

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE LANCASTER PLANNING COMMISSION

November 19, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mann called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

INVOCATION

A moment of silence was observed in honor of the troops.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner MacPherson led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann.

Absent: None.

Also present were the Deputy City Attorney (Doug Evertz), Planning Director (Brian Ludicke), Principal Planner (Silvia Donovan), Assistant Planner (Elma Watson), Principal Civil Engineer (Carlyle Workman), Recording Secretary (Joy Reyes), and an audience of approximately 80 people.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Troth and seconded by Commissioner Salazar to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 15, 2007, and Special Meeting of October 22, 2007. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

7. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 66680 & TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 69747

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. and moved the item up to hear a request by Stratham Homes for a subdivision of 72.9± gross-acre lot located on the southwest corner of 52nd Street West and Avenue K-8. Tentative Tract Map No. 66680 is a subdivision for 238 single family lots (128 lots are within the R-7,000 Zone, 89 lots are within the R-10,000 Zone, and 21 lots are within the R-15,000 Zone). Tentative Parcel Map No. 69747 would subdivide the property into four parcels for financial purposes to allow the individual parcels to be sold on 5± gross acres located on the west side of 30th Street West and future Avenue M-6. There was a letter from the applicant requesting for a continuance of the item.

Silvia Donovan presented the staff report.

There were members of the audience who wished to comment, as follows:

Patricia Stevens, resident of Lancaster, CA, wanted clarification as to what a continuance meant. She lives on K-10 and 50th and her concern was the access on K-8, which is currently a dirt road so would it get paved. The schools would also be greatly impacted by the developments. She was also concerned about the water issue. The developments going in the valley are making it more stressful for everybody to deal with the water crisis. She said that she also had the same concerns about Items 3a, 3d and 3e. Carlyle Workman addressed her concern regarding the access issue. Chairman Mann stated that when a developer comes to the City, there is a fee paid by the developer to the local school districts (elementary and high school) to mitigate the impact of developments. As for the water issue, the water purveyor would issue a will-serve letter to the developers.

Ike Winchell, after being informed by Chairman Mann that the items would be continued, declined to speak.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Commissioner Faux to continue Tentative Tract Map No. 66680 and Tentative Parcel Map No. 69747 to the January 28, 2008, Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

CONTINUED ITEMS

2. Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m. to hear the following three continued items concurrently. Vice Chairman Troth recused himself from the hearing citing that his residence is within 500 feet of the development, and that he is a stockholder of a company that has merged with another company that is a tenant in one of Mr. Eliopoulos' buildings.

a. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 04-04 & ZONE CHANGE NO. 04-05

Requests listed below by JP Eliopoulos Enterprises on 8.5± gross acres located at the southeast corner of Avenue K and 30th Street West.

1. Amend General Plan land use designation for the subject property from UR (Urban Residential, 2.1 to 6.5 dwelling units per acre) to C (Commercial) and MR2 (Multiple-Family Residential, 15.1 to 30 dwelling units per acre).
2. Rezone property from R-10,000 (single family residential one dwelling unit per 10,000 square feet) to CPD (Commercial Planned Development) and HDR (High Density Residential, 15.1 to 30 dwelling units per acre) Zones.

Brian Ludicke presented the staff report. Staff is just going over the conceptual redesigns that came up from the direction given by the Planning Commission last month. Staff presented to the applicant several redesign options. The Commission needs to weigh whether those redesigns are better, worse or about the same as what was seen at the last meeting. One possible redesign involves taking the parking that is currently along this western side of what would be the Fresh & Easy store, converting that into a parallel parking arrangement, taking the setback that is currently at 10 feet along this eastern side of that building, and shifting that building some 10 feet further to the west. Other than the buffer, there really is no change in design 1A, other than the increase the amount of buffering along the easterly wall of the building. The design 2 concept, in responding to one of the Commission's concerns about whether there might be a better design by using housing as a transition between the commercial and the existing residential to the east, would essentially take the commercial design area, front that to 30th and use the condominium townhouse development as a transition between this and the existing residential area. In this particular layout, it would still have access to this project from 30th Street West. There will be no left-turn component off of Avenue K in this design. In design 3, there is a need to provide access into the townhouse-style area. The Fire Department indicated this may be accommodated with an access that comes from the commercial site that would then create a residential component in which the residents, who have no alternative other than this access, are entering through the commercial area. This proposed redesign does not respond to the any of the Commission's concerns. What it does is it maintains the orientation of these building towards Avenue K. It creates a fire access and pedestrian access from Avenue K-1. This particular design does try to address the Commission's concern in regards to providing a transition, and it does retain the orientation of the commercial area toward Avenue K. Instead of running the commercial area all the way over to the eastern property line, what it relies on instead is taking some of this condominium townhouse design, and running it northward as transition between this residential area to the east and the commercial area to the west. Access to the residential area is retained. The opinion of Public Works Department about the possibility of a pedestrian access was also sought. The City would need to acquire a pedestrian easement of some kind, because the homeowners association that has formed as part of this condominium project is not going to allow it. One of the concerns from staff's stand point is squeezing some of the parking field for

some of these commercial buildings as it is laid out. This lowers the amount of commercial development, and increases the number of housing units from 50 to about 62.

The following people came up to speak for and against Items 2a and 2b.

