperson Routh also supports logo signage on the north and south elevations without any lettering.

**A motion to approve project application #13-083 with the following conditions and findings was made by Commissioner Graves and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz:**

**CONDITIONS**

1. The project approval consists of an extensive interior and exterior remodel of an existing commercial building (Burger King). No new square footage is proposed, but improvements include new exterior materials on all facades, four new wall signs, landscaping, and removal of one tree.
2. Plans submitted for a Building Permit must substantially comply with the plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission on August 1, 2013. Any significant modifications to the size or exterior appearance of the approved design must be approved by the Planning Commission. Similarly, any significant change to the use itself, or the site, must be approved by the Planning Commission.
3. The application shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission upon evidence of non-compliance with conditions of approval or applicable municipal code provisions.
4. Delivery hours shall be limited to 8 a.m.-8 p.m. to minimize noise impacts to neighboring residents. Delivery vehicles shall not be permitted to remain at idle during non-delivery hours.
5. Air-conditioning equipment and other roof top equipment shall be screened from view and fall within the allowable city permitted decibel levels. No roof equipment is to be visible to the general public. Any necessary roof screening is to match the color of the building as closely as possible. Plans for any necessary screening shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to, or in conjunction with, building permit submittal.
6. Trash enclosures shall be covered, gated, and maintained to provide a clean and sanitary area.
7. Security lighting in the rear of the store shall be shielded to prevent light from shining on to neighboring properties.
8. Prior to issuance of a building permit, any necessary encroachment permit shall be obtained from the Public Works Director.
9. The applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Santa Cruz Water District with regard to the required landscape irrigation and any other new water fixture requirements.
10. The final landscape plan submitted with the building permit application shall include the specific number of plants of each type and their size, as well as the irrigation system to be utilized. A drip irrigation system shall be incorporated as part of the landscape plan.
11. The project shall meet the 41st Avenue Design Guideline which recommends one 24” box tree be planted for every two car spaces. The total number of trees on site shall be no less than 30 trees. One tree must be planted along the 41st Avenue street frontage.
12. The existing monument sign along Clares Street must be removed from the site prior to the installation of the new wall signs on the property. The existing monument sign along 41st Avenue is authorized. Two wall signs along 41st Avenue are authorized. One wall sign containing the Burger King logo is authorized on the north elevation facing the parking lot. One wall sign containing the Burger King logo is authorized on the south elevation facing Clares Street. No additional signs are allowed without approval of the Planning Commission. The sign face of existing directional signs within the parking lot may be replaced with a new sign that is substantially the same size and design as the existing signs. No additional logos or wording may be added.
13. Window signs may not exceed one-third of the total area of the window.

**FINDINGS**

1. **The application, subject to the conditions imposed, will secure the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan, and Local Coastal Plan.**

Community Development Department Staff, the Architectural and Site Review Committee, and the Planning Commission have all reviewed the project. The project conforms with the development standards of the CC (Community Commercial) Zoning District and the 41st Avenue Design Guidelines. Conditions of approval have been included to carry out the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan.

1. **The application will maintain the character and integrity of the neighborhood.**

Community Development Department Staff, the Architectural and Site Review Committee, and the Planning Commission have all reviewed the project. The project conforms with the development standards of the CC (Community Commercial) Zoning District and the 41st Avenue Design Guidelines. Conditions of approval have been included to ensure that the project maintains the character and integrity of the area. The area is defined by a mix of commercial uses, including stand alone businesses, plazas, and a mall.

1. **This project is categorically exempt under Section 15301(e)(2) of the California Environmental Quality Act and is not subject to Section 753.5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.**

Section 15301(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines exempts interior or exterior alterations to existing structures. No adverse environmental impacts were discovered during review of the proposed project.

**The motion carried by the following vote: Aye: Commissioners Graves, Ortiz, Smith, and Welch and Chairperson Routh. No: None. Abstain: None.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **B.** | **Sign Content** |
| Senior Planner Cattan reported that in response to concern about the use of the word “restaurant” on the awning of a business with no sit-down service, the city attorney reviewed how much oversight the City has. He indicated that while it can clearly regulate land use along with sign size and placement, content jurisdiction is much murkier.  Commissioner Graves said he reviewed the attorney’s recommendation and thanked staff for follow-up. |

1. **DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A.** | **General Plan Update** |
| Community Development Director Grunow presented a report on the status of the General Plan update. He reviewed the initial goals and response to date, and the City Council approved a revised work plan in June. It reviewed the budget on July 25along with a sample of a revised, more general approach organized by land use designations. The Zoning Ordinance and Local Coastal Plan revisions will be separated from the General Plan adoption, and will return to the Planning Commission for guidance.  Director Grunow reviewed the current budget and expenditures to date, and noted the consultants are contractually obligated to complete the plan within budget. However, he sees staff taking the lead and building upon the framework to date. He anticipates a meeting of the GPAC in September or October, and a joint meeting/study session with the City Council to review the work in the fall.  Commissioners expressed support for the new approach. Commission Smith asked that the joint study session target specific issues. Commissioner Graves noted that attendance at community meetings fell off and he would suggest finding a way to reenergize the initial participants in order to avoid conflict when time comes to adopt the revision.  . |
|  |

1. **COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS**

Commissioner Graves said that recent work on the Ulta project at the Capitola Mall appears to include changes to parking and tree removal that he did not recall in the project description approved by the Commission or 41st Avenue guidelines. Senior Planner Cattan replied that she believes the work in question is in response to the building official’s discovery that the plan was not ADA compliant.

Commissioner Smith noted that she will not be able to attend the September and October meetings. Several other commissioners said they will be away in late September and requested any special meetings avoid that time.

1. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning Commission adjourned the meeting at 8:10 p.m. to a Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to be held on Thursday, Sept. 5, 2013, at 7 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 420 Capitola Avenue, Capitola, California.

Approved by the Planning Commission on Sept. 5, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Linda Fridy, Minute Clerk