



# CITY OF West Linn

## PLANNING COMMISSION

### SPECIAL MEETING

Minutes of October 30, 2013

Members present: Chair Michael Babbitt, Vice Chair Christine Steel, Russell Axelrod, Nancy King, Robert Martin and Holly Miller

Members absent: Lorie Griffith

Staff present: Chris Kerr, Interim Planning Director; and Megan Thornton, Assistant City Attorney

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order in the Council Chambers of City Hall at 6:18 p.m.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Alice Richmond, 3939 Parker Rd., thanked the Commissioners for being committed and conscientious.

Karie Oakes, 1125 Marylhurst Dr., asked the Commission to put an email from the Assistant City Attorney regarding proceeding with the "Cut the Red Tape" process in the record and on the website. She indicated she felt it was not proper process. Chair Babbitt agreed to put it in the public record and on the website. Ms. Oakes reported the *West Linn Update* was still conveying the same propaganda regarding the "Cut the Red Tape" project even though the Commission had made it clear it was not a good description of what they were doing. She indicated that raised the issue of whether it was really a transparent process.

Teri Cummings, 2190 Valley Ct., thanked the Commissioners for their time and diligence. She indicated that when a city attorney advised about the ["Cut the Red Tape"] process people should have the opportunity to speak to that. She questioned how and why the Commissioners had singled out some aspects of it and not other aspects if they were concerned that there had not been sufficient public outreach.

#### WORK SESSION

Discussion of "cut the red tape" amendments including proposed amendments to CDC chapters 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 46, 52, 55, 56, 60, 65, 75, 85, and 99, and the Comprehensive Plan, CDC-13-01

Chair Babbitt invited neighborhood association representative's to participate in the discussion. Those present were: Aaron Buffington, President, Robinwood Neighborhood Association; Brenda Perry and Ken Pryor, Savannah Oaks Neighborhood Association; Julia Simpson, Willamette Neighborhood Association; and Gail Holmes, Economic Development Committee. The discussion documents were: "Discussion Draft for October 16, 2013 meeting;" and "Cut the

Red Tape: Amendments for Consideration dated July 10" (with strike-outs dated October 15). The group discussed the following aspects.

*Exclusion of City Council goals*

Staff recommended removing the 2003 City Council Goals from the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission had modified them and renamed them "Citizen Vision Goals." At the end of this discussion Chair Babbitt observed the consensus was to keep the Citizen Vision Goals as drafted, except they would add back the 2003 City Council Goal that had been number 10.

During this discussion comments were related to the amount of vetting of the proposed Citizen Vision Goals; that annual City Council goals changed every year; that Council goals were more practical than visionary; that Council goals were not always added to the Comprehensive Plan; that the goals in the Comprehensive Plan had been around for ten years and the community relied on them; that the goals were loftier, aspirational goals which could be vetted through a public process; that the Council Goals were outdated and did not belong in the Comprehensive Plan; and that if the Commission recommended the Citizen Vision Goals and left them in the document they would be vetted by the community at the City Council hearing. The neighborhood association representatives offered comments which included that citizens had not been involved in creating the Citizen Vision Goals; that it was important for West Linn to have the guidance of a vision; that as things changed the goals should be updated; and that these were long range, aspirational, goals as contrasted with the City Council's annual, practical, goals.

Commissioner Axelrod was asked what process and background information he had used to craft the Citizen Vision Goals. He related he had started with the City Council goals, changed some wording, cleaned them up a bit, and made them more current, but he had not changed most of them. He related that he had looked at Mr. Kerr's proposal related to economic development and tried to integrate the interest in the current economic vision as well as the concept of looking to revitalize areas of mixed-uses. He had kept the big, aspirational, goals. He had used the information they had received in the packages they got from the staff. He related that after hearing testimony and thinking about it he would add back the goal that had previously been #10 which called for growth to pay 100% of its cost, and retain and renumber new goal #10 as #11. He noted the community could now voice their opinions on the Vision. He recalled the Commission had gotten very positive feedback from the citizens who had come to their meetings.

Mr. Kerr suggested if the Planning Commission thought there was a valid reason to make the change this might not be the right venue to do it in. It might mean a separate process and outreach. They could recommend that. Commissioner Axelrod suggested the Commission proceed with the proposed Citizen Vision Goals and let the citizens decide what they wanted to do.

