

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

November 9, 2005
7:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Bonincontri, Vice-Chair Mathews, Commissioners Bach, Lynde, Orrico, Sheffels

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Robertson

STAFF PRESENT: Kathleen Burgess, Matt Jackson, Michael Paine, Heidi Bedwell, Department of Planning and Community Development

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by Chair Bonincontri who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Robertson who was excused.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Comprehensive Planning Manager Kathleen Burgess provided the Commissioners with information regarding upcoming Sound Transit open house events and copies of emails received regarding critical areas and Crossroads.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Tim Rodgers, 2617 169th Avenue SE, said the Beaumont subdivision in which he lives is blessed with panoramic vistas of the Cascade Mountains and Lake Sammamish. In order to preserve the views, community covenants have been put in place that call for maintaining view corridors; those covenants have been successfully implemented for the past 40 years. The proposed critical areas ordinance significantly limits the ability of property owners to manage vegetation on their properties. The ordinance is an unnecessary intrusion on private property rights. The residents have no intention of allowing blight to occur. It is clearly in the best interests of the local residents to do a good job of managing both the views and the ecology of the area. He submitted materials in support of his objection to the September 7 version of the critical areas ordinance relative to vegetation management and the overly conservative steep slopes criteria and asked the Commission to direct staff to revise the critical areas ordinance to allow property owners in developed plats to manage their own vegetation without requiring a

permit and without the vegetation management restrictions outlined by the critical areas ordinance.

Mr. Roy Eisenbach, 12110 SE 16th Place, said the Woodridge neighborhood also has covenants that for many years have served to protect views. The covenants have not cost the city anything, and the result has been a very nice-looking neighborhood. Nothing has been said about how the city intends to enforce the proposed rules against the topping of trees, but it will be costly. When the views are gone property values will fall; that will result in fewer revenues for the city to use for enforcing the rules. The covenants established by Woodridge have been challenged in court and upheld, even through the appellate courts. The city should not even consider rules that disallow the topping of trees when there are neighborhoods that have covenants that have already been tested in the courts.

Ms. Barbara Antes, 12152 SE 23rd, spoke as covenant chairman for the Woodridge Community Club. She said she has been fighting tree issues for the last eight or nine years. The city of Bellevue chose to annex Woodridge knowing full well that the neighborhood has covenants in place; it is foolish to step up now and say the residents will no longer be able to cut trees. Those who own view properties in Woodridge paid dearly for them; they knew the covenants were in place and have agreed to them. Views make a huge difference in the value of properties, and in order to preserve those views trees must be trimmed and topped.

Mr. Al Slaten, 17007 SE 45th Street, said he purchased his view-property home in 1992 and paid accordingly for it. He said when the homes in the area were constructed, several areas were designated as greenbelts, but the deeds specify that management for view preservation is permitted. In fact, \$50,000 was paid to certain property owners below the greenbelts for certain rights to preserve the views. The property lying between his property and his view of Lake Sammamish is not greenbelt, however, but rather a stormwater retention area. The city's current policy precludes view preservation in the area, and the view has substantially diminished; in a few years it will disappear altogether. A new city regulation should be enacted that says no property with a view subject to being lost because of tree growth can be advertised, offered by a realtor, or described as view property in any form of sale solicitation. That would keep the city from being a party to misrepresentation.

Mr. Larry Diamond, 2669 169th Avenue SE, also a resident of Beaumont, said he is the owner and publisher of the *Washington Realtor* newspaper. He suggested that the proposed critical areas ordinance is classic bureaucratic meddling. People with view properties in Bellevue covet where they live and will do nothing in preserving their views to destroy the environment. He said the covenants that govern his property allow him to maintain the views in perpetuity.

Ms. Marilyn Robertson, 4236 140th Avenue NE, commented that to the north of her property along 14th Avenue NE the city purchased a property on which to construct a storm retention facility. The first thing the city did was to remove all of the trees, some of which were very large. It appears the city thinks that action is alright for the city to do but not for homeowners to do. Trees grow over time and they should be maintained. Some trees should be removed and replaced with lower-growing species. The restrictions proposed by the critical areas ordinance step too hard on the toes of residents and indicate the city has no confidence in the judgment of its citizens.