Nathan Ung, representing the applicant, came forward and submitted exhibits to the Commission. He stated that the design before the Commission (Design 1, 2 and 3b) were schematic designs provided to staff per the direction of the Commission. Design 1a was able to improve the project by increasing the buffer between the Fresh & Easy building and the residence to the east. With design 1 and 1a, it allows direct connectivity between K-1 and the commercial center. Traffic-wise, design 1 and 1a is over-parked. Design 2 and 3b were about 14 percent under-parked. As for the traffic route, design 1 and 1a provide access on Avenue K and 30th Street West. Design 2 and 3b would require opening up Avenue K-1 to the townhome in order to meet the fire department access requirement. In regards to safety, there is no issue on design 1 and 1a as they had worked with the adjacent owners, and addressed this concern by putting additional wrought on the fencing, and installing security cameras along the building. Designs 2 and 3b have security concerns because it is an invitation to the public to trespass on to private property in the townhome areas. Regarding buffering, the original design submitted was a 10-foot setback that was required by the City's ordinances. However, based on the comments from the Planning Commission, staff and the tenant, it could become a better project if buffer from 10 feet to 20 feet could be increased. Mr. Ung stated that financial viability of the center is also another issue. Design 3b would be detrimental to the project as it would reduce the amount of square feet that can be rented out. Designs 1, 1a and 2 would allow bringing in as many tenants and as many jobs to the community. Design 3, however, with its smaller footprint, would mean that there will be fewer businesses and job opportunities for the community. Regarding orientation on Avenue K, it is a major concern of tenants that their business might be impacted and that it might lead to a potential blight of the center in the future. Mr. Ung showed the Planning Commission that the 21-member citizen group that is planning on the 2030 General Plan is proposing commercial on the southwest corner of 30th & K, commercial on the southeast side of 30th & K, and a multi-family unit project to the south. The design that they came up with were in consonance to the direction given to them by City Council. He invited Russ Perkins from Fresh & Easy and Tom Davies, representative from Rite-Aid, to come up and talk about their respective stores.

Russell Perkins, representing Fresh & Easy, stated that six stores have now been open in the Los Angeles Valley area and that he is now a true convert of what their stores have to offer. The products are well-priced, healthy and good-tasting. Fresh & Easy wants to be a good neighbor to each of the communities in which it enters into, and they would really like to be a part of this community beyond this corner. They have a quiet, odorless, efficient operation. No food preparation occurs on-site. They also have a very efficient recycling program, in which they will have quite a bit less waste product than other retail stores of this size; they intend to be good for the environment. They are utilizing a brand new fleet of vehicles, which are more fuel efficient and quieter. The refrigeration systems on these trucks are running on a quieter hybrid operation; they have a policy to turn that refrigeration system off while off-loading the trucks. They want to hire much of their staff from the local community. While Fresh & Easy does want to be at this site, obviously, the convenience, efficiency of the parking and traffic on site as well as the vibrancy of the businesses on the site are all factors that influence their decision to want to be here in the City. They do have an interest on the site, but they are very concerned about the direction that some of the site planning efforts are going.

Tom Davies, representing Rite-Aid Drugstores and Davies Properties, stated that they have been the preferred developer for Rite-Aid Drugstores for the last 3 years in northern Los Angeles County. The most important qualities that a drugstore and a grocery store require in order to be successful are easy access into the site, a convenient location surrounded by the area population, visibility to the primary street (that would be Avenue K in this situation), and adequate parking with a good parking feel in front of the stores. Drugstores must have these qualities because of the proliferation of outlets selling pharmaceuticals. There are larger groceries, discounts stores such as Target and Wal-Mart, house clubs such as Costco, and mail-order. They need to be situated on a corner, as shown on site plan 1 & 1a, as these plans fill all those requirements for success. Site plan 2 does not work well; both tenants would require left-turn access into the center. Site plan 3 is better than 2, however, the shops are clear to the right hand side of the center as oppose to being in between the anchors, which ultimately bring in all the customers. The parking feel in front of those shops is somewhat reduced because the main drive-in access into the center leads right into the shops. Davies Properties was asked about the alcohol policies of Rite-Aid, and have agreed to all prior conditions of approval as also agreed upon by Fresh & Easy.

Darth Eliopulos, resident of Lancaster, California, stated that he lives less than 8/10's of a mile from this project. He was very much interested in an opportunity to do something that is different and unique. The citizens advisory workshop relative to the general plan update would show these types of projects as being viable and desirable within our community. A neighborhood-oriented shopping such as the one being proposed tonight will be created as a neighbor to northwest corner, the Antelope Valley College, who is in favor of the project. Communities such as Fullerton and La Mirada where commercial properties are built around educational facilities are not hurting the values in those areas. Mr. Eliopulos stated he is a strong believer in developments that take into consideration upscale multi-family housing along with upscale commercial development at the same time. Within the City right now, there are two other sites that from a planning stand point don't necessarily comply with the normal development transition. In these cases, they go from commercial and retail to residential, and those being specifically the Vallarta project on Avenue I, and the northeast corner of 20th Street West and Avenue L. The developer has done an extensive design review to create elevations that enhance the views of the east side of the project where the homeowners reside. It is concerning that the current plan does not allow for public access from Avenue K-1. What the developers had done is kept the buffer to the community, and has not turned the Brentwood homes into a destination transient area to get through to this project. For the commercial part, the developer has secured strong anchor tenants, and viable to this "community" is to have viable stores that will both feed one another with those two anchor tenants, as well as enhance the value of those multi-units that are being proposed in there.

Kevin Sanders, resident of Lancaster, California, urged the Commission to follow the recommendation of the General Plan Citizens Advisory Committee in supporting a mix-use development at this location. In an era of rising gasoline prices, a project combining luxury townhomes and neighborhood shopping amenities make both good financial and planning sense. This is the type of smart growth development that's being used effectively in high-end communities like Santa Clarita and Irvine. This type of project is needed in West Lancaster, and he urged the Commission's favorable consideration of the Eliopulos center.