Mr. Pryor was concerned the Vision could be interpreted as pursuing mixed-use regardless of the cost. He questioned whether all growth could pay for itself (#10) and noted the goal related to mixed-use did not talk about factors such as cost and traffic (#7). Chair Babbitt observed the Commission could recommend the vision as a starting point and then it would be up to the elected City Council to make policy decisions after the community spoke about it. Commissioner Martin supported keeping the Vision in the document because there needed to be a vision in it and because the drafted Vision had received a lot of attention in their work sessions and public hearings and the public would have another opportunity to speak about it at the upcoming hearing. Ms. Perry asked the Commission to make every effort to publicize it and involve as many people as possible.

Chair Babbitt related that he and Vice Chair Steel had discussed additional outreach with the City Manager and some Councilors. He had advised them the Commission was going to recommend additional outreach before the Council hearing as well as offer a recommendation related to the document. Mr. Buffington inquired how much time the neighborhood associations would have to discuss the materials. Chair Babbitt clarified they had until November 13 to submit written testimony for the November 20 hearing and they would be able to offer oral testimony at the hearing. He noted that if the Commission recommended the proposal to the City Council there would be additional opportunities for public testimony at the Council hearing. He then observed consensus to keep the Citizen Vision Goals as drafted, except they would add back #10 and renumber the new goal there as #11.

39:26

#### *Conditional Use*

**Current Comprehensive Plan definition: A proposed use of land which may be allowed after the City Planning Commission has determined that the proposed use is appropriate for the site, compatible with surrounding uses, is supported by City public facilities, and is of overall benefit to the community and meets all other relevant criteria.**

**Staff recommended definition (same as definition in CDC and used by the state): A use which may be permitted by the approval authority following a public hearing upon findings by the approval authority that the approval criteria have been met or will be met upon satisfaction of conditions of approval.**

The neighborhood representatives raised the following concerns: conditional use approval authority might be taken away from the Commission; and, the staff definition was very open-ended compared with the current definition, which specified criteria such as 'overall benefit to the community' which was very important. The Commissioners agreed the criteria were important. Chair Babbitt assured the neighborhood representatives that the Commission had addressed approval authority so there was no longer concern the Commission would lose CUP approval authority. Mr. Kerr advised that if the Commissioners wished to retain the criteria, it should not be in the definition, but in the criteria section. Chair Babbitt observed the

consensus was to agree to use the staff recommended definition of Conditional Use that was consistent with the one in the CDC and to put the criteria in the criteria section.

*Approval Standards for Conditional Uses (see 60.070 on page 26)*

Mr. Kerr related that staff no longer proposed to remove any criteria. They had agreed with the Commissioners to keep the existing criteria and add to it.

Commissioner Martin posed these questions: How legitimate is it for the City to demand a benefit in return for CUP? If a proposed conditional use does no harm does it have to offer some kind of extra value? Chair Babbitt indicated he did not consider having to have a benefit a 'taking.' Neighborhood association representatives suggested the idea was the citizens were getting something of value to the community out of it; and, the idea was to first, do no harm, but in the end benefit the community. One commented that if businesses did not want to do that they could locate their businesses someplace else.

**Criterion A.3. The granting of the proposal will provide for a facility that is consistent with the overall needs of the community.**

The group discussed Commissioner Martin's suggestion to incorporate language to the effect that it 'provides a benefit to the community' into the above criterion. At the end of the discussion Chair Babbitt observed the consensus was not to add the additional language. During the discussion Mr. Kerr clarified that a conditional use was not a variance. It was a use the City had already deemed appropriate, provided it got additional scrutiny to ensure it did not have adverse impacts on surroundings. He advised determining what the benefit was would be subjective and ambiguous. He suggested that if the Commissioners did not want to allow a use in a zoning district they should change the CDC so no one could even apply for it. Discussion comments included that 'benefit' was subjective and should not be added; that they did not need another subjective criterion because they had already agreed to the subjective criterion, 'consistent with the overall needs of the community'; and that there were a number of other criteria that had to be met that could prevent a use from happening in the wrong place. Chair Babbitt then observed the consensus was to not add the additional language.

1:00

*Charge neighborhood associations an appeal fee*

Mr. Kerr proposed to no longer allow neighborhood associations to appeal land use decisions for free. He reported the appeal fee was \$400. Chair Babbitt recalled that this change was supposed to limit the potential for frivolous appeals that cost the City money. He clarified the Commission did not support the staff recommendation. The neighborhood association representatives indicated they did not support it either. Their comments included that being able to appeal for free had not been abused; neighborhood association input during appeals had enhanced applications; an appeal was a lot of work for a neighborhood association; if a neighborhood association could not afford the fee then they could not pursue a legitimate appeal; the associations needed the stipend they got from the City to run their organizations; if

the number of association appeals was a problem the Commission could place a limit on how many free appeals a neighborhood association could make each year. Commissioner Martin offered to pay a neighborhood association's appeal fee if they had a legitimate appeal and were required to pay the fee but did not have the \$400.

1:06

*Lot Dimensional Requirements*

**4. The lot depth comprising non-Type I or II lands shall be less than two and one-half times the width, and more than an average depth of 90 feet.**

The Commissioners had already agreed to strike this provision in zones with larger lot sizes because it made no difference there. Now they considered whether to strike it in R7 and R10 as well. Mr. Kerr explained it regulated the depth of the buildable area of a lot because it controlled the depth of the non-Type I and II area of a lot. He reported staff saw a lot of variance requests related to this provision. Infill sites tended to have more constrained land so it was hard to get the required shape of the buildable area to develop on. He advised it might be overly restrictive because there were other controls in place to avoid odd-shaped or overly-deep lots; and, it was not in a developer's financial interest to create a bizarre lot. He related that staff thought removing the provision from R7 and R10 would not do great harm to the community; however, they would not fall on their swords over it if striking it created too much concern.

The Commissioners recalled a recent R7 subdivision application they had heard. In order to meet this code provision the applicant had changed their original site plan by shortening five lots by a few feet and putting the excess footage in a couple of tiny tracts that served no purpose. At the hearing the Commissioners had observed that did not make sense, so they approved the five variances the applicant had originally applied for and allowed the longer lots. Chair Babbitt noted the Commission could not have done that if the applicant had originally submitted a plan with the lots and tracts that met the code and not asked for variances.

During the discussion comments included that in the absence of this provision there were other controls in place and to give flexibility on infill parcels that were constrained; that the variance process was available; that the variance process had worked well in the case the Commissioners had described; that the Commission had only been able to resolve that case that way because the applicant had originally applied for variances; that there could be abuse without this provision; that the variance process was uncertain and might require additional fees; and that staff could make applicants aware of the variance option at the preapplication conferences.

Commissioners Axelrod and Martin each indicated he was inclined not to strike the provision. Mr. Kerr was asked what else prevented odd-shaped lots. He advised that included minimum lot size; minimum lot width; minimum density requirements that capped lot size; and a subdivision requirement that did not allow creation of inefficient, bizarrely-shaped, lots. He

was not sure why this code had originally been adopted, but thought it had to do with having regularly shaped lots with a large buildable area. Ms. Perry inquired if striking this provision would mean there would be less wiggle room on small lots and if it would result in increased density. Vice Chair Steel noted the example of the recent case showed that striking the provision would actually give developers more wiggle room; and that density would not be increased because there was still a minimum lot width in each zone.

Commissioner Martin then proposed to retain the subject code provision and increase minimum lot width. For example, he would increase R7 minimum lot width from 50 ft. to 75 ft., which would increase the depth limit by 15 feet without dramatically changing anything. He would make minimum lot width 75 ft. in R10 as well. Mr. Kerr clarified provision 4 was not talking about the lot's width and depth, but about the depth and shape of the buildable area of the lot (outside of non-Type I or II lands) and required it to be less than two and one-half times that area's width. He indicated he did not think it was necessary to make minimum lot width wider. He related that applicants were dealing with the issue that infill lots were a little bit more difficult to design so more flexibility would help.

Commissioner Martin then suggested both striking provision #4 and increasing minimum lot width. Responses to that suggestion included concern about the effect on existing planned lots in the City; that some land owners who were counting on dividing their parcel into a certain number of lots for retirement investment would not be allowed to have that many; that some of the developers were their neighbors; that owners who had been counting on dividing their 100 ft. wide parcel into two 50 ft. wide lots would now have to try to create a flag lot; that it was not fair to change the minimum lot width because too much was already in place now; and that this could be handled through variances. Commissioner Axelrod noted he had asked for additional analysis of this. In the absence of additional analysis he would leave the provision in the zones. Chair Babbitt then observed that four Commissioners leaned towards striking the provision in the R7 and R10 zones. Mr. Kerr noted that the hearing draft would reflect that.

1:42

*Commercial buffer (see pages 36 and 37)*

Mr. Kerr pointed out the commercial zones specified the setbacks from residential zones and then the draft code continued by saying, '**In addition, in order to mitigate adverse impacts, a landscape buffer not to exceed 50 feet and which may include fencing or walls may be required.**' He noted the Commissioners had previously agreed to that language. He explained staff recommended deleting the 50 ft. buffer language because it did not make any sense to tell permitted uses their required setback was 20 ft. and then add language telling them a buffer of 50 ft. might be required with no explanation of what that meant. He related that staff did not think the buffer would be necessary most of the time; they did not think it added any value to commercial properties or encouraged the things the City was looking for. He noted the applicant would be spending a lot of money to come up with their proposal but the buffer was not a certainty. He suggested a different tactic could be to keep the 50 ft. buffer language but be specific about what its purpose was and what would occur in it. He advised that if a buffer

was necessary because of noise, light or other adverse impacts the code already had regulations that addressed those. Commissioner Martin noted keeping the drafted language would serve to warn applicants that they needed to look in the other sections because a buffer might be required. Chair Babbitt saw consensus to keep it.

Mr. Kerr confirmed that staff would correct some typos the Commissioners had found in the new draft. The Commission recessed for a few minutes and then reconvened the work session.  
1:55

#### *De Novo versus On-the-record Appeal Hearings*

Mr. Kerr clarified for the neighborhood association representatives that all appeals were currently *de novo* hearings. He guessed there had been about a dozen land use appeals since he began working for the City. Chair Babbitt mentioned there seemed to be an increase in the number of appeals. He recalled the Commissioners had noted one advantage of on-the-record hearings was that the applicant would tend to present their best proposal to the Planning Commission instead of waiting to change it for the Council *de novo* hearing.

Ms. Thornton was asked to clarify how much of an application could be changed in a *de novo* appeal. She advised a project could be changed to the extent that it did not involve any new criteria (the Lake Oswego-Tigard water treatment plant application was an example of that). If the change made it subject to additional criteria the process had to start again at the beginning.

Neighborhood association representatives' comments included that although on-the-record hearings might encourage an applicant to put their best foot forward, laymen citizens needed enough time to understand the matter; the *de novo* process gave them more time to prepare and the ability to provide new evidence; to a certain extent an appeal was the price of doing business; and the bottom line was the change would take away the voice of the people. Commissioner Miller pointed out they still had the right to testify at Planning Commission and City Council hearings. Mr. Pryor cited the example that neighborhood comments had prevented a drive-through that was in the marketplace initial design. He indicated he thought if developers were much more proactive and forthright in presenting their plans to the neighborhood associations that might ameliorate some of the fears and doubts neighborhoods had.

Ms. Holmes said they were not ready to get rid of *de novo* for one reason, which was because communication with the City was not good enough; things happened that people had no idea were going on; and by the second (*de novo*) round they became aware of them. Commissioner Martin characterized that as using the Planning Commission as a trial run before people woke up and got involved at the Council level. He suggested the Commissioners consider ways to make people aware of applications and educating them about them. He indicated that until the City could do that he would not consider moving to on-the-record hearings. Chair Babbitt agreed the City could strive to do it better; however, he questioned that the end result would be better because the problem for years had been that there were some dedicated people who

stayed involved, but for the most part people were not interested in spending their time that way.

The Commissioners then discussed communication and timing. At the end of that discussion Chair Babbitt observed that the Commissioners wanted to keep on-the-record hearings in the draft for the time being, but before they made a formal recommendation they wanted to look at other options for improving the process and recommend those as well. The CCI could take it up at the same time. During the discussion the group considered a suggestion to put more information in the notice of land use application, including the applicant's findings. They asked Mr. Kerr to talk about the process. He related that notice that a land use application had been submitted was sent to the neighborhood association when it came in. They were invited to the preapplication conference. As soon as an application was deemed complete it was placed on the website. At that time the 120-day clock started. Staff was always looking for ways to get the information out even faster. The timeline they were using exceeded state standards. It took four to six weeks for staff to do their analysis and finalize the staff report, but the other materials were available for people to read during those weeks, including the complete application, which contained the applicant's findings of facts. He explained a problem with *de novo* hearings was that the City Council might be pressed for time to review an application and all of the materials in the record, but *de novo* allowed even more materials to come in. He indicated he believed an on-the-record appeal hearing would help and it would bring better applications. The Council could reopen the record if factual or procedural errors were discovered.

Commissioners' and neighborhood association representatives' responses included that if neighborhood associations had four to six weeks to consider it they should not wait until the last minute to look at it; four to six weeks gave them time for due diligence, but neighborhood association meetings were not all well attended and not all of them represented the views of their members; the Commission should ask them what they needed in terms of communication and education that could make on-the-record appeals work; one aspect of the communication problem was that not all citizens were aware they had a neighborhood association; the staff report was a critical piece of information for the neighborhood association; they should not go to on-the-record hearings until they could improve communication to the point it would work well; *de novo* was not used much by other jurisdictions, but it was overused in West Linn; watching a Planning Commission hearing was the ultimate education and prepared the citizens; they should think about limiting the number of free appeals a neighborhood association could ask for each year if they continued with *de novo* hearings to ensure the privilege was not overused, but if they decided to have on-the-record appeal hearings the associations should be allowed unlimited appeals; some neighborhoods were built out so a limit like that should be based on how much growth a neighborhood was going to experience; they needed the redundancy of *de novo* appeals until they were able to involve people earlier in the process and had made it possible for people who wanted to be informed to do their preparation; and the Commission needed to rebuild trust that had been lost recently.

Vice Chair Steel recalled the neighborhood associations' concern about uncovering facts. She also recalled that Ms. Thornton had advised that the record could be re-opened in an on-the-record hearing if a factual or procedural error was discovered. She asked if there could be a third reason for reopening it if significant facts came to light after the initial hearing. Commissioner Martin related a former mayor had explained to him that the City went to *de novo* hearings because they spent a lot of time in hearings arguing about whether something was new information or not.

Chair Babbitt observed that four Commissioners were leaning toward on-the-record if the other issues could be solved, and two had indicated they wanted to maintain *de novo* hearings for the time being. He summarized that on-the-record would be kept in the draft for the time being, but before they made a formal recommendation they wanted to consider ways to improve the process. The CCI could take it up at the same time. He noted some suggestions had been made that night. He asked the neighborhood associations to ask their members what would work for them and provide recommendations. Mr. Kerr offered to provide a report outlining the current process.

*Planning Commission review of Planning Director decisions*

**99.160 DECISION BY DIRECTOR**

**C. A decision made by the Director shall be final as provided by CDC 99.230 unless:**  
**2. ~~Not less than two~~ A majority of the members of the Commission or two members of the Council order a review within 14 days of the final decision pursuant to CDC 99.240.**

Mr. Pryor and Ms. Perry each indicated they did not support the proposed change because they believed if at least two Commissioners were concerned about a Planning Director's decision it should be reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Thornton advised the charter required a majority of the City Council. Commissioner Martin recalled the Commissioners had talked about going from two to three Commissioners. He anticipated it would be difficult to learn about it and somehow get four Commissioners to agree within the two weeks after the planning director's decision. Vice Chair Steel agreed those were practical reasons for calling for less than a quorum. Commissioner Martin indicated he would change this provision back to two Commissioners and also change the related Council requirement (in 99.170) to two Councilors instead of a majority. Ms. Thornton confirmed they could not engage in deliberations towards a decision outside of a quorum. She suggested they work through the planning department to schedule a special meeting to decide whether to review the director's decision. Chair Babbitt noted changing the Council requirement would not be consistent with the City charter. He observed the consensus was to change 99.160 to two Commissioners.

Chair Babbitt thanked the neighborhood association representatives for participating in the work session. He told them the Commissioners were thinking about opening the public record that evening and leaving it open for written comments until November 13; and scheduling the public hearing on November 20, when they would invite more testimony.

3:02

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - DELIBERATION**

**CDC 13-01 Proposed "Cut the Red Tape" amendments to CDC chapters 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 46, 52, 55, 56, 60, 65, 75, 85, and 99.**

Chair Babbitt opened the hearing and announced the Commission was not going to take formal action or make a recommendation on the project that night, but they were going to discuss it and re-open the public record.

Commissioner Martin **moved** to continue CDC 13-01 to November 20, 2013; leave the written record open until November 13, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.; and allow oral testimony at the November 20 hearing. Chair Babbitt **seconded** the motion and it **passed** 6:0. The Commissioners then considered the following aspects of the draft code.

*Citizen Vision Goals*

Commissioner Axelrod suggested making the following revisions to Goals 12 and 13.

Drafted Goal 12: ~~Explore the possibility of creating~~ **Create** a special mixed use zone **and framework plan** for the **industrial Arch Bridge** area overlooking the Willamette Falls.

Revised Goal 12: Create master plan for Arch Bridge area and prepare a planning framework and propose CDC revisions, as necessary, to implement the plan.

Drafted Goal 13. **Explore opportunities for creating specific district plans and regulations for each of the City's commercial areas.**

Revised Goal 13: Explore opportunities and create specific district plans and regulations, as necessary, for each of the City's commercial areas.

Mr. Kerr indicated he could agree to the revised wording because it added clarity and was action-oriented. No one objected to these changes.

*GREATER FLEXIBILITY*

**Proposed GC zone permitted uses**

**27. Lodge, fraternal, community center, and civic assembly within the commercial districts along Highway 43 and Salamo Road.**

***[alternative: all Lodge, fraternal, community center, and civic assembly permitted as conditional uses.]***

**28. Religious Institutions within the commercial districts along Highway 43 and Salamo Road.**

***[alternative: all Religions institutions permitted as conditional uses – if this alternative is selected, lodges, fraternal, community center, and civic assembly (No. 27 above) must also be permitted as a conditional use. The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA) mandates equal treatment among these types of assembly uses]***

Commissioner Axelrod inquired about the addition of the above permitted uses. Ms. Thornton recalled that she had advised and the Commissioners had agreed to treat religious institutions and fraternal organizations the same. Mr. Kerr pointed out the language only permitted them in specific areas of commercial that were '**within the commercial districts along Highway 43 and Salamo Road**'; and that the Conditional Uses made them conditional uses in other areas.

**ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Commissioner Miller related that a *West Linn Tidings* article quoted a citizen who said they did not understand how the Planning Commission would approve any trails plan that would jeopardize the safety and well-being of West Linn citizens, but the article did not report that the Commission had done a substantial amount of work to address citizens' concerns and mitigate potential hazards before it approved the master trails plan. She reported that she had contacted the reporter to explain that and she believed he had printed a retraction.

**ITEMS OF INTEREST PERTAINING TO THE COMMISSION FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**

Chair Babbitt asked staff to schedule a CCI meeting on December 4. Mr. Kerr related the City Council had indicated they wanted to meet with the Planning Commission in January to discuss a variety of issues. Chair Babbitt anticipated they could talk about the CCI and the Cut the Red Tape process as well. He reported the City Manager had told him they would delay the City Council hearing until they could do some additional outreach. Commissioner Miller asked that the City Manager put it in writing because no one had contacted her. Commissioner Martin expressed his opinion that so much had been removed from the proposed amendments package and so little was left they should just start over again, using a better citizen involvement process. Chair Babbitt anticipated the other items would be addressed in separate, smaller, groups of projects. Mr. Kerr offered to outline the things they had agreed on in preparation for the hearing. The Commissioners talked about issues related to their electronic drop box.

**ITEMS OF INTEREST FROM STAFF**

Mr. Kerr confirmed that he was serving as the interim planning director.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no other business, Chair Babbitt adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 10:08 p.m.

APPROVED:

*for* Christine M Steel, vice chair  
Michael Babbitt, Chair

1-21-2014  
Date