

From: [Steve Golden](#)
To: [Terry Linder](#)
Cc: [Leslie Little](#); [Jenna Luna](#); [Joe Mueller \(Verizon\)](#); [John McKay \(Yahoo\)](#); [Liam Downey](#); [Michael Orosco](#); [Pat Toombs](#); [Wayne Tanda \(Charter\)](#); [Wayne Tanda \(Cloud\)](#); [Ymartinez66@yahoo.com](#)
Subject: RE: PC Mtg. Questions
Date: Monday, January 23, 2017 5:28:30 PM

See answers below for Item #1.

Steve Golden

Associate Planner

Community Development Department

steve.golden@morganhill.ca.gov

408-778-6480

From: Terry Linder
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 3:50 PM
To: Steve Golden; Tiffany Brown; Donald Larkin
Cc: Leslie Little
Subject: FW: PC Mtg. Questions

Hello Everyone,

Below is the list of questions from Commissioner Mueller. Several of the Agenda 2 questions will require input from the City Attorney. Please respond to his questions and "cc" the rest of the Planning Commission and Jenna.

Thanks,

Terry

From: Joe Mueller [<mailto:JoeMueller@verizon.net>]
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 3:25 PM
To: Terry Linder
Cc: Leslie Little
Subject: PC Mtg. Questions

Terry,

Good afternoon,

Below are my questions for tomorrow's PC Mtg.:

1. Agenda 1:
1. Approval Resolution, Section 2: Please explain how Phase 2 meets existing facilities exception since it is on a vacant lot?

Thanks for your review and feedback. In addition to the Section 15301 Existing Facilities categorical exemption, staff will recommend listing Section 15303 New Construction Or Conversion Of Small Structures, and Section 15332 In-Fill Development Projects. All of these categorical exemptions could apply to the project and it is best practices to list all categorical exemptions that can apply.

2. Approval Resolution, Exhibit A, Other Conditions III.B: I believe the last sentence needs to be clarified

I would recommend the following changes:

For multiple businesses to operate at the site, an amended conditional use permit and/or additional conditional use permits shall be approved ~~for~~ to establish the use or operations for each individual or business entity.

3. Do we have any idea what the fence in Phase 2 will look like?

The fence is not a requirement improvement, however, the applicant shows a 6' high wood fence on the site plan, but this is only conceptual. The design details of the fence would be reviewed during the Design Permit approval. The fence would need to comply with zoning code (height and setback requirements for fences along exterior property lines) and aesthetic considerations of the Downtown area. The Police Department may recommend a certain fence type and height as part of the safety and security plan if that element is significant to public safety. If the planning commission believes the fence and height is pertinent in consideration of the land use approval, then the Commission should approve with conditions.

2. Agenda 2:

1. I would like to hear from the City Attorney on our ability to “reserve” Measure A Allocations. I do not recall any language in

Measure A allowing Allocations to be reserved.

2. It appears that the Measure A Allocations would be awarded after March 1. How is this possible with an effective date of Measure S

of March 1st?

3. If we are being asked to make a recommendation on a DA to award 61 Measure A Allocations, how do we do that when we do not have

A copy of the DA to review?

4. The Addendum appears to be a Program Level review not a Project level review. Is this

correct?

5. Resolution Section 3: How do we find residential units in conformance with the General Plan when part of the land has a GP designation

Of Public Facility?

6. Please compare the size of the proposed units with the units in the two City Venture projects in the downtown area.

7. Addendum (page 67 of the complete packet file): It appears that a traffic study needs to be completed for the Depot St re alignment to

To the Church St Intersection. Does this give us a CEQA issue for this approval?

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks for the help.

Joe