Anna Graves, resident of Lancaster, California, did a private survey for the residents at the Marbella Villas. The questions pertained to ingress and egress onto 30th Street West, a stop light at Avenue K-4, parking, wider sidewalks, a walk over from the college to the Marinita project, 25 percent reduction in the high density of the condos in the Eliopulos project, gingerbread on the Marinita, and a block wall from the Marinita to the Marbella. She spoke with Silvia Donovan, and some of her questions were answered. There will be egress for the Marbella Villas and senior citizens complex across the street. She stated Marbella Villas has 33 extra parking spaces and they fight over parking all the time. She would like to see an 8-foot sidewalk and a 4-foot section behind the bus stop areas for handicapped persons. She would like the Marinita to have fences as high as theirs. She also stated that even though the fences have wrought iron bars, people use the lower access to their benefit by jumping on it to hop over in to the Marbella Villas. As a result of this, cars and condominium units have been broken into.

Patricia Harris, resident of Lancaster, California, said that she lived in close proximity to the project. She works as an administrative assistant in the President's office at the college and that she is in support of the Eliopulos center because it will meet the needs of the expanding college community, as well as benefit the local residents greatly. The opportunity to live, shop and enjoy meals and beverages within walking distance of the college will be attractive to many of the faculty staff and students as the college continues to grow. As she is originally from England, she is very familiar with Tesco stores. The store is an excellent addition to the local neighborhood. She understands as a resident that the traffic and security concerns are problems for the local residents, as well as the college and students, but she is confident that the issues can work out to everyone's satisfaction. It is important to develop this area as it has just been used for dumping furniture in the past. She feels that it is a worthy and well-planned project.

Bill Koukourikos, representing the St. Constantine Hellenic Greek Orthodox Church, voiced his support for the Eliopulos project. For years, the dirt north of the church has just been an ugly site to drive around. The project is a viable one for this corner for a basic reason; the Lancaster and Palmdale area is the fastest growing community in California, and the tenth largest and fastest growing in the nation. For anyone, it should be obvious that if there's dirt around their house, and somebody owns that dirt, somebody will be building on it sooner or later. Their options are single family homes, commercial, multi-family dwellings or industrial. In a corner where the public record shows 45,000 vehicle operations every single day, building single family homes is not a viable option. Additionally on the other side, the college has 14,000 students that attend every single day, and since those students have nowhere to go and eat, they have to go in their cars, go somewhere, even if it's a mile away to get something to eat. Even if half of those students go somewhere in their cars, there are 7,000 of those traffic movements going through the intersection. Putting a Tesco food or a Subway across where they can go get something is perfect. People can just walk across the street, thus, save gas, pollution and traffic for the city. The multi-family housing is also a viable option for the center, because single-family homes in such a busy area probably do not make a good mix.

Dr. Jackie Fisher, President and Superintendent at Antelope Valley College, made a statement to support the three projects across the street from the college. He indicated that the Board of Trustees is in support of design 1a and the Marinita project. He also commented that these two projects will provide jobs to students, as student retention and jobs go hand and hand. These two projects will bring both full-time and part-time jobs for students.

Gerald Bigalk, resident of Lancaster, California, remarked that he would like to speak in favor of the project. Talking about tax for the schools, most people do not realize the bottom money goes up to Sacramento, and then it gets short threshold up there, and the schools get 4 cents for every dollar that goes to Sacramento of the fees that these developers pay. If people complain about their scenic views blocked, he suggested for them to buy the land. The developer develops a first-class project, and it is evident when you go around town that they are all first class. He still has some time left to speak and he would like to use it for later.

Dotty Jernigan, resident of Lancaster, California, stated that she had a challenge in the EIR based on the fact that it is not an adequate or proper environmental review under CEQA guidelines. The people who spoke in favor of the project do not even live in the area so they would not be affected by this project. She will not shop in the proposed stores. She stated that the figures used by Mr. Nathan Ung from Zillow.com were not an appropriate tool to use for appraisal purposes. She was appalled that the Board of Directors for the College would even support this project.

Mike Elias, resident of Lancaster, California, said that this mix-use situation would be the worst zoning that can happen to a city. He found an ideal community in an R-10,000 neighborhood that has low traffic, no noise, and no kids running around all day. Most of them are retired people. If the project comes through, more projects like this would follow suit. If this project gets approved, he would just move out of Lancaster.

Barbara Foltin, resident of Lancaster, California, commented that she was confused about Dr. Fisher's remark. The college students now having a place to go to eat and hang out, because that is what the cafeteria is for. The property was zoned residential to protect the college, the neighborhood and the quality of life in Lancaster. She is objecting to any further high density housing along 30th Street West. There is already a plethora of multi-family housing in the area that contributes to traffic, helicopters flying over their heads every weekend, and vandalism in their neighborhood. There is no need to put stores in every corner and cram homes together. As one speaker put it aptly, residents are considered insignificant.

John Foltin, resident of Lancaster, California, remarked that the proposed project falls in the category of Planning 101 gone wrong. The British company Tesco should look for a more suitable location for their market. The area should keep its current zoning. City planning should be telling the developers what the proper development of a site is and not vice versa. If he was a developer, he would propose building a gated seniors citizens project because they do not need a 2-story home or a large backyard to take care of. This type of project would be accepted and welcomed by the people in Brentwood Estates, and would also dovetail nicely with the existing senior Prestige facility to the south. This would eliminate some of the concerns such as noise decibel levels, increased traffic and the loss of a nice view.

