

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES

September 13, 2006  
7:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

PLANNING

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair, Vice-Chair Robertson, Commissioners Bonincontri, Bach, Ferris, Sheffels

PLANNING

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Orrico

TRANSPORTATION

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Young, Vice-Chair Yuen, Commissioners Glass, Northey

TRANSPORTATION

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Bell, Holler, Wendle

STAFF PRESENT:

Paul Inghram, Department of Planning and Community Development; Kris Liljeblad, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Planning Commission Chair Mathews who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Planning Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Bonincontri, who arrived at 7:04 p.m., and Commissioner Orrico, who was excused. All Transportation Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Bell, Holler and Wendle, all of whom were excused.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

4. STAFF REPORTS

Senior Planner Paul Inghram informed the Commissioners that staff has been monitoring the work of the Puget Sound Regional Council to update Vision 2020. A briefing was provided to the City Council on September 11. The new horizon year is 2040, by which time the population of the region is expected to increase in the four-country area by 1.6 million. The focus is on how that increase will be distributed. A preliminary preferred alternative may be selected in October.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – None
6. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None
7. STUDY SESSION
  - A. Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
– Crossroads Center Plan

Mr. Inghram reminded the Commissions of the public process undertaken to date as part of developing the Crossroads Center Plan. He noted that three alternatives were released in June and presented to the public for review. The Parks Board, Planning Commission and Transportation Commission were all given updates. There was a display put up at the Crossroads Mini City Hall, and a booth was put up at two farmer's markets at Crossroads. In addition, there have been discussions with stakeholder property owners and with Parks & Community Services.

Mr. Inghram said the workshop group met again on September 12. They reviewed summaries of the public comments received, and discussed the pros and cons of the three alternatives. He noted that on September 13 there was a long meeting with representatives from Metrovation, the owners of the mall site, to talk about how the various pieces could be brought together.

Mr. Inghram briefly walked through the aspects and implications of the three alternatives. Common to all three of the alternatives is the notion of including a hotel north of the cinema and south of Top Foods; Metrovation has suggested that the hotel use appears to be a feasible and realistic opportunity. One potential concept is for parking under two hotel floors topped with two levels of condominium units, an approach that could allow for two different types if financing to be utilized. One of the challenges will be in creating access to the hotel/condominium building. There are questions in the minds of some concerning the notion of providing access along the edge of the park to the west of Top Foods. Some in the workshop group believe access in that location would reduce the number of cars driving through the shopping center site. The tradeoffs and impacts associated with allowing access to the hotel through the mall parking lot are being studied.

Commissioner Ferris suggested the number of trips to and from a hotel use will pale in comparison to the traffic generated by Top Foods, the cinema and the rest of the shopping center. The traffic impacts associated with the hotel use alone will not justify creating a separate entrance. Mr. Inghram allowed that there are other considerations in play, such as what constitutes an appropriate front for the hotel. Some have argued that having it on the back side of Top Foods will not make a good front, and others have suggested that driving through shopping carts will not make a good front either. The property agreements with the different tenants will certainly play a role in the final outcome; there are certain restrictions the cinema has regarding access and parking. Top Foods is a separately owned property and any access through their site will require separate negotiations.

Mr. Inghram said a connection to the park will play a key role in the Crossroads Center Plan. As a first step, a connection similar to the one outlined in Alternative 1 may work best. There is an interest in creating an approach that will allow the community center to serve as a front door to the park. There are grade elevations to be taken into account, and there is the issue that the current location of Circuit City is the most likely spot for creating an open space connection with the park.

The issue of congestion on NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street in front of the Post Office is an issue that has been in the minds of many in the local community; the Transportation Commission also raised the issue during its last review of the Crossroads Center Plan. There is a conflicting turning movements between those wanting to turn north into the mall and those wanting to turn south into the Post Office. At the most recent workshop, several options were discussed. They ranged from restricting turning movements in the center turn lane to reconfiguring the parking flow on the Post Office site. One option tossed out was having a Post Office drop box on the Crossroads site so people heading west would not have to turn across NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. The turning lane restriction used to extend further than it does currently; that generated even more complaints, and modifications were made as a result.

Kris Liljeblad, Assistant Director, Transportation Planning, said the left-turn queue for NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street traffic wanting to access the mall site was originally much larger, and access to the Post Office site was more constrained. The longer turn bay was broken into some smaller driveways. From the perspective of the traffic operations group, the congestion problems occur periodically rather than every day, though during the holiday season turning conflicts increase. There is no particular safety problem; the issue is more focused on having a rational flow that will serve the needs of the Post Office, and any changes to improve that flow will have to be paid for by the city.

