

**LODI PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING
CARNEGIE FORUM, 305 WEST PINE STREET
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2008**

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The Regular Planning Commission meeting of August 27, 2008, was called to order by Chair Kiser at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Mattheis, Olson, and Chair Kiser

Absent: Planning Commissioners – Heinitz

Also Present: Planning Manager Peter Pirnejad, Deputy City Attorney Janice Magdich, Senior Planner David Morimoto, Assistant Planner Immanuel Bereket, and Administrative Secretary Kari Chadwick

2. MINUTES

“June 25, 2008”

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Vice Chair Cummins, Olson second, approved the Minutes of June 25, 2008 with additional language added to page three, fourth bullet point as noted below by Commissioner Mattheis:

Added Verbiage – Chair Mattheis would like to get away from using, front, side, and back yard designations in flag lot situations thus looking at the intent of adjacencies in existing conditions.

Commissioners Kirsten abstained because he was not in attendance at the subject meeting.

“July 9, 2008”

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Mattheis, Hennecke second, approved the Minutes of July 9, 2008 with additional language added to page three under item number 7 as noted below by Commissioner Mattheis:

Commissioner Mattheis would like the discussion regarding why the Heritage Tree Ordinance was rejected by the City Council during the preliminary discussions with them added to the minutes.

Commissioners Cummins and Kirsten abstained because they were not in attendance at the subject meeting.

“August 13, 2008”

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Mattheis, Kiser second, approved the Minutes of August 13, 2008 with additional language added to page 3, 6th paragraph of item 3c as noted below by Commissioner Mattheis:

A Land Use designation in the document should be reconsidered because of the conflict with the General Plan and he suggests that it be changed.

Commissioner Hennecke and Olson abstained because they were not in attendance at the subject meeting.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the Community Development Department, Chair Kiser called for the public hearing to consider the

request for a Use Permit to allow Live Entertainment and Dancing at La Luna Restaurant located at 910 South Cherokee Lane.

Planning Manager Pirnejad made a brief introduction pointing out the letters received, which are provided on the blue sheets.

Chair Kiser asked if these activities are already going on. Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that based on the letters received the activities are currently happening, but suggested that the applicant may be the best person to answer the question.

Assistant Planner Bereket gave a brief PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

Commissioner Olson asked for clarification of whether or not there has been dance classes and dancing already taking place with no complaints. Assistant Planner Bereket stated there have not been any complaints to date. Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that the public hearing notice has generated some complaints.

Hearing Opened to the Public

- Noe Luna, applicant, came forward to answer questions. Mr. Luna stated that he is concerned about the surrounding neighbors and will do all he can to not disturb them.
- Chair Kiser asked if there has been dancing and live music taking place. Mr. Luna stated that there has been Salsa Classes and he has rented the area for private parties. He also added that he has altered the position of the speakers and posted the doors to help keep the noise from getting outside.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked if there was a fence separating Mr. Luna's property from the property to the south and east. Mr. Luna stated that there are fences.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked if Mr. Luna has received any complaints from the residences on Lloyd Street or from the Police Department. Mr. Luna stated that there was one incident involving the Police, but it involved someone unassociated with the business loitering around the area.
- Chair Kiser asked if there is a regular security company patrolling the area or is it regular employees. Mr. Luna stated that it is regular employees that have had security background.
- Commissioner Olson asked if the conditions of this permit would alter Mr. Luna's restaurant hours. Mr. Luna stated that the restaurant closes at 8:30pm, but the dancing lasts until 1:30am.
- Chair Kiser asked if Mr. Luna is trying to turn this into a nightclub. Mr. Luna stated that is not the intension.
- Debra Cass, Lodi, came forward to ask if this was going to happen every Friday and Saturday. Mr. Luna answered from the audience and out of range of the microphone by stating that it will occur every Friday and Saturday.