Anne Durr, resident of Lancaster, California, said that her home was vandalized Saturday night, and all the trees on 28th Street West were nearly destroyed. She was a victim in this high crime area and would not like to see the densely packed residence being planned in that location. It was interesting that the redesigns presented tonight did not do anything to address the Commission's comment about opening up the foot traffic pattern to the corner. They still show their shopping center sign proudly landmarked right on the corner of that intersection. The insufficient parking in their proposed housing has still not been addressed, and the residents of Marbella have repeatedly spoken about how problematic this is. She commended Mr. Foltin for

his comments about how we have far too many 2-story homes as it is, and it is difficult to find single story homes for retirees.

Charles Wordsworth, resident of Lancaster, California, stated that the developers drew in advance alternate plans and paid lip service to the recommendations by the Commissioners at the last meeting. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission allowed the developer four months to come up with modified approach. In a few days, it was back to the Planning Department with a batch of dashed off or rehashed lay-outs considered an insult to the Planning Commission and to local residents. Design 2 asked to provide for 50 units – the plan shows only 47 units. The layout is contrived so the only access to the residential section is via Avenue K-1. With regards to the commercial section, pointing at the drawing of the Fresh and Easy store, Mr. Wordsworth stated that this would present bad visibility for the tenants of Prestige Assisted Living. The plans need to be sent back to the drawing board because they are completely unacceptable.

Ramasamy Mahadevan, resident of Lancaster, California, urged the Planning Commission not to consider the zone change request. He commented that a strip mall serving alcohol across the street from a college with a planned high density residential project is a deadly combination as it would greatly impact crime rate. There would be a need for more law enforcement, and it will become a bad influence to the students of the college. He stated that it is incomprehensible that the college president would even support this project.

Malessa Ramirez, resident of Lancaster, California, voiced her opposition to the project because it would take away a lot of what she came to Lancaster for, such as tree-lined streets and the family living environment that is provided here. There are more than enough convenience stores and fast food places for the residents.

Gene Kiefer, resident of Lancaster, California, remarked that this project is all about greed. There are enough stores in the neighborhood to meet their needs. He hopes that the Planning Commission and the Council would consider the common good of the citizens.

David McCaslin, resident of Lancaster, California, read a letter that his wife sent to the AV Press. He reiterated his opposition to the zoning change and that the people who spoke in favor of the project were not even residents of the area. The residents have spoken clearly of their opposition and made that understood to Mr. Ung.

Linda McCaslin, resident of Lancaster, California, commented that she was taking issue with the EIR over aesthetics and land use in Planning. For many years, they have enjoyed the scenic view of the mountains and this will now be taken away from them. Their quality of life and the value of their property would be greatly diminished. The residents have been shown utter contempt and disregard by the developer.

Destiny McCaslin, resident of Lancaster, California, remarked that if this project goes through, she would not be able to see the sunset, and she would have to climb a tree to see over the building blocking the sunset.

Jess Diaz, resident of Lancaster, California, was concerned about the crime element that the project would bring into the area. The developer is totally uncaring of citizens and their wishes. He would not even bother shopping at the Rite-Aid and Fresh and Easy stores.

Jean Diaz, resident of Lancaster, California, strongly urged the Commission to keep the zoning residential. She said she moved from the eastside where their former home was situated right behind a Rite-Aid and an Albertson's because she got tired of the police helicopters buzzing overhead and the shopping carts littered in the neighborhood. She wondered if the developer's mother would not mind having those shopping carts parked on her driveway.

Ron Hitchcock, resident of Lancaster, California, opined that this project did not have to be adversarial and that it was just moving too fast right now. He suggested waiting until the General Plan Update was finalized before going forward with this project. The developer, the residents and the City could come up with a compromise that would be for the greater good of all.

Ray Chavira, resident of Lancaster, California, clarified that as a member of the General Plan Citizens Advisory Committee, they never specifically approved, contrary to what was already said, mixed use development on that corner. The committee took the basic principle of infill that you fill empty spots from the corner of the city out, and that was about the extent of that kind of discussion. So he hoped the record would show some correction after due consideration that the committee is not in the business of approving any specific development for that corner. It is the job of the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Chairman Mann wanted to go on record that he received two letters, one from an Ed Knassen (in favor) and another from an Adelle Deschler (in opposition). Neither one of them was able to attend the meeting tonight.

Jerry Bigalk came back up to use his remaining time and commented that the developer spent 2 ½ years developing the project and that if the residents want to have single family units, the developer could put in 2 story single family units.

Nathan Ung stated that they did not have any rebuttal to the comments but he wanted to go on record that the comment for CUP 07-10 Item No. 41 was vague and that they did not have direction from staff what it meant. The other item is CUP 05-07 Item No. 14, which they have also submitted a letter to staff stating that the 3-foot ground elevation difference will be detrimental to the project. The last is Item 16, which states to modify their plans and bring it back to Planning Commission for review and approval. They already submitted a letter to Planning Commission today to request for an action for approval or denial of all the items before the Planning Commission in one vote or all the actions taken care of today.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 9:16 p.m. Commissioner MacPherson stated that this is an important corner with the college as a key element so a lot of factors have to be very carefully considered. He was not happy that the developer did not seem to make an effort to address issues that were brought forward. He thought that the redesigns needed to be sent back and done properly. Commissioner Salazar concurred with Commissioner MacPherson's comments and remarked that he could not support a project that a developer was just trying to force their agenda on the Commission. Commissioner Faux also signified her acquiescence to the two Commissioners' comments, stating that even though she would like to see a Fresh and Easy Store in that location, they have to do what is best for the community. Chairman Mann said that on the contrary, he thought that the developer did make an attempt, and that looking at what was presented, there might be a nucleus that could be worked with. Brian said that Design 3B

would be the closest in terms of responding to the Commission's concerns and maintaining the desire of commercial tenants to face Avenue K.