Chair Young asked to what extent the turning movement conflicts will increase as the Crossroads mall site redevelops and generated more traffic. Mr. Inghram said staff will look into that.

Commissioner Yuen suggested one solution would be to restrict the turning movements into the southern portion of the mall along NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street to right turns only, then creating a left-turn pocket at 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE for westbound NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street wanting to turn left into the mall. Mr. Inghram allowed that that might be a good solution, but pointed out that 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is in fact only an easement, not a public right-of-way; he added that one of the property owners has expressed an interest in turning it over to the city. Access to the Crossroads Community Center is via 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Chair Young pointed out that in all three alternatives 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is shown as part of the overall circulation plan.

Mr. Inghram explained that there is one parcel of land to the west of 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE adjacent to the Ivar's and Stuart Anderson Restaurants that are zoned for residential used but designated in the Comprehensive Plan for Community Business. At the same time, the Comprehensive Plan includes a restriction against residential development in the Community Business zone. Accordingly, there are very few uses allowed on the properties. That conflict will need to be reconciled as a part of the process. The property owners would like to construct a three- or four-story mixed use commercial/residential building. They have expressed their vision to the workgroup. If it is determined that additional multifamily housing should be permitted in Crossroads, the conflict for the two parcels will be easier to resolve.

Mr. Inghram said the owner of the property west of 160<sup>th</sup> along NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street is also interested in the mixed use concept.

Commissioner Glass asked if there have been any discussions regarding the properties to the west of 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE across from Sports Authority. Mr. Inghram said staff has had contact with the property owners in the past, but there have been no indication of a desire to redevelop

the parcels.

Commissioner Ferris commented that parking has been a central issue in the development of the Crossroads Center Plan. He suggested that the issue continues to be significant. It should be possible to determine how many parking stalls will be required based on the uses allowed by the three alternatives. If the surface parking stalls are removed and replaced with structured parking, the result may be an insufficient amount of parking to meet the requirements, let alone the demand. At the end of the day, some above-grade parking garages may be required. If that is the case, the public should be made aware because that may significantly change their views.

Mr. Inghram agreed and pointed out that the need for structured parking has been openly discussed with the workshop group. He added that any new use will be required to meet the parking standards of the code, but how the parking is provided will certainly be of interest to the community. While it would not be difficult to determine the parking need under each alternative, to do so be premature prior to settling on a preferred alternative.

Commissioner Robertson agreed with the need to be up front with the community about the parking needs and how it may be provided. She said the Commissions should also be mindful of the fact that the parking standards may be changed from what they are currently by the time the mall site builds out.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Robertson, Mr. Inghram said there are no critical slopes on the mall site.

Commissioner Robertson commented that from the public comments received to date that low-income housing is an issue for many. She asked what percentage of the multifamily housing already in the Crossroads subarea is subsidized or low-income. Mr. Inghram allowed that a large portion of the multifamily units on the east side of Crossroads Park are under the control of the King County Housing Authority. He added that there is no proposal to add new low-income or subsidized housing as part of the Crossroads Center Plan.

Commissioner Robertson asked if the city has any incentives in place for property owners to set aside some housing units as affordable. Commissioner Ferris said there is a six-foot height bonus allowed, which does not do anyone any good.

Commissioner Robertson asked how the population of school-aged children in the Crossroads subarea compares to the capacity of the schools in the area to accommodate them, pointing out that adding new housing will increase the population of school-aged children. Mr. Inghram explained that the amount of new housing being discussed for the area would at most add only a modest number of school-aged children to the district. The issue has been discussed with the Bellevue School District, which projects its capacity needs out five years ahead, and they have indicated confidence in being able to accommodate the projected increase in students.

Commissioner Robertson noted that some in the community have said there has not been any focus on traffic. She asked if during the process the traffic issues will be studied. Mr. Inghram said there have been traffic studies conducted and will continue to be as the process moves forward. The original alternatives for the Crossroads Center Plan that envisioned 900 housing units were analyzed for traffic impacts; even at that level of development it was determined that the system intersections would continue to operate at acceptable levels. The level of development proposed by the three new alternatives would add only a nominal amount of trips to the thousands the roadway system currently handles on a daily basis. Some turning movement adjustments will certainly be required. The Bel-Red corridor study, which is also currently under way, will to some degree take into consideration the overlapping traffic concerns.

Commissioner Robertson asked if the public has been made aware that changes to the Comprehensive Plan may be required as part of the Crossroads Center Plan. Mr. Inghram said that point has been made clear during the public open house events and at the workshops. The notices that were mailed directly to property owners within the study area did not, however, specifically mention possible Comprehensive Plan changes.

Commissioner Bonincontri said she attended the workshop on September 12. She said there was excellent dialog between the public, the property owners and the city. It is generally understood that redevelopment of the area will occur in stages, not all at once.

Commissioner Sheffels asked if the redevelopment will trigger a need to produce an Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Inghram said staff does not believe it will.

Commissioner Northey asked what the rationale was for prohibiting multifamily housing in the Crossroads area. Mr. Inghram said the restriction dates back to the early 1980s at which time the bulk of the multifamily development around the city was located in the subarea. Most of that housing was constructed in during the 1960s and 1970s, and it turned the Crossroads area into the center of moderate-density for the city. The public reaction was that no additional multifamily housing should be permitted in Crossroads until such time as the imbalance is addressed through the development of multifamily housing in other parts of the city. Since that time, the housing picture in the Crossroads subarea has changed very little; the amount of housing and the ratios for the various types of housing are very similar to what they were when the restriction was imposed. However, citywide the development picture has changed substantially, particularly in the downtown. There has also been a shift in the economics of shopping centers; the trend across the country over the last decade has been toward the integration of housing units with the commercial uses.

B. Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
– Wilburton/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street Study

Mr. Inghram outlined the boundaries of the Wilburton/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street study and noted that within the area there is a mix of uses. He noted that there is a lot of potential for the area along I-405 given that it is visible from the freeway and has good access; the area also has some uncertainty, not the least of which is the possible alignment of Sound Transit routing along the east side of the freeway. The significant issue for auto row is that the dealerships are located on a combination of leased and owned properties; property values are rising and there is an increased demand for large format retail uses. The Burlington Northern-Santa Fe rail corridor transects the study area. King County is looking to acquire the right-of-way for use as a trail, and as Washington State Department of Transportation looks to expand I-405 in the vicinity of the Wilburton tunnel they may need to expand into the rail right-of-way. The portion of the study area that includes several large format retail uses also includes sites used for storing school buses and concrete products; those properties could seek to redevelop in the near future.

Continuing, Mr. Inghram said a number of east/west connection options have been considered between 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The option of constructing a flyover bridge at Main Street has been considered and discarded. More attention has been given to extending either NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street, or both. There is a Comprehensive Plan policy in place that prohibits the extension of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street alignment has the advantage of offering better connecting the downtown and the Bel-Red corridor via 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, but the NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street alignment would improve local access and provide an alternative to using NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. Extending NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street would require tunneling under the railroad right-of-way without

interfering with a King County Metro sewer main. If NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street were extended, the railroad crossing could occur at grade, but the slope from the right-of-way down to 116<sup>th</sup> may be too great and require complicated engineering. If redevelopment within the area occurs after discontinuance of the railroad use, maintaining the current elevation of the railroad right-of-way may not be necessary, allowing for more flexibility.

Four development alternatives have been drafted; each is based on a set of criteria established by the City Council. Mr. Inghram noted that the Planning Commission has discussed each alternative and has recommended Alternative 1 for Area A between the freeway and 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE; a hybrid of Alternatives 2 and 3/4 for Area B, which constitutes auto row; and Alternative 4 for Area C between the railroad right-of-way and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The Planning Commission has also indicated a desire preserve the opportunity for future east/west connections through the study area; squaring off the intersection of NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE; enhancing pedestrian and bicycle safety and access generally; and implementing phased traffic calming for NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street timed to correspond to redevelopment. With regard to urban design, the Planning Commission has recommended consideration of a mix of urban design elements to improve the aesthetics of 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, which is a designated urban boulevard; and enhancing the character of the area, emphasizing the identify of the area as both auto row and the Wilburton neighborhood.

Chair Young asked how 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE will be impacted by any of the scenarios. Mr. Inghram shared with the Commissions the auto volumes chart showing how the traffic patterns would change with the outlined improvements to the transportation system, including extending NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street. It was shown that there would be decrease in the volume of traffic using 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Commissioner Sheffels pointed out that the grade uphill on NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street from 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is quite steep and asked if traffic calming measures will really be useful there. Mr. Inghram said the primary traffic calming focus will need to be on the intersection of the two roadways. A narrow lane width and tight curb radii will not invite traffic to speed around the corner.

Mr. Liljebblad said the typical approach to traffic calming is to start with some education to get motorists to make some different choices regarding both route selection and speeds. The next step is additional signage and enforcement. The last step is the installation of physical interventions. Before any strategy is implemented, the neighborhood will be engaged. He said the Department of Transportation is prepared to close the street entirely to through traffic if the local residents want to take that approach, but in the community meetings to date the opinions on that point have varied widely. There are no plans to increase either the capacity or speeds on 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the south of NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, but from NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street north to SR-520 it is recognized that some improvements may be needed.

Mr. Inghram called attention to the Wilburton/SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street subarea plan policies. He noted that the overall goal calls for a separation of residential, recreational and open space areas from commercial areas. If mixed use development is to be allowed in the area of Larry's Market, it will be necessary to acknowledge the community intent of not allowing the commercial uses spread up the hill into the residential area.

Commissioner Sheffels said she served on the original CAC that developed the goals and policies for the subarea. She said the Wilburton area has a lot of open space, including the golf course and the park. The intent of the CAC was to preserve those areas, especially near the residential areas. There was not a lot of consideration given to having any sort of residential uses in the commercial areas to the west. She pointed out that the study area is only one part of

the Wilburton subarea and proposed the policy focus should be only on those that pertain to the study area; there is no need to review the policies for the entire subarea.

Commissioner Ferris concurred, suggesting it would be a mistake to revise policy language that would inadvertently impact the whole subarea.

Mr. Inghram pointed out the need to maintain the policy intent for the entire subarea while making sure that no change applicable to the study area will leave an inconsistency in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Robertson suggested a separate goal specific to the study area could be developed which would allow for a mix of housing and commercial uses.

Commissioner Sheffels asked if an overlay applicable only to the study area could be crafted. Mr. Inghram allowed that approach could be feasible.

Commissioner Bonincontri pointed out that the goal seeks to prevent the incursion of commercial uses into residential areas, but does not say anything about not allowing residential uses in the commercial areas. While the policy language could be clarified, there is no huge conflict. The intent to preserve open space and residential areas should be continued.

Commissioner Sheffels said there is no designation for park land in the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Code. The original Wilburton subarea CAC was concerned that nothing would prevent the golf course from being sold to a developer. That concern formed the basis for the need to preserve open space, particularly in the residential areas.

Commissioner Ferris proposed that if there is an intent to create an urban village within the study area, it would be good to have language that identifies the vision.

Mr. Inghram said he will discuss with staff what approach should be taken.

Mr. Inghram noted that some of the language in the overview section of the subarea plan needs to be revised to correct references to City Hall and the like. He also observed that Policy S-WI-1 speaks to the separation of residential and commercial uses and that the language will need to be revised in accord with how the overall goal is stated. The language of Policy S-WI-2 needs to be revised to remove the reference to governmental uses.

Policy S-WI-16a should be relocated to the land use subsection and renumbered. It is not known how a policy focused on auto sales was included in the section containing residential development policies. The policy states that auto uses are appropriate; it may be that the focus should be more on recognizing the area along 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE as auto row.

Commissioner Robertson commented that the importance of auto row to Bellevue should be recognized in policy language. Encouragement should be stated for renewing and developing the area as auto row.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Ferris, Mr. Inghram said the Commission's review of the subarea policies should focus first on any shortcomings that need to be addressed. The Commission will also review what the current General Commercial zoning allows and what could be achieved by going to Community Business. It could be that something more will be needed to better address the issue of affordable housing. Affordable housing may be addressed as a citywide issue.

Commissioner Robertson held that it would be appropriate to clarify in the section on residential development that nothing in the policies is intended to prohibit allowing a mixed use development in an already existing commercial area, provided that there is consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Code.

Mr. Inghram noted that Policy S-WI-17 will need to be revised in order to preserve the opportunity to extend NE 4<sup>th</sup> between 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The language regarding 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE should be retained. Policy S-WI-19 could be tweaked to be more specific to the study area with a focus on providing both safe and convenient access.

Commissioner Ferris commented that there should be some policy encouragement for developing striped bike lanes within the study area as a means of connecting the bicycle grid within the city.

Mr. Inghram said the community design section of the subarea plan includes a number of policies focused on the NE 8<sup>th</sup> corridor. The policies could be rewritten to broaden the focus to include 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE as well. Policy S-WI-34 calls for creating a gateway to the corridor from NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, but nothing is said about creating entrances to the corridor from other locations, such as the flyover ramp from I-405 that connects with 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, or the future NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street connection with 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Commissioner Bach commented that NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street serves as the major connection to the corridor from I-405. The language regarding that location should certainly be retained.

Commissioner Robertson called attention to Policy S-WI-29 and pointed out that while the language refers to views it does not specifically refer to views of the downtown, a correction that should be made. Commissioner Ferris agreed that the view corridors that look toward the downtown should be referenced and protected. He suggested the policy language should not refer generally to views but to view corridors.

Mr. Inghram suggested a new policy may be needed to stress the importance of the rail corridor. He allowed that the future of the corridor is unclear, but held that there should be policy language calling for it to be taken into consideration as development and redevelopment occur in the study area.

Commissioner Northey proposed including language that seeks to preserve the opportunity for future transportation use and access; the language should not be limited to only preserving trail access. She suggested the language regarding the possible project addition list should not specify the number of lanes for the NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street extension.

Mr. Inghram called attention to the dimensional requirements matrix included in the packet as Attachment 3. He reminded the Commissioners that auto row and the area that includes Larry's Market and Home Depot is zoned General Commercial. The area to the south where City University is located is zoned Office, and the section adjacent to the freeway is zoned Office/Limited Business. He noted that the Commission has talked about retaining the General Commercial zoning for auto row, though potentially with some changes. One solution for the area where Larry's Market is would be to change the zoning from General Commercial to Community Business, which would still allow for a variety of different types of retail uses. Under that approach, auto sales would become a conditional use rather than permitted outright; the Commission could discuss whether or not the section along NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street where the Nissan dealership is located should or should not be part of the zoning change. The truck and

motorcycle sales that are allowed in General Commercial are not allowed in Community Business. The allowed height in Community Business is one story more than in General Commercial, and Community Business does allow for multifamily residential. Hotels are allowed in Community Business as a conditional use; the use is not allowed at all in General Commercial. Community Business is more restrictive with regard to some of the manufacturing uses that are permitted under General Commercial. Wholesale trade, which is permitted in General Commercial, is not allowed under Community Business; that restriction could potentially apply to Mutual Materials. Community Business allows for a variety and department store uses, where General Commercial does not.

Commissioner Robertson asked if changing the area to Community Business would allow Costco to locate in the zone. Mr. Inghram said he will have to research that, allowing that while the use has the look and feel of wholesale, it could be determined to be retail.

Commissioner Northey urged the Commission to do what it can to retain uses such as Mutual Materials. She noted that as the Bel-Red corridor redevelops some of the industrial and light industrial uses will be lost. It is still necessary for homeowners and construction firms to purchase goods such as bricks and building materials, and the businesses providing those goods should not all be chased out of the city. Mr. Inghram explained that the use could continue even with a zoning change because the use would become a legal non-conforming use. He added that the company owns the land it is on and therefore will not easily be priced out.

Commissioner Ferris suggested the densities and heights allowed under General Commercial and Community Business can be characterized as suburban and do not necessarily represent the vision for what the density might want to be in the area. In urban settings, 30 to 40 units to the acre is very low density, and 45 feet of height does not go very far in accommodating commercial and housing over parking.

Chair Mathews pointed out that if heights above 45 feet are allowed, there will be view impacts.

Commissioner Sheffels commented that the city has not engaged in view preservation for any areas and suggested that to do so would be opening a can of worms. She held that the city should not start down that road.

Commissioner Robertson asked how many single family homes exist in the immediate vicinity that could be impacted by a growing urban core. Commissioner Sheffels said there is almost none adjacent to the area; the bulk of the single family homes are located to the east of 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Commissioner Robertson agreed that establishing view easements would not be the right way to go. She commented, however, that one of the things that makes Bellevue a livable city is the views that result from the openness of the development pattern, and protecting that amenity keeps property values high and makes the city a desirable place to live.

#### 8. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Sheffels said she has recently been hearing comments from people who are asking for some kind of a circulator serving the downtown area.

#### 9. OLD BUSINESS – None

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. June 7, 2006

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Robertson. Second was by Commissioner Sheffels and the motion carried unanimously.

B. June 28, 2006

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Robertson. Second was by Commissioner Ferris and the motion carried unanimously.

C. July 19, 2006

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Sheffels. Second was by Commissioner Bonincontri and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Robertson abstained from voting.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:09 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Staff to the Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair of the Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date