Mr. Gene Meyers, address not given, said he lives on the west side of Somerset. He said he purchased his property in 1968 at a time when he had a view of approximately 200 degrees. The greenbelt to the south of his property has not been maintained by the city in accordance with the covenants all of the residents of the community must abide by. As a result, some trees have grown tall enough to block views. The property is valued for tax purposes at about \$250,000

more than a similar property without a view would be taxed. The city is in effect charging a tax on the view, but it does not act to maintain those views and thus preserve its own tax base. As the greenbelt continues to mature, more views will be lost. The city should be held to the same covenant standards and should take out trees that block views.

Mr. Steve O'Donnell, address not given, said he is also a resident of Somerset. He said he has lived in Bellevue all his life and has yet to see tree topping kill any tree. The idea that topping a tree will kill it is absolute nonsense. The hill in Somerset was completely barren 40 years ago; the city at that time allowed the property developer to completely clear-cut the area. The city should give great deference and consideration to the millions of dollars that have been spent on landscaping on Somerset, let alone all the other neighborhoods in Bellevue. The idea that a homeowner will have to come to City Hall and pay for a permit to top a tree is outrageous. Anyone on the Commission and the Council should be embarrassed to even suggest it; they should remember who it is that pays their salaries. The whole notion of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" and "we the people" seems to have been forgotten. There should be an outing planned to show the Council and the Commission members all the dead trees in Bellevue that died because they were topped.

Ms. Ann Nelson, address not given, pointed out that utilities companies are allowed to go around pruning trees at will, and none of those trees have died.

Mr. Shibo Gotserat(?), address not given, said he has been a resident of Somerset since 1987. He said when he purchased his property he had views of Seattle and Mt. Rainier. When the Forest Ridge area was developed, promises were made about maintaining the vegetation so as to preserve the views for Somerset residents, but that has not happened. Over the years the trees have grown tall enough to block out all views. The property taxes collected by the city, however, continue to be based on the fact that the property has a view.

6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

7. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Bridle Trails Trees

Senior Planner Matthews Jackson pointed out that the proposed Land Use Code amendments are applicable only to the R-1 land use district in the Bridle Trails subarea. He said in December 2001 the City Council initiated an update to the Bridle Trails subarea plan of the Comprehensive Plan to address tree clearing policies; the initiation was made at the request of Bridle Trails residents. At the time there was significant concern on the part of many with regard to the amount of clearing and clear-cutting that was going on both on vacant and developed properties. There were several land clearing instances that occurred prior to subdividing to skirt the city's requirements to retain significant trees.

Mr. Jackson said the draft ordinance was submitted to the Planning Commission on October 12. Since that time, only minor changes have been made to the ordinance.

In 2002 a tree survey was conducted in the Bridle Trails subarea. Approximately 511 residents were asked to comment on their concerns, issues, wants and needs relative to trees in their neighborhood. A majority of the respondents voiced concern that the city does not do enough to preserve the green character of the neighborhood; approximately 75 percent of the respondents supported the development of tree preservation regulations particular to Bridle Trails. The Bridle Trails Tree Committee was formed to study the issue along with staff. In 2004 the Bridle

Trails Tree Committee presented its recommendations to the City Council, and staff was directed to develop the recommendations into proposed code amendments.

Mr. Jackson said the primary focus of the code amendment is on saving trees within the perimeter of properties, as well as a percentage of trees within the interior of lots. In order to implement a code amendment particular to Bridle Trails, staff looked at reorganizing the way the current code treats tree preservation and landscape development; they are currently combined in a single section. There was recognition of the fact that if other neighborhoods in the city indicate similar interest in neighborhood specific regulations, it would make sense to organize the Land Use Code to accommodate tree preservation requirements specifically. The typical landscape development regulations have, accordingly, been separated from the requirements to retain significant trees; the latter has been housed in a new code section, 20.20.900.

The proposed regulations require the retention of all significant trees within the first 20 feet adjacent to property lines, the area referred to as the perimeter area. Significant trees are defined by the code as trees that have a diameter of eight inches or more at four feet above grade. The requirement does not currently apply to any residential properties in the city. There are exceptions to allow for necessary access, utilities, removing hazardous trees, and accommodating the minimum side yard setback requirements.