Chairman Mann reopened the public hearing to ask Nathan Ung what his preference was between Designs 2 and 3, to which Nathan Ung responded that they were not happy with either that was why they were pushing for Design 1. However, Design 2 would make a viable center.

Chairman Mann reclosed the public hearing. Commissioner MacPherson said that he was conflicted because he did not want to hold up the developer and yet, he felt that specific directions the Commissions made were not followed properly. Commissioner Salazar reiterated his stance that he could not support a project that is not designed properly.

Another Commissioners discussion ensued and it was determined at the end of the discussion that the body had to make a motion separately on the three agenda items. On the General Plan Amendment and Zone Changes, their action is more advisory to the City Council. The Commission would then take a vote on the Conditional Use Permit and Tentative Parcel Map.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Commissioner Faux to adopt Resolution No. 07-46, a resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lancaster, California, certifying the final environmental impact report, adopting environmental findings, and recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 04-04 and Zone Change No. 04-05, with the commercial zone (westerly side) and HDR zone (easterly side) to conform to the layout of Design No. 2. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, and Chairman Mann
NOES: Commissioner Salazar
ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Troth
ABSENT: None.

b. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 07-10, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 05-07 & TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 69301

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m. to hear a request by JP Eliopoulos Enterprises for the requests listed below on 8.5± gross acres located at the southeast corner of Avenue K and 30th Street West.

1. Conditional Use Permit No. 07-10 to construct 3 buildings totaling 41,849 square feet of commercial retail in the CPD Zone on 5.0± net acres.
2. Conditional Use Permit No. 05-07 to construct 50 multiple family units in the HDR Zone on 3.5± net acres.
3. Tentative Parcel Map No. 69301 to create 4 parcels on the site ranging in size from 1.4 acres to 3.5 acres in the CPD and HDR Zones on 8.5 net acres.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 9:16 p.m.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Commissioner Faux to approve Conditional Use Permit No. 07-10, Conditional Use Permit No. 05-07 & Tentative Parcel Map No. 69301, with the following design changes related to Schematic Plan No. 2:

1. Entry driveway to the project off of Avenue K to be aligned with Eliopulos Drive to the north.
2. Entry driveway to encompass an access for both the commercial and residential projects ("T" intersection).
3. Relocate the condominiums in the future driveway area to the east.
4. Condominium project units along the east property line shall consist of 50% 1-story and 50% 2-story buildings.
5. Strengthen and provide more pedestrian access between the high density residential and commercial portions of the project.
6. Provide east-west driveway to the south between the commercial and residential portions for emergency access.

Staff to refine the site plan and create final conditions of approval for the conditional use permits. The above conditional use permits and tentative parcel map to be returned to Planning Commission at next available meeting. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson and Chairman Mann

NOES: Commissioner Salazar

ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Troth

ABSENT: None.

c. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 06-01 & ZONE CHANGE NO. 06-01

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 7:26 p.m. to hear a request by Lancaster Redevelopment Agency for the requests listed below on 4.7± gross acres located at the southwest corner of Avenue K and 30th Street West.

1. Amend General Plan land use designation for the subject property from UR (Urban Residential, 2.1 to 6.5 dwelling units per acre) to C (Commercial).
2. Rezone property from R-7,000 (single-family residential one dwelling unit per 7,000 square feet) to CPD (Commercial Planned Development) Zone.

Dave Garrison, representing Marinita Development, said that they did not have any problems with the conditions. The EIR is very specific and detailed in terms of discussing and describing their project, and all the mitigations that must take place for them to comfortably develop. They worked very closely with staff over the years, including the property owner which is the school district.

Dave Garrison, after hearing the comments from residents, came back up to remark that most of the comments were directed to the project on the southeast corner, which is unfortunate, because he felt that those two can really work together in harmony. They agree with the comments that were made in a positive sense as it relates to the layout. Access, parking, full training is absolute critical to a commercial project. Without that, the project is just destined for not good things. He suggested for the Commission to take these things into account when deciding what site plans to use. There was one woman who came up and handed the Commission something that he was not privy to so he would not know what that was or if he could address that. Mr. Garrison stated that she was at the homeowners meeting with Marbella, and she was asking for some unusual things that they, as developers, could not consider.

Chairman Mann had to reopen the public hearing to accommodate Dave Garrison, who wanted to make a statement that he did not want their project tainted with the project on the southeast corner so he would like to request the Commission to look at and decide on their project separately and independently.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 9:16 p.m.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Chairman Mann to adopt Resolution No. 07-47, a resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lancaster, California, certifying the final environmental impact report, adopting environmental findings, and recommending to the City Council approval of General Plan Amendment No. 06-01 and Zone Change No. 06-01. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: Vice Chairman Troth
ABSENT: None.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

4. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 17 - LANCASTER MUNICIPAL CODE - ALCOHOL SALES ESTABLISHMENTS

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 10:20 p.m. to hear a request by the Planning Department for an amendment of Title 17 of the City of Lancaster Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) revising the requirements for alcohol sales establishments through the addition of Chapter 17.42 and associated amendments within Chapters 17.12, 17.16, and 17.32. With the concurrence of the Planning Commissioners, this agenda item was taken out of order and heard after Items 2a, 2b and 2c.

