

THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF LA HABRA
September 8, 2025

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Mahecha called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of La Habra to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: LED BY COMMISSIONER LOGAN-CANNON

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: MAHECHA
RAMSLAND
MANLEY
LOGAN-CANNON

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: CARDENAS

OTHERS PRESENT: DIRECTOR: KIM
CITY ATTORNEY: ROBERTO
PLANNING MANAGER: LUI
SECRETARY: LOPEZ

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Mahecha asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to address the Commission on the consent calendar or any item not listed on the agenda. There were none.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Secretary Lopez explained the Consent Calendar procedures. Chair Mahecha asked if any of the Commissioners wished to remove an item. There were none. She then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to remove an item. There were none.

Motion made by Commissioner Logan-Cannon seconded by Vice Chair Ramsland, to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion passed unanimously.

1. **PROCEDURAL WAIVER:** Waive reading in full of resolutions and ordinances and approval and adoption of same by reading title only.
2. Approval of the Special Meeting minutes and the Planning Commission regular meeting minutes of August 25, 2025.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ZONE CHANGE 25-0003 TO ADD A NEW CHAPTER 18.65 (SPECIAL EVENT PERMITS) TO TITLE 18 (ZONING) AND AMEND SECTION 18.04.030 (TERMS DEFINED) AND SECTION 18.06.040 (LAND USES) OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) OF THE LA HABRA MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH CHAPTER 18.65 (SPECIAL EVENT PERMITS).

Chair Mahecha asked if any correspondence had been received with regard to the item.

Secretary Lopez said no.

Planning Manager, Sonya Lui, informed the Commission that staff requires additional time to further refine the ordinance and asked the Commission to continue the item to the September 22, 2025, Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Mahecha asked if any of the Commissioners had questions for staff.

There were no questions from staff.

Chair Mahecha opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on the item. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing and asked for a discussion or a motion.

Moved by Commissioner Manley and seconded by Commissioner Logan-Cannon, to continue the public hearing to the Planning Commission meeting on September 22, 2025, to CONSIDER AND PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING AN ORDINANCE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 25-0003 TO ADD CHAPTER 18.65 (SPECIAL EVENT PERMITS) TO TITLE 18 (ZONING) AND AMEND VARIOUS SECTIONS OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) FOR CONSISTENCY WITH CHAPTER 18.65 (SPECIAL EVENT PERMITS) OF THE LA HABRA MUNICIPAL CODE.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: MANLEY, LOGAN-CANON, RAMSLAND, MAHECHA
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CARDENAS

2. DULY NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING AN ORDINANCE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 25-0005 (ZCA 25-0005) AMENDING SECTION 18.04.030 (TERMS DEFINED) OF CHAPTER 18.04 (DEFINITIONS) AND SECTION 18.06.040 (LAND USES) OF CHAPTER 18.06 (ZONES ESTABLISHED -- ZONING MAP BOUNDARIES AND LAND USES) OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) OF THE LA HABRA MUNICIPAL CODE TO DEFINE SMOKE SHOPS AND TO REFLECT THAT NEW SMOKE SHOPS ARE PROHIBITED IN ALL ZONES.

Chair Mahecha asked if any correspondence had been received with regard to the item.

Secretary Lopez said no.

Director of Community and Economic Development, Susan Kim, presented the report.

Chair Mahecha asked if any of the Commissioners had questions for staff.

Vice Chair Ramsland questioned if the impetus behind this zone change was brought on by public outcry or concerns from the police department. Director Kim said this zone change was initiated by Council Member Gomez and Mayor Pro Tem Medrano in response to public comments made at previous City Council meetings on the subject. Director Kim also reminded

the Commission that a member of the public commented on limiting smoke shops at the meeting when the Planning Commission was considering code amendments to implement a minor conditional use permit process.

Vice Chair Ramsland asked why new smoke shops were deemed healthier than the other 68 existing locations in the City where you can buy tobacco products. Director Kim said that the goal expressed by the City Council was to not allow the establishment of any new smoke shops in the City.

Chair Mahecha asked staff if they knew how many fast-food restaurants or doughnut shops there are in La Habra. She pointed out that La Habra has significantly more fast-food restaurants than smoke shops. Chair Mahecha said that the number one cause of death in the United States is heart disease and she said obesity is a greater public health problem than smoking. She wondered why the City was not considering limiting the number of fast-food restaurants or businesses that contribute to these adverse health issues. Chair Mahecha asked if staff knew how many smoke shops the City of Gardena had allowed before they put in place their moratorium. Director Kim responded that she did not have that number, but said it may be mentioned in the attached ordinance from Gardena, which was included in the staff report. Chair Mahecha said that she didn't feel that having the existing 20 independent smoke shops constituted an emergency.

Commissioner Logan-Cannon thanked staff for their report and said that all her questions were answered. She said she is aware that other factors can have an impact on health but reminded the Commission that they were focusing on smoke shops tonight.

Commissioner Manley asked staff if the tobacco retailer permit that Anaheim implemented in June 2025 was administratively processed. Commissioner Manley then asked what could happen to an existing smoke shop that closed after this ordinance is passed whereby no more new smoke shops are allowed to be established. Commissioner Manley asked staff to explain the current requirements for someone who wants to open a new smoke shop. He said he didn't follow the logic as to how this ordinance would help reduce the number of smoke shops over time. Director Kim explained that if an existing smoke shop closed, but was replaced by a greeting card store, that location would no longer be able to revert back to operating as a smoke shop. Director Kim stated that a new smoke shop is currently treated the same as general retail, which is permitted by right and generally requires issuance of a business license.

Vice Chair Ramsland wondered if the City had documentation on any smoke shops in La Habra prior to 2008. Director Kim said she did not have records for smoke shops prior to 2008, but didn't know if the lack of records was a result of prior code amendments that aimed to simplify the land use matrix.

Commissioner Manley asked if the 68 business licenses that were issued to all retailers offering smoking products were renewed annually with the State. Director Kim said yes. Commissioner Manley wondered if there were guidelines in place to limit business hours for smoke shops and wondered if any of the existing smoke shops were required to have a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Director Kim said that the City had considered limiting the hours of shops that are open 24-hours, but Council decided not to move forward with establishing provisions for limiting business hours of operation unless a use is subject to a CUP approval. Commissioner Manley asked if the draft resolution included any language to

modify the hours of operation for the existing smoke shops. Director Kim said no. Commissioner Manley said the proposed ordinance will stop new smoke shops, but they would not be doing anything to address any of the number of existing smoke shops. Director Kim said that was correct.

Director Kim explained that if the City wanted to address existing tobacco retailers, they could look at implementing a tobacco retail license requirement. Director Kim said that establishing a tobacco retail license process would require the City to conduct a fee analysis to ensure that sufficient fees are collected to cover charges for staff's time and enforcement. Director Kim said a tobacco retail license requirement would likely fall under the purview of the City Council because such licenses are unrelated to land use ordinances. City Council could make a recommendation that the City pursue having a tobacco retail license at the City level, but this would require extra work be done, which would cost the City more money to implement, issue and provide enforcement of such licenses. Director Kim explained how Anaheim has distancing requirements for tobacco retailers and if La Habra adopted similar distance requirements, the City would have to enforce that the distancing requirements are met every time a tobacco retailer came into the City. She explained how enforcing that type of regulation or comparable code or licensing requirements could be a way to help limit the number of existing tobacco retailers. Commissioner Manley reiterated that if this ordinance passed, the existing 68 tobacco retailers in La Habra would not be affected and they would be allowed to continue to operate as is. Director Kim said there was clear deliberation from City Council on not wanting to impact existing tobacco retailers.

Vice Chair Ramsland asked if having to get a State license for tobacco retailers is similar to obtaining an Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC) license, where a state inspector comes out to check that the business is complying with all requirements. Director Kim said she was not familiar with the State's process. Vice Chair Ramsland held that since the use is tied to the land, they wouldn't be changing anything, since existing smoke shops can continue to exist indefinitely as long as other smoke shops keep taking over the existing locations.

Commissioner Manley pointed out that the proposed definition of a smoke shop would include a business that provides 20% of the floor area devoted to tobacco products. He asked how would that be determined when they come in to the City to apply for a business license. Director Kim said staff can tell most of the time, by the name of the business or by the type of products that they want to sell, whether staff should ask more questions. Commissioner Manley asked how does the City know that 60% of gross sales are from tobacco products. Director Kim said sales are substantiated based on the business license tax receipts. She then explained how there are different mechanisms to look at to determine if a business falls into the category of a smoke shop and that the proposed definition was taken from other cities who are using it and it seems to be working for them. Commissioner Manley said he didn't think the proposed definition of a smoke shop was foolproof because someone could easily make sure that they had less than 20% of products on display and/or perhaps specify the sale of "chips" rather than specify tobacco to avoid the 60% gross sales trigger. Director Kim said tobacco products are taxed differently than other products and if a business operator is mis-identifying tobacco products as something else that could be tax fraud. Director Kim and the Commission then discussed the reason for needing a definition of smoke shops. Commissioner Manley asked if there are records to prove that the existing smoke shops contribute to delinquency and violence concerns. Director Kim said the Chief of Police was asked at the City Council meeting if they had records and he was not able to say if they did. She explained that concerns were referenced in the City's General Plan-Safety Element.

Commissioner Manley said that of the 14 smoke shops that have come into the City during the past five years, he has not heard the Police Department express any safety concerns, nor have they asked the City to stop them from opening. Director Kim said she is not aware of the City of La Habra's police expressing any concerns, but said that Anaheim did engage in some significant police work associated with the smoke shops in that city which is what led to their tobacco retail license. Commissioner Manley expressed concerns about the City not wanting the proposed code amendment affect the existing 20 independent smoke shops, especially if there are community safety concerns. Director Kim said the Commission could include in their recommendation to City Council that the City Council reduce the number of existing tobacco retailers. Commissioner Manley asked which other city has done something similar to what La Habra is proposing. Director Kim said she used the City of Gardena as an example. Commissioner Manley asked if she knew if the City of Gardena did anything to address their existing tobacco retailers. Director Kim said she wasn't aware.

Chair Mahecha asked what is the point of the moratorium. Director Kim said this is a legislative decision of City Council. Chair Mahecha expressed her concern over the City not limiting larger retailers like Walmart from continuing to sell tobacco products.

Chair Mahecha opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the item. There were none. She asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the item. There were none. Chair Mahecha closed the public hearing and asked for a discussion or a motion.

Vice Chair Ramsland said he has issues with smaller retailers being singled out as a result of this code amendment. He also said there is not any information to indicate the need to prohibit new smoke shops based on secondary effects.

Commissioner Manley said he shares some of the same concerns voiced by Vice Chair Ramsland and Chair Mahecha. He said he didn't feel right about saying that new smoke shops would not be good for public safety, but still allow the existing 20 independent smoke shops to continue to operate. Commissioner Manley said he is aware of certain smoke shops that are operating well into the morning when other businesses that fall under CUPs have their hours regulated. There was a discussion about change of land use and how smoke shops are not required to comply with hours of operation.

Vice Chair Ramsland asked if Commissioner Manley wanted to include in their motion to ask Council to include a modification to the hours of operation and to limit the hours of operation of the existing smoke shops.

Chair Mahecha said she was voting no on a moratorium and said she had a list of reason why. She felt this was discrimination and can open the City up to lawsuits. Chair Mahecha said she may be amenable to requiring a CUP for smoke shops or a tobacco retail license.

Commissioner Manley reminded the Commission that the moratorium is already in effect and not under the Commission's purview. He then went back to his example of how a smoke shop without a CUP can continue to operate 24-hours a day. The Commission briefly discussed when the moratorium came into effect and when the extension would be brought forth to the City Council.

Vice Chair Ramsland suggested that they ask City Council to extend the moratorium for now until they can get more details on the proposed ordinance.

Chair Mahecha said she would be opposed to that for several reasons. First, the prohibition of new smoke shops would result in a loss of tax revenues. She talked about her participation in getting people to vote on the recent sales tax increase to keep the City running at acceptable levels. Prohibiting new smoke shops would turn away tax revenue since tobacco is taxed at a higher rate. Chair Mahecha said moving forward with this zone change is also promoting the idea that some vices are more acceptable than others. She said this also protects existing businesses from competition. Chair Mahecha stated that she is pro-business and wants the City to be able to collect tax revenue to bring in money to its coffers. Chair Mahecha said this penalizes small businesses when we should be protecting small businesses. She also said that adults should be able to consume and make their own choices regarding purchasing legal products. Chair Mahecha said she has no problems restricting where smoke shops can operate and said she doesn't want to see these shops near schools or in residential zones, but noted that she's fine with them if they remain in commercial zones. Chair Mahecha said the proposed amendments discriminates against certain types of businesses and she is surprised that the City would open themselves up to these types of lawsuits. Chair Mahecha said it seems silly to say that tobacco causes delinquency. She said that California already has some of the strictest regulations in the country and therefore she didn't see any urgency requiring City action. Chair Mahecha said she would vote no on a moratorium, but she would be amenable to discussing requiring CUPs or tobacco retail licenses.

Commissioner Manley said he would not be making the motion and said if the motion is made, then he will be voting no. Vice Chair Ramsland said they have to make a recommendation to Council and if they vote no then their recommendation is "no. Commissioner Logan-Cannon said she would be voting yes.

Commissioner Manley asked City Attorney Roberto if they had to make a motion. City Attorney Roberto said the Commission's purpose is to make a recommendation to the City Council. She explained that if the majority of the Commission is voting no then the recommendation and the motion would be that the City Council not approve this ordinance. Attorney Roberto said that however, City Council is not bound by their recommendation.

Commissioner Manley wished for the record to show that he recommended that the City Council revisit this item. He said he is fine with the City Council extending the moratorium at their next meeting.

Vice Chair Ramsland said City Council can extend the moratorium for up to a year.

Commissioner Manley asked Chair Mahecha if she would be in support of that. Chair Mahecha said she is not in favor of the moratorium being extended for up to a year.

Commissioner Manley said he would be in favor of that and he would want City Council to reconsider what they are doing to regulate the existing smoke shops or retailers. He said that it doesn't seem right for a smoke shop to be able to operate 24-hours a day, seven days a week. Commissioner Manley said that if the City believes that there is a correlation between public safety and these new smoke shops, then all tobacco retailers should have some regulations especially limiting the hours of operation. He said that he can deduce that the

reason why they don't want to regulate the existing smoke shops is because they don't want to burden staff more or use resources to regulate those and so the easy thing to do is say no more. He said he is not in support of the resolution as it is written.

After discussing what they can recommend with the City Attorney, Commissioner Manley made a motion that City Council reconsider the regulation of the existing smoke shops in the City to be more congruent with some of the concerns that were cited that they believe need to be addressed. City council needs to reconsider whether allowing the existing shops to remain in operation without further regulation would be effective.

City Attorney Roberto said that the ordinance before the Commission is specific to new smoke shops, but the motion that was made is related to existing shops. She asked that the Commission clarify what they are recommending to Council as it relates to the proposed ordinance.

The Commission reiterated that they're tasked with voting on a recommendation to either approve or not approve ZCA 25-0005 . Director Kim reminded them that the moratorium was not up for their vote. Vice Chair Ramsland said that there is a clear consensus that the vote would be that the City Council not adopt the ordinance to approve ZCA 25-0005. He said all of the Commission's reasons are stated on the record and he would make a motion that they not adopt the Zone Change.

Director Kim clarified that a "yes" vote meant that they were recommending that the City Council not approve the ordinance and a "no" vote" meant they were in favor of the City Council approving the ordinance.

Moved by Vice Chair Ramsland and seconded by Chair Mahecha, approving Resolution No. 25-18 Entitled: A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LA HABRA, CALIFORNIA, NOT RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 25-0005 (ZCA 25-0005) AMENDING SECTION 18.04.030 (TERMS DEFINED) OF CHAPTER 18.04 (DEFINITIONS) AND SECTION 18.06.040 (LAND USES) OF CHAPTER 18.06 (ZONES ESTABLISHED --ZONING MAP BOUNDARIES AND LAND USES) OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) OF THE LA HABRA MUNICIPAL CODE TO DEFINE SMOKE SHOPS AND TO REFLECT THAT NEW SMOKE SHOPS ARE PROHIBITED IN ALL ZONES AND MAKING A DETERMINATION THAT THE ORDINANCE IS EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 15378(b)(5) AND 15061(b)(3) OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES.

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: RAMSLAND, MAHECHA, MANLEY
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: LOGAN-CANNON
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CARDENAS

3. DULY NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING AN ORDINANCE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 25-0004 (ZCA 25-0004) TO ADD A NEW SECTION 17.12.070 (PARCEL MAPS FOR URBAN LOT SPLITS) TO CHAPTER 17.12 (PARCEL MAPS) OF TITLE 17 (SUBDIVISIONS) AND A NEW SECTION 18.24.060

(TWO-UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT) TO CHAPTER 18.24 (R-1A, R-1B AND R-1C SINGLE-UNIT DWELLING ZONES) OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) OF THE LA HABRA MUNICIPAL CODE TO IMPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 9 (2021) AND SENATE BILL 450 (2024) RELATING TO TWO-LOT SUBDIVISIONS AND TWO-UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATE LAW.

Chair Mahecha asked if any correspondence had been received with regard to the item.

Secretary Lopez said no.

Planning Manager, Sonya Lui, presented the report.

Chair Mahecha asked if any of the Commissioners had questions for staff.

Vice Chair Ramsland asked staff to clarify the proposed ordinance requirement that each lot must have adequate access to a public right-of-way and he asked staff why the ordinance includes language prohibiting flag lots. He explained that the City annexed hundreds of lots north of Whittier Boulevard that used to be part of the County of Orange that are flag lots and/or are located off of private roads.

Planning Manager Lui deferred to the City attorney whether the State law requires the City to prohibit flag lots. City Attorney Roberto said that requirement is not in State law Attorney Roberto also clarified that the ordinance does not explicitly say that there has to be access to a public road, but said that this is a State requirement.

Vice Chair Ramsland said he is aware of several large lots that could be divided into two lots and build two units on each lot, but noted that these lots are along easement roads and not public roads. Vice Chair Ramsland said that Public Works and the Fire Department usually considers the need to require the addition of a cul-de-sac, turnaround radius, and/or public improvements when they review projects on those types of lots. Vice Chair Ramsland asked if Senate Bill 9 (SB9) prohibits Public Works and/or the Fire Department from making those types of requirements. Planning Manager Lui said staff does not believe that there are any provisions that would undermine safety requirements. Vice Chair Ramsland said that was a key question since the State seems not to care about public safety, noting that it appears to be the State's desire to just cram as many houses into as many spaces as they can without parking. There was a discussion about landlocked parcels and flag lots. Planning Manager Lui said the Commission could ask staff to strike out the stipulation that flag lots are prohibited, but she informed the Commission that flag lots are generally seen as undesirable because they don't promote uniformity, and it requires layering of multiple types of easements.

The Commission discussed the minimum requirements in order to allow an urban lot split. Attorney Roberto clarified that the requirement regarding access states that landlocked parcels shall have an access easement over the other parcel and that the easement shall be not less than ten feet in width and must connect to the same curb cut and apron. Attorney Roberto said that the Commission could impose a requirement that each lot have access to or be adjacent to a public right of way.

Vice Chair Ramsland asked staff to clarify whether private roads would serve as adequate access. Director Kim said yes, those would meet the requirement as long as there is an easement. Vice Chair Ramsland then asked if a property owner could split their lot without

having to install a turnaround and other improvements as long as they have an easement to a public road. Director Kim said they cannot if the Building Official determines that the urban lot split without a turnaround or other improvements would be a public safety hazard.

Commissioner Manley asked what was the purpose of this ordinance. Attorney Robert said that the spirit of the ordinance is to codify the requirements of SB9. Commissioner Manley asked if other cities have done the same. Attorney Roberto said yes, La Habra is behind as many other cities codified state provisions in 2022.

Vice Chair Ramsland asked staff if Public Works or the Fire Department could not require a turnaround because State law stipulates that the City shall not require dedications or construction of off-site improvements. Director Kim responded that the draft ordinance includes language under the section regarding requirements for denial which gives the building official authority to require additional methods to mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. She gave the example of the Fire Department requiring a cul-de-sac.

Chair Mahecha opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the item. There were none. She asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the item. There were none. Chair Mahecha closed the public hearing and asked for a discussion or a motion.

Moved by Vice Chair Ramsland and seconded by Chair Mahecha, approving Resolution No. 25-19 Entitled: A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LA HABRA, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT AN ORDINANCE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 25-0004 TO ADD A NEW SECTION 17.12.070 (PARCEL MAPS FOR URBAN LOT SPLITS) TO CHAPTER 17.12 (PARCEL MAPS) OF TITLE 17 (SUBDIVISIONS) AND A NEW SECTION 18.24.060 (TWO-UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT) TO CHAPTER 18.24 (R-1A, R-1B AND R-1C SINGLE UNIT DWELLING ZONES) OF TITLE 18 (ZONING) OF THE LA HABRA MUNICIPAL CODE TO IMPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 9 (2021) AND SENATE BILL 450 (2024) RELATING TO TWO-LOT SUBDIVISIONS AND TWO-UNIT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS AND MAKING A DETERMINATION THAT THE ORDINANCE IS EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 65852.21(k) AND 66411.7(n).

The roll call vote was as follows:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS: MANLEY, MAHECHA, RAMSLAND, LOGAN-CANNON
NOES: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS: NONE
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS: CARDENAS

Secretary Lopez said the motion carried and this item will be forwarded to the City Council for their review and approval.

COMMENTS FROM STAFF

There were no comments from staff.

COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Chair Mahecha encouraged everyone to support El Cerrito Elementary School by going to Taco Nazo on Tuesday night for their fundraiser.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:17 p.m. to the Planning Commission meeting on September 8, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Veronica Lopez,
Secretary