The amendment calls for the preservation of 25 percent of the cumulative diameter inches of significant trees within the interior of properties. Mr. Jackson explained that for a property with ten trees of ten inches diameter, or 100 cumulative diameter inches, the property owner would be required to preserve 25 diameter inches in any configuration. Under the current code property owners are allowed to remove trees on vacant or developed lots, unless there are critical areas or certain plat conditions involved. The city's clearing and grading permit has been the mechanism by which approval to remove trees has been given, and the threshold historically has been 1,000 square feet of disturbance area, which was understood to be equal to three significant trees. Early in 2005, the Director made the decision that up to 20 trees could be removed (as equivalent to 1,000 square feet of distribution) without any permit; beyond that threshold a permit is required.

The proposed ordinance includes what has been labeled the alternative tree retention option where the strict application of the regulations is not conducive to the development of a property. The alternative approach may result in the preserving of trees elsewhere on a property, or in removing some trees that would otherwise be required to be preserved in exchange for planting additional trees elsewhere on a lot.

Another aspect of the proposal deals with penalties. Mr. Jackson said there has been a lot of discussion about the fact that currently the city treats violations of the tree preservation requirements by requiring the violator to obtain the necessary permits retroactively. The problem is that the removal of significant trees cannot always be mitigated by planting new trees, at least in the short term. The proposed ordinance includes enhanced penalties for illegal and deliberate removal of trees on private property. The code includes penalties for removing vegetation from public lands that are based on either treble fees, up to \$500 per tree, or the value of a tree based on the guide from the International Arboriculture Society; those fees can be significant. For a healthy 14-inch Douglas fir, the value is set at \$2,900; for a healthy 28-inch Douglas fir, the value is set at \$11,600. The same sizes of Douglas firs in poor health command \$1,700 and \$7,000 respectively.

Mr. Jackson said the primary course of action the city will take in the event of illegal removal of vegetation will be toward restoration and revegetation. The monetary penalties are intended to serve as a disincentive.

The proposed ordinance was taken before the East Bellevue Community Council for review. While they are not affected directly by the ordinance, the fact that the Land Use Code is being reorganized does fall under their jurisdiction. They had questions about how to treat hazard trees, but nothing of substance regarding the ordinance.

Motion to open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Orrico. Second was by Commissioner Sheffels and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Christina Deegoni, address not given, spoke as one of the owners of Overlake Farm located at the northeast corner of Bridle Trails State Park between 132nd Street and 140th Street. She said she supports the goal of the Bridle Trails subarea plan, which is to protect and preserve the rural, equestrian and residential character of the area, and having a tree ordinance which will support the subarea goal. However, the proposed ordinance should be amended to allow for some additional flexibility for property owners engaged in traditional farming and equestrian activities. The Overlake Farm has been in operation since 1947 with livestock. Over the years the back 40 acres of the farm has been systematically and selectively logged to provide grazing area for the horses. The most recent logging activity was accomplished in 2004 under a permit from the city. The recent logging was followed by the planting of hundreds of Leyland cypress trees along the perimeter of the property, along with dozens of native species. The proposed restrictions aimed at preserving trees within the perimeter of properties is supportable, but the interior restriction should allow for periodic selective logging to maintain grazing areas. There should also be some phasing with regard to tree diameter.

Commissioner Orrico left the meeting.

Ms. Betty Lou Kapela, 5652 132nd Ave NE, spoke as one of the owners of Overlake Farm. She said she served as a member of the Bridle Trails CAC that developed the original subarea plan that has as its primary goal the protection and preservation of the rural equestrian nature of the area. Equestrian uses are a major part of the identity of Bridle Trails. She called for adding specific language in the ordinance to protect horse farm uses. Trees grow fast and over time need to be removed and replanted.