Brian Ludicke presented the staff report. Mr. Ludicke stated that what is presented before the Commission, staff has taken comments, evaluated them and in some cases, proposed changes to the ordinance to respond to concerns. One of the issues raised was the definition of a bona fide restaurant. Currently, the City code uses the definition as the State Alcoholic Beverage

Control Board defines it, which states that bona fide restaurants be at least 51% of the revenue should be derived from food (non-alcohol). A suggestion was made to raise the percentage to perhaps 60% or 65%. The change was not recommended by the staff because there was no legal basis and no rational standard why a certain percentage would be a better rate in determining a bona fide restaurant. Certain wordings related to the requirement for alcohol beverage service were also looked into to address concerns. There was an issue about whether the City was strong enough in its approach to deal with deemed approved alcohol uses and to try to exert more control over the ability to bring those under review and in certain cases, revoke licenses. The City Attorney looked at those suggestions and opined that our alcohol ordinance was in line with that. A section has been added to address temporary alcohol sales. The ordinance as proposed would provide the City stronger control, and would require that every alcohol sales establishments, with the exception of wineries and winery related issues, obtain a conditional use permit. It is recommended that the Planning Commission take an action to recommend approval of the ordinance to the City Council, as the process has resulted in a much better ordinance.

There were members of the public that wished to comment as follows:

Ray Chavira, representing Antelope Valley Alcohol Tobacco and Other Drug Policy Coalition, requested the Planning Commission to direct staff to respond to the 2-page memorandum that was sent last week from the State Consultant. Ken Mann responded that he would prefer that the speaker takes his 3 minutes and defer the questions for later. Mr. Chavira concurred with staff's recommendation, with possible modifications. He hoped that the City would be able to come up with an ordinance similar to that of the City of Palmdale two years ago.

Chantel Kilmer, resident of Lancaster, California and President of Antelope Valley Winegrowers Association for two years, thanked the Commission for considering their thoughts on the matter concerning the alcohol ordinance. They wanted to stress the fact that in no way did their vineyards promote drunk driving or underage drinking. On the contrary, they promote wine education and the enhancement that wines bring to food. According to a study by MADD, the choice drink of drunk drivers is beer. Their group has also adopted in their by-laws rules that must be conformed to by their members. They also take pride in the local grape growers and winemaking staff as well as the tourism opportunities that their business brings to the valley.

Frank Donato, resident of Leona Valley, California, and representing one of the wineries in Lancaster, thanked the City and Brian Ludicke for their cooperation as they first started out. He stated that wine-making is a more stringent process; they had to go through the federal government, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, State ABC, then through the City. There were three levels of governmental control watching what they do. He supports the ordinance and thinks that it is an asset to the City. His only question is regarding page 18, 17.42.140 regarding temporary alcohol sales. If for instance they are allowed to go into existing facilities for a charity event, would they need another CUP? Brian Ludicke responded that if the event itself requires some kind of special event permit, there's language in the ordinance that indicates that approval of special events permit shall be deemed as in compliance with the section. And if the event was held at the fairgrounds or state property, the City would have no jurisdiction over it.

Allen Quinton, resident of Palmdale, California, and works with the AV Winegrowers Association, stated that they were happy that the ordinance was being tightened. They want to

make a distinction that they were serious about the ABC and making sure that everyone is in compliance. They want to present their product so people are aware that it is a higher end product. They were appreciative of the fact that staff took time out to go over point by point their concerns and issues.

Steve Rice, resident of Lancaster, California, and chairman of local GAVAR, thanked Brian Ludicke for providing the association with the opportunity to review and provide input to the alcohol ordinance. Members of their organization participated in the workshop and reviewed the document extensively. He encouraged the Commission to adopt the ordinance in its current form.

Steven Kinsey, resident of Lancaster, California, stated that as a member of the Brewers Association and as a resident putting together a business plan to open up a brewery in the valley in the next few years, he noticed the exemptions made for the vintners and wineries, and asked that the same exclusions be made to breweries and pubs.

Richard Hecker, resident of Lancaster, California, commented that it was a difficult task for the Commission trying to protect public interest and public safety. His heart goes out to the homeowners who voiced their concerns. He wanted to thank the Commission for their consideration of the ordinance and to state that it's the right thing to do because it addresses the local needs. He hopes that the Commission would be guided by their conscience when ruling on this. He is in support of the ordinance.

Tim May, representing May Centers in Aliso Viejo, California, said that as a long-time shopping center owner and in the process of building two more, his concern was regarding the bona fide restaurants. Most shopping center owners in this town have no clue that the ordinance even exists, and that it is on the agenda tonight. He just wanted the commitment from staff and the Commission, and asked if one of the Planning staff could be assigned to help streamline the process so they do not get caught up in a 6 to 7-month wait. He was also concerned about the prohibitive cost of \$10,000 to apply for a conditional use permit. He would also like some clarification on the guidelines, particularly on Item C. He sought to get clarification on bona fide restaurant definition, and Item E that deals with full-time cooks. He also commented that BevMo, which is a fine national establishment that has now a store in Palmdale, would have a difficult time finding a location in Lancaster.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 10:49 p.m. Commissioner Faux inquired if staff received the memorandum from Dr. Whitman and if staff responded to it. Brian Ludicke answered that staff had a copy, and staff concluded that as a bona fide restaurant, a drinking contest cannot be conducted on premises. Commissioner MacPherson wanted to clarify that the language of no-drinking contest was not included in the other uses besides the bona fide restaurant because there would be control in the conditional use process. As for limitations on floor area allowed for a bar, it would be difficult to define a standard. Chairman Mann also wanted clarity that within the conditional use permit, the City could take specific action against a violation. The Deputy City Attorney stated that the only way to go after deemed approved establishments by nuisance abatement. Commissioner MacPherson inquired if there's a definition between the different levels of restaurants as they come in for approval of the conditional use permit process. Brian Ludicke responded that there are restaurants moving into existing buildings, restaurant building from the ground up, and restaurants being built in a shopping center where there's a CUP already approved. Staff has concluded that there ought to