Public Portion of Hearing Closed

- Commissioner Olson asked if it is staff's recommendation to give this a 6 month permit then bring it back to the Commission. Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that that is what Staff is recommending.
- Commissioner Kirsten stated that he is in favor of the application with the conditions in the resolution.
- Chair Kiser asked about updating the fire suppression system. Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that that would have to be done as part of any tenant improvement. Commissioner Mattheis stated that there is language in the staff report regarding the fire suppression system being required by December or the use permit will be revoked.

- Commissioner Cummins stated his support of the application.

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Kirsten, Olson second, approved the request of the Planning Commission for a Use Permit to allow Live Entertainment and Dancing at La Luna Restaurant located at 910 South Cherokee Lane subject to the conditions in Resolution P.C. 08-22. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Mattheis, Olson, and Chair Kiser
Noes: Commissioners – None
Absent: Commissioners – Heinitz

- b) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the Community Development Department, Chair Kiser called for the public hearing to consider the recommendation for a General Plan Amendment to the City Council for Reynolds Ranch.

Planning Manager Pirnejad gave a brief PowerPoint presentation based on the staff report.

Commissioner Mattheis stated that this amendment is a huge, significant change to the type, character, and quality of what was approved. He would like staff to elaborate more on why this change is necessary. Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that he will give a summary, but would like the applicant to expand on the answer when the public hearing is opened. The expansion of the road to line up with Melby increased the retail area to the east of Reynolds Ranch Park Way (RRPW). Mattheis asked why couldn't there be housing in between RRPW and the existing retail area. Pirnejad stated that the road alignment drove the decision to expand the retail. Commissioner Mattheis stated that the project has gone from a neighborhood community to a large retail area. He is also surprised that staff feels this is a good plan for the growth of the City and a better plan than the original. Pirnejad stated that the job balance, higher density, and walk ability are all make this a responsible plan.

Commissioner Mattheis pointed out that there are a lot of missing words and phrases in the document which makes it illegible. He asked about the General Plan Amendment on page 12 section 7, point A; there is a statement that the plan is inconsistent with the general plan, but consistent with the General Plan vision and then referenced the General Plan Vision as being something for future development. Pirnejad stated that the proposed plan is inconsistent with the approved General Plan because it requires a General Plan Amendment to be consistent. The Planned Residential (PR) zoning which is defined as neighborhood related uses, and the amendment consists of all neighborhood related uses, makes it consistent with the vision of the approved General Plan. The land uses need to be amended.

Commissioner Mattheis asked for clarification on the parking. He does not think that the 2288 sf of parking is correct. Pirnejad stated originally the parking should have been 4 spaces per 1000 sf of retail space now we know that there will be more than that. Mattheis stated that the retail is being doubled and feels this document is not taking that into consideration. On page 48 the Traffic study and Noise Study are mentioned as being done and they are not a part of this staff report, why? Pirnejad stated that the traffic study is a technical document and is available upon request and will wait until the Public Hearing is opened to the public so that the Traffic expert can answer further questions. Mattheis asked about the noise? Pirnejad stated that the increase in traffic will not increase the noise that was already mitigated in the original EIR.

Chair Kiser asked about eliminating the school. Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that because of the primary type of housing being senior housing the school district felt a school would be better served elsewhere. Kiser asked about the Fire House that was planned for the area. Pirnejad stated that it is still there.

Commissioner Olson stated that the document does not answer all of her questions because of the "Technical Difficulties". She also stated her bias to the project as an Economic Developer with the

increase in jobs. She would like to have more information. Pirnejad stated that there are different levels of the types of establishments going into the project. There will be large retail, Jr. Majors, smaller retail, and in the center of the project to break up the mass of parking lot there will be an oasis of eatery style retail. Olson would like to know more about the open spaces/transition space from one designation to another. Pirnejad stated that the proposed land use map breaks down the different areas and pointed them out on the powerpoint map. Olson asked if the plan reduces the park area to 2 acres from 5.3 acres. Pirnejad stated that the park acreage in the plan has been reduced, but will defer to the applicant for specifics.