Mr. Warren Halvorson, 13701 NE 32nd Place, said during the last few years he has experienced having trees from neighboring properties fall onto his property, and has seen developers in the area clear cutting significantly sized properties in Bridle Trails. He indicated his support for having a separate land use requirement addressing tree preservation in the Bridle Trails neighborhood. The 20-foot perimeter protection zone, and the requirement to retain 25 percent of the significant trees in the interior, along with the reasonability provisions, is appropriate. The provisions, however, could be very onerous for single family property owners, especially if a property owner must get a city permit every time he wants to cut down a tree. More flexibility is also needed with regard to the 20-foot perimeter and 25-percent interior retention requirements. The perimeter requirements alone can severely limit the buildability on some property. Furthermore, if the trees are to be measured solely from the tree trunk, it will not be possible to clear or take down a tree within six to ten feet of the trunk without creating an unsafe condition. The ordinance should include a stipulation allowing single family property owners to cut down one or two trees per year, perhaps up to five in five years, without a permit; that would add flexibility and alleviate some of the expense the city will incur in trying to enforce the ordinance and handle the required permitting. Significant trees within the perimeter should be defined as those whose base trunk and root structure lie within the 20 foot perimeter. Consideration should also be given to the significance of the canopy to adjacent trees and vegetation. The financial penalty seems appropriate for a single tree incident, which is what most single family property owners might encounter, but the more flagrant acts should incur a

more significant penalty. There should be discretionary provisions for additional financial penalties for flagrant abuses, which should be defined as the removal of more than five significant trees or a violation of the clearing and grading code for a given lot, division or subdivision. The support of the Bridle Trails community will be essential to the success of the ordinance, and that will require improved communications. It would be worthwhile to send a postcard to all residents of the Bridle Trails neighborhood outlining the proposal and asking for comments. It would also be worthwhile to require, upon approval of a clearing and grading permit, notification to adjacent property owners of the intent to remove trees.

Mr. Norm Hansen, 3851 136th Avenue NE, spoke on behalf of the Bridle Trails Community Club. He said the Tree Committee has been working on the tree preservation issue for the past five years. There has been a lot of communication in the neighborhood during the time, and a great deal of support has been garnered. Those who favor preserving trees are also fully supportive of allowing for flexibility that will permit property owners to use their properties to their fullest. The alternative option allows for the necessary flexibility. He thanked the City Council for permitting the Bridle Trails neighborhood to forge ahead seeking protections that will only apply to Bridle Trails, and the city staff and the Planning Commission for the many hours put into addressing the issue.

Ms. Dana Ficke, address not given, said Overlake Farm, which her family owns and operates, is under an equestrian overlay and a sub-classification of pastureland. The overlay may provide the city with some language to go on in providing for flexibility for the owners of pastureland properties. She suggested the ordinance could be applicable only to developers seeking to remove a large number of significant trees. The proposed ordinance is not a perfect fit for the single family property owners; it will prove to be onerous for them and will not solve the problem of developers clear cutting properties before development.

Motion to close the public hearing was made by Commissioner Lynde. Second was by Commissioner Mathews and the motion carried unanimously.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Land Use Code Amendment – Bridle Trails Trees

Commissioner Lynde asked for clarification with regard to the pastureland overlay. Mr. Jackson said there are several areas labeled for equestrian uses in the Comprehensive Plan. During the deliberations to develop the proposed ordinance, the equestrian areas were not specifically talked about for special exemptions. Rather, the focus was on providing the necessary flexibility through the alternative tree retention option. The requirement to retain 25 percent of the diameter inches of significant trees within the interior of properties means that up to 75 percent of the diameter inches of significant trees can be removed from the interior of properties.

Ms. Burgess added that while there is an equestrian overlay, there is no pastureland overlay.

Commissioner Sheffels observed that there is no recognition in the proposed ordinance to the equestrian overlay. She proposed adding the reference in the “Whereas” section. She agreed that selective logging on the interior properties operated as livestock farms should be permitted in order to maintain pastures.

Noting that the proposed ordinance allows for the removal of 75 percent of the diameter inches of significant trees on the interior of properties, Commissioner Mathews asked if a permit will be needed for each tree removed. Mr. Jackson said as written the ordinance requires a permit for

the removal of any significant tree. He said the language could be tweaked to allow for the removal of a set number of trees annually without a permit. There are a couple of neighboring jurisdictions that take that approach; Redmond allows the removal of two trees per year, provided two trees are replanted, and Kirkland also has a limit on the number of trees that can be removed annually without a permit. Commissioner Mathews said he could support making it easier to remove significant trees within the interior provided the cumulative actions over time do not violate the 25 percent retention requirement. Mr. Jackson pointed out that if no permit is required, there will be no means of oversight. He stressed that where there are critical areas involved, the provisions of the critical areas ordinance will trump the proposed regulations.

Commissioner Lynde agreed that property owners should be allowed to remove one or two trees per year without a permit. She said she could agree to setting a limit of no more than five trees in a three-year period. In order to allow for tracking over time, the city should provide a simple form that can be downloaded and mailed in or filled out online at no charge.

Chair Bonincontri asked if the ordinance as drafted requires a property owner to hire a certified arborist to make a determination that a tree is hazardous and should be removed. Mr. Jackson said where there is an imminent safety issue, hazard trees can simply be removed. Typically, for trees that otherwise are required to be saved, the opinion of an arborist is needed to determine that a tree is unhealthy before it can be removed.

Commissioner Bach commented that allowing property owners to remove one or two trees each year without a permit is not unlike the approach of allowing 1,000 square feet of trees to be removed in any single year without a permit. Commissioner Bach expressed his reluctance to requiring property owners to have a permit to do anything with their properties.

There was consensus to draft the ordinance to allow for the removal of up to two trees annually from a given property.

Commissioner Mathews suggested that no special exemptions should be necessary for properties operated as livestock farms given the implied right to remove up to 75 percent of the diameter inches of significant trees from the interior of properties. There are also flexibilities built into the proposal. Mr. Jackson expressed the same view but said he would be willing to fold in language specific to the equestrian overlay areas if directed to do so. He noted, however, that such properties are the largest properties in the Bridle Trails area and to exempt them outright from the provisions of the ordinance would allow for the greatest impact.

There was consensus to add a reference in the “Whereas” section to the equestrian overlay.

Mr. Jackson said the issue will be back before the Commission on November 30.

B. Land Use Code Amendment
– Critical Areas

Associate Planner Heidi Bedwell distributed to the Commissioners an updated version of the transmittal memo that recognizes the intention of the Commission to recognize Native Growth Protection Area and Native Growth Protection Easement areas differently. She noted that the language of the transmittal had also been revised to change “canopy pruning” to “canopy restoration.”

Ms. Bedwell said staff recognizes that there are covenants in place in various neighborhoods and a desire on the part of property owners to preserve their views. She clarified that many neighborhoods do not have critical areas that will limit the ability of property owners to top or

prune trees; for many of the properties that have been highlighted by the public, the ordinance will not apply, including for most of Beaumont Division 1. There are slopes in the neighborhood, but they are not regulated slopes. There are no conflicts under the current code, which has been in place since 1987 and which limits the removal of vegetation; no conflicts are anticipated to continue forward under the proposed code either. As drafted, the code allows for pruning in critical areas without a permit, something that is not permitted under the current code.

Commissioner Bach said part of the problem lies in an understanding of the terms used in the ordinance. “Topping” refers to reducing the height of a tree for reasons that have nothing to do with the health of the tree. “Pruning” is a term that relates more to maintenance over time and applies to trees that have been previously topped. Chair Bonincontri allowed that there is some disagreement on that point.

Ms. Bedwell said staff provided the Commission with details taken from the International Arboriculture Society relative to pruning guidelines that potentially could allow for some height reduction. She noted that they do not use the term “topping” in that circumstance.

Commissioner Mathews asked if views can be maintained through the pruning process the ordinance will allow. Ms. Bedwell suggested that the guidelines will allow for that result; the guidelines refer to “crown reduction” which can result in a reduction in height which in turn can be understood to have the effect of preserving views. For the occasional tree that cannot be pruned in a manner that will preserve the life of the tree and maintain a view, the property owner can through a vegetation plan have the tree removed and replaced with a lower-growing tree. In the long run, removing and replacing trees will be less costly for homeowners and will achieve the desired result.

Commissioner Sheffels suggested it would not be onerous to require a permit for any pruning activity on hazardous slopes if the ordinance were to allow for the cost of the permit to be fully refunded where there is agreement to remove the offending tree and replace it with a lower-growing species.

Answering a question asked by Chair Bonincontri, Ms. Bedwell explained that before the 50-foot setback from the top of slope, or the 75-foot setback from the top of slope, is applied, a slope must be either designated as being 40 percent or a landslide hazard area. The areas that have been referred to most often in the public testimony will not be regulated under the proposed ordinance because they do not meet either criteria; most were developed many years ago and there is no evidence of landslide issues in those neighborhoods. The current code defines landslide areas as areas with colluvium, and the proposed code clarifies what that is. The proposed code does add a 50-foot setback from the toe of 40 percent slopes, something the existing code does not have. Unless a property is specifically identified as a landslide hazard, most property owners can conclude they will not be regulated as such.

Environmental Planning Manager Michael Paine said the key component, with respect to setbacks from toe and top of slope is the contemplation of new development. For slopes in developed areas that meet the criteria for a steep slope where new development is proposed at top of or on the slope, the issue becomes more paramount because the safety hazard increases. If all that is contemplated is making intrusions into landslide hazard areas to conduct some vegetation pruning, safety is far less of an issue. Where individual citizens are concerned, staff could visit sites and determine visually whether or not there is evidence to suggest a landslide hazard. Of course, absolute proof can only be shown with a subsurface exploration, but it is a safe bet that so long as people are not pouring water or fill onto a slope and the slopes have been solid for 40 or 50 years a slope will not slide except in an earthquake or other significant natural event.

Chair Bonincontri asked if the code could be written to regulate only the slopes of 15 percent or more, or that have more than ten feet of rise, where new development is contemplated. Mr. Paine cautioned against moving in that direction. He allowed that there are many lots along Lake Sammamish that are extremely hazardous and which have very little potential for additional subdivision but on which a single family home could still be built. The approach would engender a debate over what constitutes new development. He committed staff to taking a look at the approach, however.

Commissioner Sheffels suggested the “Whereas” section should include a reference to the principle of managing vegetation in a manner that will ensure the continued health of the vegetation. There was agreement to add that notion.

Commissioner Lynde called attention to the last sentence of the first paragraph on the second page of the transmittal and suggested the Commission should be more proactive and ask the City Council to provide funding for and direct staff to develop template plans for use by the public.

Ms. Bedwell clarified that the vegetation pruning section of the code as drafted does not require a critical areas permit. Removal of trees does require a permit under the vegetation management plan.

Commissioner Lynde pointed out that the term “species of local importance” as used in Section 8 on page 33 should be capitalized given that it is a defined term.

There was agreement to review the ordinance one last time before sending it on to the Council.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Tim Rodgers, 2617 169th Avenue SE, took exception with the comment that there are no critical areas in his Beaumont neighborhood. He said he personally measured the lot across the street from him and found that it measures out at 40.5 degrees and in places is over ten feet high. He added that if measured in a certain way, his property could be classified as a steep slope. The definition of steep slope needs to be revisited and clarified. Steep slopes should be those of 40 degrees or more instead of 40 percent or more. The city should steer away from requiring a permit for pruning; it will irritate the citizens and will be a headache for the city to administer.

Ms. Barbara Antes, 12152 SE 23rd, said there needs to be some clarification with regard to how “windowing” a tree is defined.

Ms. Janet Nelson, address not given, said she heard nothing at all in the discussion about “topping” trees. She added that the health of the vegetation should never be put ahead of land values and the use of land by private landowners.

Mr. Gary Dime, address not given, commented that the city restricts the height to which homes can be built, but does nothing with regard to the height of trees growing on single family properties. There is no obligation for the person who owns an offending tree to window it. In most cases, the tree that is blocking a person’s view is not on that person’s property. The city should not allow property owners to let their trees grow to full height and block views.

9. NEW BUSINESS – None

10. OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Burgess reviewed the schedule with the Commission.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bonincontri adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Chair of the Planning Commission

Date

Staff to the Planning Commission

Date