be three different fees for each of those as the level of staff review would vary. A streamlined CUP process would be the answer. Chairman Mann wanted to know what guarantee is in place that what was discussed would actually take place. Brian Ludicke answered that the best approach is for staff to come back before Planning Commission with a new business item, and lay out for the Commission how each situation is to be addressed and use that to establish the procedures. Commissioner MacPherson asked if it would be more of a matter of policy than a matter of ordinance, and the policy would be directed by the Planning Commission. Vice Chairman Troth asked if the ordinance would prohibit a store such as BevMo from coming into Lancaster. Brian Ludicke said that under the draft ordinance on Page 12, there is a provision under C, which is a request for a waiver of the distance requirements.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Chairman Mann to approve Resolution No. 07-33 recommending to the City Council approval of an amendment to Title 17 of the Lancaster Municipal Code, revising the requirements for alcohol sales establishments, with modification to Section 17.42.020.C (Definition of Bona fide Restaurant), removing "by a server", and directing staff to establish a tiered policy for conditional use permit application and approval process for bona fide restaurants. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

3. ONE-YEAR EXTENSIONS

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 11:07 p.m. to hear the following eight requests for extension concurrently:

a. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 53642

A request by Pacific Communities Builder, Inc., for a subdivision of 161 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 40± gross acres located on the northeast corner of 60th Street West and Avenue K-8. Silvia Donovan presented the staff report. There was a letter from the applicant concurring to the conditions of approval. John Jacob, representing JT Engineering, came forward to state that they were in agreement to the conditions of approval as stated in the staff report.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 11:10 p.m. Chairman Mann stated that for the past several months, there had been requests made from the Commission regarding having an understanding with the water issue. He was not being anti-growth; he was just concerned about responsible growth. He would like to make a motion to continue this item and every other item related to extension requests until such time there is clear direction and policy regarding the water issue from the City Council. Commissioner MacPherson commented that in light of recent developments relative to water provision in Southern California, it is prudent to go forth with

Chairman Mann's suggestion, so he seconded the motion. The motion was withdrawn later after a thorough discussion of the consequences of the motion.

Vice Chairman Troth asked if the developers would then be in a state of limbo until the City Council gives the Commission directions on the water policy issue. Brian Ludicke responded that map extensions, as the State Subdivision Map Act deals with them, are a little different than other actions. These items cannot be continued, since the Map Act states that once someone makes a request, they get 60 days until the advisory body decides to deny or approve it. His recommendation would be to give them all extensions to a certain date and then hear the items again. During that time, they can, in theory, get a recordation of a final map provided that they can get a will-serve letter from the water purveyor. They will just be in a shortened extension.

Chairman Mann reopened the public hearing at 11:38 p.m. to hear Items 3a through 3h concurrently.

Athena Bowyer, representing Royal Investors, applicant for Tentative Tract Map No. 61480, wanted clarification on what kind of policy the Commission would like to pass to extend the maps. Her concern is that the City of Lancaster is not the agency to decide who gets water, it is the water district. Chairman Mann responded by reiterating what was already explained previously by Brian Ludicke. The Chairman simply wanted clarification, understanding and direction from the City Council regarding the water issue.

Jim Barletta, resident of Lancaster, California, and representing Averydale Water Company, was speaking against Items 3c, 3d and 3e. He said that he wanted to applaud Chairman Mann for stepping up to the plate and taking initiative, which indicates leadership. The water situation is serious. We should take into account the water capacity before we approve anymore developments. Chairman Mann responded that his action stemmed originally from Vice Chairman Troth bringing it to the Commission's attention.

Dan Stitt, representing Penfield & Smith and speaking on Items 3d and 3e, inquired whether they have to keep filing for an extension until there is resolution from the City as to how the water situation should be handled. Brian Ludicke responded that Planning would need from the applicant the fee to renotice (\$1,292.00) and the mailing labels to be updated. Commissioner MacPherson stated that the City needs to take a serious look at the water crisis.

Robert Terry, representing RWR Homes and speaking on Items 3g and 3h, stated that he was aware of the water situation as they have projects all over California. He wanted to know that if the Commission decides for a 6-month extension, would it theoretically go back to the one-year extension after that. Chairman Mann answered that there would be a policy established by the City Council as to which direction to take. Commissioner MacPherson replied that there are only certain things that the Commission can and cannot do relative to tentative maps and extensions. By extending this to an agreed upon timeframe, the Commission is not denying the extensions; they are basically putting some control over the process. Mr. Terry also asked if fees would be waived, to which Mr. Ludicke responded that the Commission has no authority to waive fees.

John Jay, representing JT Engineering, commented that he heard the Commission debating over the amount of time to extend requests for extensions between March 2008 and 6

months, and he wanted to bring to the Commission's attention that their last extension was April 19. Vice Chairman Troth responded that he felt bad about the people caught by surprise tonight. He asked about the possibility of folks over the next month being informed as their items are put on the agenda that the extension would be good for 6 months. Brian Ludicke stated that the projects scheduled for December are already in the process but can still be notified.

Chairman Mann reclosed the public hearing at 11:50 p.m. and said that he would defer the matter to Doug Evertz, from a legal standpoint. Doug Evertz inquired if the Commission would make an action tonight on the extensions. Chairman Mann stated that the Commission will take action to approve extensions of the map.