Chair Kiser asked if the project is increasing the retail and decreasing the residential. Pirnejad stated that the retail is increasing and the residential is staying the same just with a higher density.

Hearing Opened to the Public

- Dale Gillespie, applicant, came forward to answer questions.

Commissioner Kirsten disclosed that he had a meeting with Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Robertson prior to the meeting.

- Mr. Gillespie stated that the parking ratio figures seem to be misstated in the document. The site plan that is currently being put together will show 4 parking spaces per 1000 sf of retail space. The school district removed the requirement of the site based on the type of housing proposed. The configuration and types of parks will be different. The land use map doesn't represent them all. There will be two or three anchor type establishments employing 150 +/- benefited positions and 25 +/- non-benefited part-time positions each, the Jr./major type (Best Buy) can typically employ 75 people with maybe 30 to 40 of those being benefited. Roughly 500 jobs along with the numerous part-time positions will be created at full build out. Mr. Gillespie added that there is no surprise that the housing market is not in the best of shape prompting the increase in retail. The proximity to HWY 99 is a big draw for the retail market. The future for housing is showing that there will be a great demand in senior housing. There will be a large graduated care facility/Campus with open space areas.
- Chair Kiser asked if the seniors will be able to purchase these homes. Mr. Gillespie stated that this will be predominately owner occupied. The greater care unit will not be owner occupied. There has been some casual discussion with the LOEL Center. There will be approximately 350 patio homes & 300 – 400 graduating care units.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the different phases. Mr. Gillespie stated that the Blue Shield building and the infrastructure is all a part of the first phase. Phase two will consist of the core retail area and phase three will be everything else.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked how many employees Blue Shield will have when it is open. Mr. Gillespie stated that there will be 1000 to 1100 employees with a max of 1600 at the time of full build out. The core retail will bring in 500 jobs with approximately 350-ish benefited positions.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked how the area around Grant Line Road in Elk Grove is being mothballed and there is such great demand here in this project. Mr. Gillespie stated that the Grant Line area was expecting to have a great deal of residential surrounding it, but that has not developed. This project is a tiny fraction in size of that project.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the housing market for seniors being better than that of family housing. Mr. Gillespie stated that at this time it is better, but it is still based on the idea of the seniors being able to sell if necessary their current home.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the park land differences. Mr. Gillespie stated that initially 5.3 acres were planned, but he can't at this time give a definitive answer as to how many acres there will be when the project is finished.
- Commissioner Olson asked about any inclusions or income restrictions on the senior housing. Mr. Gillespie stated that that has not been determined at this time. The patio

housing being affordable has not been determined. There is a requirement in the State Bond financing that requires that 20% of the project be affordable housing.

- Commissioner Mattheis stated his understanding of creating a development in response to market flow. Mattheis asked about the proposed land plan. The dead end culd-e-sacs don't seem residentially friendly. Mr. Gillespie stated that the roads are set up to be more pedestrian friendly. He used the proposed land use map to show how the flow of the configuration is geared to be pedestrian friendly.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked about the finish of the housing element portion and construction to start on the housing units. Mr. Gillespie stated that he was not certain. The retail portion of the project should be built out by mid-year 2010.
- Vice Chair Cummins stated his favor for the addition of the senior housing and the hotel close by to that area. He also asked if there will need to be any improvement needed to the Harney Lane and HWY 99 interchange. Mr. Gillespie stated that there will need to be improvements made. The interchange improvements are currently second on the measure K list for the improvements needed. The funding should come through some time in 2011 and the construction should be complete in 2015.
- Chair Kiser asked about the effect on the downtown. Mr. Gillespie stated that because there isn't any BigBox stores planned for this area the effects on downtown are not significant. There is a per square foot of retail space impact fee assessed at the time of building permit issuance that will be used to help with the vitality of the downtown area.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked if there was a market analysis done regarding the impact of the additional retail on the Downtown. Pirnejad stated that the analysis was done in the initial study phase of the project which determined that the analysis done as part of the original EIR was adequate. Mattheis stated that in his opinion the smaller retail establishments would have more of an impact on the downtown. Mr. Gillespie stated that the stress in the market has been on the smaller retail areas. Mattheis asked about the build out of the retail. Mr. Gillespie stated that the core stores by August 2009 and the surrounding area by March of 2010 which will consist of 510,000 sf of retail.
- Commissioner Cummins asked who the major anchors are. Mr. Gillespie stated that he is not at liberty to say until formal documents have been signed.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked about any concerns that the retail market will follow the residential. Mr. Gillespie stated that yes it is a concern, but that is part of the risk of doing business.
- Grant Johnson, Traffic Engineer for the Project, came forward to answer questions. Mr. Johnson stated that the team working on this project built a traffic model to see if it would work and after working within that model found that the mitigations fit within the standards set in the 2006 Final EIR for the project. No additional mitigations are necessary.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked about the specific table that dictates requirements for traffic. Mr. Johnson stated that everything used to be done off of spreadsheets but with modern technology it has become easier to determine the flow of the traffic. The information regarding the traffic gets plugged in and the program simulates the flow of traffic, so you get to see where you may have traffic backing up allowing alterations to be made. Kirsten asked if it takes into account peak use times. Mr. Johnson stated that yes it does. The simulation is based on the busiest time of day which is the PM peak hour.
- Kirsten asked if there is a requirement to look out 20 years down the road. Mr. Johnson stated that the 20 year window is the industry practice.
- Commissioner Mattheis stated that without the traffic study in front of the Commissioners it makes it a little difficult to follow the conclusions. How many lanes will be on Harney Lane at build out? Mr. Johnson stated that there will be four lanes with left and right turn only lanes at major intersections. Mattheis asked if the original project was over-sized. Johnson stated that the original project was based on a category of LOSC which was an over mitigation for the proposed project.

- Commissioner Mattheis asked how many lanes Harney Lane will need to be from the time of the retail build-out to when the construction on the interchange at 99 will be complete. Mr. Johnson stated that there will be four lanes, two lanes for each direction. There will be a signal placed at Cherokee Lane with right and left turn lanes allowing for the current overpass to accommodate the traffic. Mattheis stated that that was hard to believe with the amount of increase in the traffic.
- Melissa & Charles Katzakian, owners of the home on the frontage road, came forward to oppose the new proposed plan. The new plan is not what she and her husband had wanted. The property is now going to be surrounded by large retail buildings. The roadway access is going to be taken away when the frontage road is diverted on to Reynolds Ranch Parkway. This will eliminate access onto their property from the frontage road and require them to use the new retail parking lot for access.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked if Mrs. Katzakian's concerns are based on the increase in retail or decrease in the residential. Mrs. Katzakian stated that her concern is based on the extra retail and the additional pollution and noise that will accompany it. Mr. Katzakian stated that the traffic will be doubled and that will impact how they get in and out of their property, kids to school, etc.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked how the Katzakians came to realize they would have to use a parking lot to access their property. Mrs. Katzakian has a piece of paper that she will be presenting at a meeting next week that shows the access. She added that she wanted Blue Shield and the retail to come to the area, but with all the changes it puts a pit in her stomach. Kirsten asked how big their parcel is. The parcel is 1.1 acres.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked for the original Land Use Plan to be put up on the PowerPoint screen and asked Mrs. Katzakian to explain the concerns in the differences. Mrs. Katzakian with the help of the land use map explained her concerns regarding the differences.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked what the original conditions were in the agreement with the developer. Mr. & Mrs. Katzakian stated that the original agreement gave them a private roadway to their property from the frontage road/Parkway connection. It was going to be nicely landscaped with the possibility of a fountain just to the west of the entrance. Mattheis stated that he did not realize that there was a historical home in that area because it is colored red like the retail. Mrs. Katzakian stated that the property is called the Skinner Ranch and the original plan showed that the developer was going to possibly re-using it. Mattheis asked when the Katzakians were told of the change. They stated that they were informed of the change in May of this year.
- Dale Gillespie came forward to address the issues with the Ranch. Mr. Gillespie stated that there was an offer to purchase the property that was not accepted.
- Chair Kiser asked Mr. Gillespie to show how he plans to work with the Katzakians to provide them with access. Mr. Gillespie showed with the assistance of the proposed land use PowerPoint slide what the intentions are for supplying them with access to their property, but pointed out that CalTrans has required a large easement into the current frontage road area to accommodate the expansion of Hwy 99. A secondary access to the property will be added to accommodate the Fire Department's conditions.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked if the area south of the Ranch is still going to be landscaped. Mr. Gillespie stated that it is anticipated that there will be a monument sign and landscaping and possibly a water feature in the corner where the frontage road meets up with the new Parkway, but a formal plan has not been mocked up yet. Mattheis would like to see more sensitivity shown to the Ranch property in how it is integrated into the overall "Campus". Mr. Gillespie stated that it would be better for it to be integrated into the overall plan, but that hinges on who is in control of the property and what agreements can be made.
- Mr. & Mrs. Katzakian came forward to state that there was an offer for the Ranch property, but that it was only a 24hr offer.

Chair Kiser called for a five minute adjournment (9:32pm).

Chair Kiser called the meeting back to order (9:41pm).

- William Griffiths, property owner on Stockton Street, came forward to oppose the new project plan. Mr. Griffiths read the letter (attached to these minutes) aloud he and other residences signed and submitted for this hearing.
- Commissioner Olson asked what the residences wanted the Commission to consider. Mr. Griffiths stated that the original plan gave the residences along Stockton Street a buffer to the retail that was planned to the east of their homes.
- Commissioner Hennecke asked how large the property is that Mr. Griffiths owns. Mr. Griffiths stated that he sits on .43 acres and his home is 2450 sf.
- Domenico Della Maggiora, resident on Stockton Street, came forward to state that if the sewer and water are being brought to the properties he is in favor of the plan even though he signed the letter submitted by Mr. Griffiths. He is in support of the new jobs being brought into the area.
- Seng Heuansavath, resident on Stockton Street, came forward to oppose the new plan. He stated that he came to Lodi to live because of the draw that Lodi has. He did not object to the original plan because of the buffer of residential surrounding his property. The new plan puts a big masonry wall in the resident's front yard in the form of a large retail building and then possibly in the back yard as a large fence surrounding that residential neighborhood.
- Commissioner Mattheis asked about the discussions between Mr. Heuansavath and the developer. Mr. Heuansavath stated that the notice that went out for this meeting was the first he has heard of this new change, but it was the newspaper article that brought the major changes to light.
- Commissioner Kirsten stated that it's the responsibility of the Commission to consider the concerns of what is right for Lodi and still have to weigh the concerns of the individual. Mr. Heuansavath stated that this is an emotional issue for him and his family. He would like to work with the developer to make this work for both sides.
- Chair Kiser asked if Mr. Heuansavath was satisfied with the plan prior to the changes. Mr. Heuansavath stated as much as he could be.
- Commissioner Cummins asked how long Mr. Heuansavath lived on this property. Mr. Heuansavath stated that he and his family have lived there since 2004. Cummins then asked if he had looked at the General Plan to see that there was going to be development in his area. Mr. Heuansavath stated that he knew that there was going to be development all around his property, he just feels that presented with this plan at that time he would have had a different feeling about the area.
- Commissioner Kirsten asked if the developer offered what was on the assessor's role. Mr. Heuansavath stated that he was offered the appraisal amount.
- Pirnejad stated that the decision on the proposed General Plan Amendment should be based on the relationship of the Amendment to the General Plan and the rules of CEQA.
- Stacy Allen, resident, came forward to state her approval of the project.
- Cliff Deby, Lodi, came forward to ask how Harney lane is going to handle the additional traffic. Grant Johnson stated that enlarging Harney Lane to four lanes will accommodate the level of traffic that this project will generate
- Debra Cass, Lodi, came forward to object to the traffic conclusions. She does not feel that the conclusions are accurate.

Public Portion of Hearing Closed

- Commissioner Olson stated that she is familiar with reading EIRs and traffic studies and she is not getting all the answers to all of the questions from the documents presented.

- Commissioner Mattheis stated that he also feels left out of the loop without having the traffic study having been made available. He also disagrees with Mr. Pirnejad in regards to what the Commission's purview is. His concerns are with: The direction that this plan is taking the project, the concentration of senior housing, the decrease in parks – seniors need parks also, traffic Impacts. He felt this was not good land use planning. In regards to the existing historical residence there should be more attempts to positively integrate it into the plan. The Harney Lane overpass will not be able to handle the additional traffic as is and it isn't scheduled to be updated for five to ten years. He doesn't see why the property on the east side of Stockton Street couldn't be residential.
- Chair Kiser stated his concerns regarding the differences in the proposed project verses the original plan. He would like to see the traffic study. He does not like the idea of the Ranch being land locked. The reduction in park area has him very concerned and can not support the project at this time.
- Commissioner Kirsten stated that we need to acknowledge that this new plan is market driven. When looking at the plan the increase in jobs and senior housing is a positive factor. He is a little concerned with the loss of the park area, and would like to see more of the plan to see how they are going to make up for that. Overall he is in support of the project.
- Vice Chair Cummins stated that he likes the new proposed plan. The bottom of the housing market has dropped out and the need for the senior housing is great for this area and having it in an isolated area is a definite plus. He is in favor of the project.
- Commissioner Hennecke stated that there are too many changes to support the plan at this time. There are plenty of positive elements in this plan but there needs to be some tweaking done before he can support it.
- Commissioner Olson stated that if the traffic study had been made available she could be supporting this project tonight, but without it she can not support it at this time.
- Planning Manager Pirnejad stated that the traffic study is available to anyone that would like to view it. Mr. Johnson, the Traffic Engineer, was brought here tonight to address the traffic issues and answer all your questions. The level of detail regarding the project for the General Plan Amendment (GPA) is not to consider the Ranch or the added retail or increase in senior housing that should be done at the SPARC level.
- Chair Kiser stated his concern with the why the project is growing. Planning Manager Pirnejad read the statute for CEQA requirements regarding the GPA.
- Commissioner Mattheis stated that the time to determine whether or not the merits of the project are consistent with the General Plan is now and doubling the size of the retail is not consistent with the current General Plan or we wouldn't need an amendment. The Commission is not here just to "rubber stamp" everything that staff brings before us.

Public Portion of Hearing Re-Opened

- Dale Gillespie came forward to state that he would be in favor of continuing the hearing to the next Planning Commission Meeting date.
- Mrs. Katzakian stated that she does not think that the EIR addresses the Ranch as a historical landmark

Public Portion of Hearing closed

MOTION / VOTE:

The Planning Commission, on motion of Commissioner Mattheis, Kirsten second, continued Reynolds Ranch items b & c to the Planning Commission meeting of September 10, 2008. The motion carried by the following vote:

Continued

Ayes: Commissioners – Cummins, Hennecke, Kirsten, Mattheis, Olson, and Chair Kiser
Noes: Commissioners – None
Absent: Commissioners – Heinitz

- c) Notice thereof having been published according to law, an affidavit of which publication is on file in the Community Development Department, Chair Kiser called for the public hearing to consider the request for approval of a Tentative Map for Reynolds Ranch.

This item was continued along with item 3b in the above Motion/Vote.

4. PLANNING MATTERS/FOLLOW-UP ITEMS

None

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

None

6. ACTIONS OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Summary memo attached

7. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE/DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

None

8. ACTIONS OF THE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

None

9. UPDATE ON COMMUNITY SEPARATOR/GREENBELT TASK FORCE

None

10. ART IN PUBLIC PLACES

None

11. COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC

None

12. COMMENTS BY STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Cummins thanked Peter for everything he had done and wished him well in Daly City. Peter responded in kind.

13. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:41 p.m.

ATTEST:

Kari Chadwick
Community Development Department Secretary



RECEIVED

ITEM 3a

JUN 25 2008

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT
CITY OF LODI

June 25, 2008

Stockton Chapter 19
(209) 469-3139
www.pwpstockton.org

Lodi City Hall
221 W. Pine Street
Lodi, CA

Dear City of Lodi Personnel:

Parents Without Partners is a non-profit organization that provides an environment for single parents and grandparents and their children to interact with each other. Family style group discussions often help open communication lines. Together we share family outings and activities for children as well as for the parents.

All PWP chapters are non-profit organizations and depend upon volunteer members for the planning and administration of chapter activities.

Mr. Noe Luna has been working with us by allowing us to hold our dances at his establishment, La Luna Bar & Grill. We appreciate his willingness to work with us and we hope that he can get a permanent permit so we can continue to hold our dances there. Many of our chapters have gone under and we are struggling to keep our Stockton Chapter afloat.

Your consideration to his request would be greatly appreciated by Parents Without Partners Chapter 19.

Sincerely,

Sonya Martinez

Dance Director

Stockton Chapter #19

La Luna Event Discription

On Friday and Saturday nights we have salsa Dance classes from 9:00pm to 10:00pm, after the class our guest stay and dance what they learned from 10:00 to 12:00pm. We also allow the group from Parents without Partners from chapter 19 to make dances for their organization, These dances last 2-3 hours. they start at 9:30 pm and end at 12:00 pm. For these events there are expected to be anywhere from 50 to 100 people. Our restaurant hours are from 8:00am to 8:30 pm. Our kitchen and doors are closed at 8:00 pm. While our guest finish their meals we prepare for our dance events to open at 9:30 and finish at 12:00 pm.

RECEIVED

JUN 25 2008

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT
CITY OF LODIMOC JUAZE LUNA

Item 3a.

RECEIVED

AUG 26 2008

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT
CITY OF LODI

Date: 08/25/08
To: Peter Pirnejad, Interim Community Development Director
Lodi Planning Commission
From: Snehal Patel, Manager of Budget Inn of Lodi
Subject: Permit for La Luna Restaurant for Live Entertainment and Dancing

I, Snehal Patel, representing the Budget Inn of Lodi, am against the proposal for a permit for live entertainment and dancing at La Luna Restaurant.

This proposal would present noise pollution to our guests at the Budget Inn of Lodi and would deter guests from staying at our business. This proposal would significantly impact our business which has been established for over 20 years as a quiet and comfy place, "your home away from home."

Currently, we have received numerous complains from guests at the Budget Inn of Lodi, regarding loud live music and patrons exiting La Luna Restaurant.

Please contact me with any questions or further concerns.

Regards,

Snehal Patel
510-432-8199

RECEIVED

Item 3a

AUG 25 2008

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT
CITY OF LODI 8-20-08

Planning Commission

IN REGARD TO LA LUNA'S REQUEST FOR LIVE ENTERTAINMENT AND DANCING PERMIT. I AND THE NEIGHBOR'S THAT LIVE BEHIND LA LUNA'S LISTEN TO THEM START THEIR MUSIC ABOUT 9:00 PM TO 2:00 AM FRI & SAT, IT IS SO LOUD WE CANNOT GO TO SLEEP UNTILL 2:30 AM, EXTRA HALF HOUR TO CLEAR THE PARKING LOT.

THEY SAY IT WAS BECAUSE THE BACK DOOR'S WERE OPEN, WHEN WE DISCUSSED IT THEY SAID THEY WOULD KEEP THEM CLOSED.

I HAVE DRIVEN THROUGH THE PARKING LOT WHEN THEY ARE PLAYING DOOR'S WERE SHUT MUSIC STILL TO LOUD. I'M NOT AGAINST THEM HAVING LIVE ENTERTAINMENT IF THEY KEPT IT CONFINED INSIDE THEIR BUILDING.

PLUS THE PEOPLE IN THE PARKING LOT FOR SMOKE BREAKS CAUSING A LOT OF EXTRA NOISE. I'M SURE IT WILL BE TOLD THEY WILL KEEP IT QUIET, WHEN THEY GET THE PERMIT, NOTHING WILL CHANGE, I HAVE LIVED HERE 37 YEARS, THERE HAS NEVER BEEN A PROBLEM WITH OTHER OWNERS THE EL CHARRO, MORY'S, WERE ALWAYS CONCERNED ABOUT THEIR NEIGHBORS. I'M SURE ANYONE ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION WOULD NOT WANT TO LIVE UNDER THESE CONDITIONS.

JAMES RITA Quintivan
937 LLOYD ST
LODICA 9524-4313
PH 209-369-7151

Sincerely
James Quintivan

Lennie & Juli Quintivan 919 Lloyd St 367-9537

Citizens of Lodi
2600-2700 block of Stockton St.
Lodi, Ca. 95240
August 27, 2008

To Whom It May Concern (Lodi Planning Commission, et al.)

As residents of the block of Stockton St. south of Harney Lane and a part of the Reynolds Ranch project we would like to go on record concerning the current general plan amendment.

Simply put, we have lived on these properties for up to 61 years. We have been inspired by the vast horizons and rows of vine grapes from both our front and rear windows. It has been a pastoral scene with Mt. Diablo towering in the distance. Our soil is a legendary Hanford Sandy Loam. We have loved it here. It is a mecca for children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

Our two options are unfolding: to stay or to leave. For those who desire to stay, we are appreciative of the offers of the developers to bear the costs of bringing in and connecting electrical, water, sewer, and natural gas, if done concurrently, and providing curb and gutter. Also to abandon wells and septic systems if desired.

For those who would want to sell and obtain comparable properties, differences persist. The proposed General Plan and tentative map appears to have almost doubled commercial/retail development and in our direction. We assume this relieves some of the financial burdens of the Developer caused by present market conditions. Our financial burdens persist and the setting in which they occur appears to be worsening. A street and a landscaped berm as now proposed appears to separate us from commercial/retail buildings. We will see the top 10 or 15 feet of the buildings until the trees mature. And in Fall and Winter?

We are all of the opinion that a developer, who in good faith is trying to fairly conduct business with those, whose lives they are altering and

at the same time are reaching out to city government for their own financial benefit would be willing to pass along a measure of their gain to those who are their neighbors. Those of us who have sought to relocate have been unable to locate comparable properties with the valuations determined by their respective appraisals. If a truly comparable property were available, many of us would embrace it and move on.

As it is now, we will become a buffer between commercial/retail on the east and residential development on the west. Barriers in front and in the rear. A strip of old world meets the creations of the avant-garde. We, the old world, are left in the middle.

So much for our assessment. We think more can be done for us as we seek to find genuinely comparable properties in other close-in country parts of Lodi . Please examine our concerns that we may come to a mutual agreement.

Yours truly
William E. Griffitts William and Cheryl Griffitts
Domenico Della Maggiora Domenico Della Maggiora
Sean and Summer Varner Sean and Summer Varner
Elsie Seeman Elsie Seeman
Seng Heuansavath Seng Heuansavath