It was moved by Vice Chairman Troth and seconded by Commissioner Faux to grant an extension for Tentative Tract Map No. 53642 to April 19, 2008, based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 04-19 dated September 17, 2007. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

b. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61480

A request by Royal Western Properties for a subdivision of 130 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 28.9± gross acres located on the northeast corner of Lancaster Boulevard and future 35th Street East.

It was moved by Vice Chairman Troth and seconded by Commissioner Salazar to grant a one-year extension to October 17, 2008, based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 05-65. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

c. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61493

A request by Pro Value Properties, Inc., for a subdivision of 12 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 3.25± gross acres located on the northeast corner of 22nd Street West and Avenue J-4.

It was moved by Commissioner Faux and seconded by Commissioner Salazar to grant a one-year extension to September 15, 2008, based on the findings listed below and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 05-58. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

d. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61535

A request by Capital Pacific Homes for a subdivision of 240 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 240 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 57.6± gross acres located on the southeast corner of Avenue J and 45th Street West.

It was moved by Commissioner Salazar and seconded by Vice Chairman Troth to grant a one-year extension to October 17, 2008, based on the findings listed below and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 05-67 and revised map. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

e. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61679

A request by Lancaster Downs 115, LLC for a subdivision of 55 single family lots in the R-10,000 Zone on 20.15± gross acres located on the southeast corner of Avenue K and 55th Street West.

It was moved by Commissioner Faux and seconded by Vice Chairman Troth to grant a one-year extension to October 17, 2008, based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to Revised Attachment to PC Resolution No. 05-68. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

f. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61977

A request by Taft Corporation for a subdivision of 16 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 3.75± gross acres located on the south side of Avenue K-4 and approximately 660 feet west of 15th Street East.

It was moved by Vice Chairman Troth and seconded Commissioner Faux by to grant a one-year extension to October 17, 2008, based on the findings listed below and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 05-70. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

g. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 62321

A request by RWR Homes, Inc., for a subdivision of 80 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 20.0± gross acres located on the northeast corner of 25th Street East and Lancaster Boulevard.

It was moved by Commissioner Salazar and seconded by Vice Chairman Troth to grant an extension to September 19, 2008, based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 05-57. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

h. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 62478

A request by RWR Homes for a subdivision of 79 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 20.0± gross acres located on the southeast corner of Avenue I and future 35th Street East.

It was moved by Vice Chairman Troth and seconded by Commissioner Salazar to grant a one-year extension to October 17, 2008, based on the findings contained in the staff report and subject to the Revised Attachment to Resolution No. 05-72. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

5. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 04-09 (DENIAL)

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 12:03 a.m. to hear a request for denial of a conditional use permit by Lancaster Storage Properties LLC to construct a 37,947 square-foot automotive repair shop in the CPD Zone on 2.22± acre site on the west side of 20th Street West and approximately 700 feet south of 20th Street West and Avenue J.

The staff report was presented by Brian Ludicke. The applicant was not present and there were none in the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the request.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 12:05 a.m.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Vice Chairman Troth to adopt Resolution No. 07-52 denying the approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 04-09. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann
NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: None.

6. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 07-13 & TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 69587

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 12:06 a.m. to hear a request by InSite Development, LLC to construct a mixed use project on 5.52± gross acres located at 44916 10th Street West, with approximately 120,000 square feet of total building area, to include: adding 105 senior residential units to the existing Essex House complex for a total of 340 units with 4,400 square feet of retail space, 4,800 square feet of residential open space in the form of a podium deck, and 8,900 of additional common open space in the form of a paseo in the C Zone. A parcel map is requested to divide the existing two parcels into three parcels and create in the new third parcel air rights. Refurbishment of the existing signage with a new façade is also requested.

Silvia Donovan presented the staff report. Scott Ehrlich, representing InSite Development, LLC, commented that they are looking into replacing the Essex sign up front that has been grandfathered in or exchange it with an electronic sign. Chairman Mann replied that

the issue could be deferred to a later day or leave it up to Director's Review. Brian Ludicke concurred to the Chairman's suggestion.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 12:20 a.m.

It was moved by Commissioner MacPherson and seconded by Commissioner Faux to adopt Resolution No. 07-53 approving Conditional Use Permit No. 07-13 and defer the signage issue at a later date. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

8. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 66688 (DENIAL)

Chairman Mann opened the public hearing at 12:20 a.m. to hear a request for denial of a tentative tract map by Tandis Homes for a subdivision for 164 single family lots in the R-7,000 Zone on 40.0± gross acres located on the southeast corner of Avenue J and 25th Street East.

Brian Ludicke presented the staff report. The applicant was not present and there were none in the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the request.

Chairman Mann closed the public hearing at 12:21 a.m.

It was moved by Commissioner Faux and seconded by Commissioner MacPherson to adopt Resolution No. 07-55 denying the approval of Tentative Tract Map No. 66688. Motion carried with the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Faux, MacPherson, Salazar, Vice Chairman Troth and Chairman Mann

NOES: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: None.

DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- January Planning Commission Meeting will be held on Monday, January 28, 2008.
- February Planning Commission Meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 19, 2008.

COMMISSION AGENDA

Planning Commission took a formal action to request that the City Council establish a water policy. Applicants will be notified that the Commission will consider limiting the time of extensions until such time a water policy is established by the City Council to address new developments and extensions of existing developments. The action was approved (5-0-0).

PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR - NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Mann declared the meeting adjourned at 12:28 a.m. to Monday, December 10, 2007, at 5:30 p.m., in the Planning Conference Room, Lancaster City Hall.

KENNETH G. MANN, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster