

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
AUGUST 25, 2010

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Dick Peek, Julia Pettit, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan

EX OFFICIO:

Thomas Eddington, Planning Director; Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Francisco Astorga, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING - 6:30 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Wintzer called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES - August 11, 2010

Commissioner Strachan referred to page 5 of the Work Session notes, first paragraph, and replaced Commissioner **Strachan** with Commissioner **Pettit**. The corrected sentence would read, "Commissioner Pettit questioned whether this stakeholder group was the right group, particularly if they are the ones driving the parameters." Commissioner Pettit acknowledged that she was the one who made the statement.

Commission Strachan referred to Page 17 of the Minutes, the last full paragraph, third line down and replaced MPD with **pre-MPD**. The corrected sentence would read, "An annexation is one standard under the Code and the **pre-MPD** is another standard.

Commissioner Hontz referred to Page 20, the motion on Park City Heights, and corrected Commissioner **Savaged** to Commissioner **Savage**.

Commissioner Savage noted that the minutes reflected a discussion at the last meeting about providing the Planning Commission with an overview of the City's affordable housing plan.

Director Eddington replied that Phyllis Robinson from the Sustainability Department was planning to provide that overview at the first meeting in October.

Commissioner Savage asked about the Quinn's Junction Joint Planning Principles referenced in the minutes. Commissioner Pettit believed it was in the General Plan. Director Eddington stated that the Quinn's Junction Joint Planning Principles were done by resolution and were online. Commissioner Savage requested that Patricia Abdullah send him the link so he could find them.

Commissioner Savage recalled that during the last meeting Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean had offered to provide a time line of key decisions associated with the Park City Heights approval process. He was still interested in seeing that time line.

MOTION: Commissioner Pettit moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 11, 2010 as corrected. Commissioner Peek seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

IV STAFF/COMMISSIONER'S COMMUNICATIONS & DISCLOSURES

Planner Francisco Astorga invited the Planning Commission to the American Planning Association Utah Chapter Fall Conference on September 30th and October 1st in Salt Lake City. The Conference is a two-day workshop format where the planners discuss various planning scenarios throughout the valley. Planner Astorga requested that two or more Commissioners participate with the Staff at this local conference. He would forward the agenda via email.

Director Eddington noted that a variety of sessions were scheduled during different time slots and he thought it would benefit the Planning Commission to see some of what goes on. If the Commissioners could not find time for both days, he encouraged them to attend at least one day or a few sessions if possible. August 31st was the registration deadline. If interested, they should register through Patricia Abdullah.

Chair Wintzer recalled another conference that Commissioners Pettit and Strachan had attended and that other Commissioners had expressed an interest in attending if it was repeated. Commissioner Pettit replied that it was a training through Utah Land Use Law. Director Eddington believed another training specific to Planning Commissions was scheduled for late Fall. He would follow through and notify the Commissioners.

Since many of the Commissioners and Staff would be on City Tour, the September 8th Planning Commission meeting would be cancelled. Commissioner Savage thought they had previously talked about cancelling the meeting on September 22nd. Based on that assumption, he had another commitment on September 22nd and would not be able to attend the Planning Commission meeting.

Planner Whetstone noted that Park City Heights was scheduled for work session on September 22nd. The applicants had originally planned to discuss traffic and transportation; however, they are now looking at the big picture and would like to discuss amenities and location of certain elements within the bubble areas.

Director Eddington noted that the Planning Commission had requested updates on the General Plan outreach sessions. The Staff had compiled the data would provide it at the next meeting.

In response to Chair Wintzer's concern regarding abandoned projects, Director Eddington reported that the Building Department had provided a list of 12 abandoned sites. The Planning Department and the Building Department will try to work with property owners on those projects. Director Eddington would email the list to the Planning Commission and schedule the projects for a future work session discussion.

Commissioner Peek asked if the Staff could also detail the projects that are not compliant with Code in terms of expired inspections or other violations.

Chair Wintzer remarked that in addition to abandoned projects, many projects are completed but the construction area was never cleaned up. He believed the issue was bigger than just abandoned projects. Director Eddington stated that non-compliant projects are harder to identify and he would work with the Building Department on that matter.

Commissioner Pettit asked about projects such as the Claim Jumper, the Imperial Hotel or other historic buildings where interior gutting was started and the structures are sitting unfinished and unoccupied. Commissioner Peek would like to know the status of those structures in terms of building safety and the basic elements of saving the historic structure.

Chair Wintzer disclosed that he would be recusing himself from the 310-350 items since he is one of the property owners.

CONTINUATIONS(S) - Public Hearing and Continue

1. 50 Shadow Ridge - Amendment to Record of Survey
(Application #PL-10-00938)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Peek moved to CONTINUE 50 Shadow Ridge - Amendment to Record of Survey to a date uncertain. Commissioner Pettit seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 811 Norfolk Avenue - Plat Amendment
(Application #PL-10-00988)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Peek moved to CONTINUE 811 Norfolk Avenue - Plat Amendment to a date uncertain.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. SA-139-A - Plat Amendment

(Application #PL-10-00989)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Peek moved to CONTINUE SA-139-A - Plat Amendment to a date uncertain.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. 29 & 39 Silver Strike Trail - Amendment to Record of Survey
(Application #PL-10-01023)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Peek moved to CONTINUE 29 & 39 Silver Strike Trail - Amendment to Record of Survey to a date uncertain. Commissioner Savage seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

5. 200 Ridge Avenue - Plat Amendment
(Application #PL-10-00977)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Pettit moved to CONTINUE 200 Ridge Avenue - Plat Amendment to September 22, 2010. Commissioner Peek seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA/PUBLIC HEARINGS/POSSIBLE ACTION

6. 310-350 McHenry Avenue - Zone Changes
(Application #PL-10-01040)

Chair Wintzer recused himself and left the room. Vice-Chair Peek assumed the Chair.

Planner Whetstone reported that this item and the 310-350 McHenry plat amendment were related applications. The plat amendment is subject to approval of the zone change.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the request for a zone change from Estate to HRL, historic residential low density, for the eastern portion of the properties at 310 and 320, 330 and 350 McHenry. The Staff report contained a plat map showing the existing zoning. Planner Whetstone explained that the HRL zone was created in 1993 by the residents of McHenry primarily to achieve low density, residential zoning. When the zone was adopted, the description of the zone line followed the east property line of the properties of Block 61 of the

Park City Survey. It did not follow the ownership boundary, leaving the eastern portions in the Estate zone.

Planner Whetstone stated that the requested zone change would clean up some of the non-conforming situations and the Estate zoned property into the HRL. The property would then be subject to the design guidelines and a steep slope CUP, as well as other requirements of the HRL zone. The zone change would also reduce the non-compliance for the majority of the structures. Planner Whetstone presented charts showing the lot areas and the footprints. The Staff report contained a table of the zoning requirements for the setbacks in the HRL the Estate zones and the existing conditions for each property.

Commissioner Pettit referred to the table on page 50 of the Staff report, as well as the condition of approval, and noted that excluding the 20-foot no-build zone in the footprint calculations reduced the allowed footprint on some of the lots. Commissioner Peek asked if the first lot area shown on the table on page 50 included the Estate zone. Planner Whetstone answered yes. Planner Whetstone stated that she had done a rough calculation of the building footprint in the subdivision report, which showed the allowed footprint for each lot area.

Planner Whetstone remarked that part of the zone change request is that the Sensitive Lands Boundary moves to follow the HRL. She noted that HRL zones are not to be considered under the Sensitive Lands Ordinance. When the SLO was adopted, there was specific discussion that the Historic District would not be part of the Sensitive Lands. Since that time, the Steep Slope CUP was adopted, which addresses many of the same issues addressed in the SLO.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended removing the condition of approval from the zone change and include it in the subdivision. The decision on the zone approval should be based on the pattern in the neighborhood and cleaning up non-conformities. Ms. McLean understood that the applicants wanted to limit the amount of density, however, it would be more appropriate to address it in the subdivision.

Planner Whetstone pointed out that the rezone creates larger areas of HRL zoning. The HRL has a minimum lot size of 3,750 square feet. Three of the lots are large enough to subdivide into two 3,750 square feet. She noted that a condition of approval cannot be placed on the rezone; however, the applicants have stipulated to a condition with the subdivision plat, that there would be no re-subdivision of these lots and that there would only be one house per lot. She noted that the rezone would allow for additional footprint on some of the lots.

Commissioner Savage clarified that someone could purchase an existing home, demolish it because it is not historic, and rebuild a house with a larger footprint as designated in the table. The home could be larger but it would still be restricted to one residence per lot. Assistant Attorney McLean remarked that the Planning Commission should be aware that might happen, but reiterated that the subdivision was the proper venue for adding conditions of approval.

Commissioner Pettit was unclear on the exact criteria for evaluating whether or not to allow a zone change. She understood that part of the rationale for allowing a rezone for this application was the fact that the applicants were agreeable to the condition that would be imposed in the subdivision, which is not to create or add additional density. Without that agreement, the rezone could result in a situation where more density is created in that area. From a precedent standpoint, she thought it should be clear that if the Planning Commission allows this zone change for the purpose of cleaning up issues between the Estate and HRL zones, without the condition of approval they may not be inclined to allow the zone change.

Assistant City Attorney McLean understood the concern and pointed out that it was partly a matter of good faith. Regarding precedent, zone changes are more legislative in terms of discretion because the Planning Commission must also think about the planning for that area. In this case, someone could increase the density, but the appropriate channel would be through the subdivision process. Ms. McLean believed the underlying question was whether HRL was the right zone for this area and whether the fact that four houses are bisected by two different zones was enough reason to change the zone.

Commissioner Savage asked if it was possible for the Planning Commission to approve the subdivision first, and as a condition of approval, have the zone change approved by City Council. He thought that procedure could eliminate the catch 22. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that it would be a "chicken and egg" situation because they would need to analyze the subdivision based on the known zone. Commissioner Savage pointed out that under the current process the Planning Commission forwards a positive recommendation to the City Council for the zone change and another positive recommendation for the subdivision. He felt a better concept would be to forward a positive recommendation for the subdivision to be conditioned on the zone change. Therefore, once the zone change occurs, the subdivision is already pre-determined. Ms. McLean stated that the Planning Commission could legally do that. Commissioner Savage remarked that since the lot owners were willing to agree to that condition, he thought they should facilitate the process with the understanding that if the zone change was not approved, the conditions of the subdivision would not be met.

Assistant City Attorney McLean emphasized that the zone change is what it is. There will be plat notes, however plat notes has its own process. Twenty years from now someone could request that the plat note be changed. The minutes of this meeting would reflect the discussion and the concern for increased density and hopefully the change would not occur. Ms. McLean felt it was important for the Planning Commission to separate the zone change and the subdivision process. She understood the difficulty of approving a subdivision for a zone that does not yet exist. She suggested that it could be done with a condition of approval that the zone change go through prior to recordation of the subdivision. The other option is to approve the zone change, recognizing that there is a slight risk that the subdivision plat would not go through. Ms. McLean did not question the good faith of the applicants.

Planner Whetstone stated that if the zone is changed and more area becomes HRL, to create another lot would require a subdivision plat or a plat amendment. She pointed out that most of

the lots are not platted. Applying for a building permit would require an owner to create a legal lot of record, which would require Planning Commission and City Council action.

Commissioner Peek clarified that all four lots have lot lines that would impede pulling a building permit. Planner Whetstone replied that this was correct. For that reason he believed that all the owners would be motivated to continue with the subdivision.

Commissioner Pettit stated that if the condition of approval is removed from the zone change, she suggested revising Finding of Fact #9 to create a record making it clear that this was a factor the Planning Commission weighed in their determination of the zoning change. She revised the finding to read, "The zone change would allow increased density on Lots 1, 3, and 4 due to the minimum lot size in the HRL zone. The property owners have submitted a subdivision application under which Staff has recommended a condition of approval that a note be added to the subdivision plat being reviewed concurrently with this zone change, that there shall only be one house per Lot and the lots shall not be re-subdivided. The property owners agree to this condition". Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that the finding as revised was appropriate.

Commissioner Strachan asked why the zone line was put there in 1993.

Helen Alvarez, an applicant/owner, stated that she was a City Council member in 1993, as well as a property owner. Like Chair Wintzer, she had abstained from the discussion and did not vote. At that time there was only one planning staff and Bush and Gudgell were the consulting engineers. Ms. Alvarez explained that the owners requested that their properties be rezoned and the presentation called for a valuation of the property. She noted that the County considers your property as one when you add to it, so they all paid one property tax bill on all the parcels owned. Ms. Alvarez stated that Bush and Gudgell apparently had no knowledge that properties had been sold from the Millsite to the owners. United Park City Mines granted a parcel of property to Tim Hayden, combined City lots, and Millsite property. That was how the line happened to be drawn. Ms. Alvarez pointed out that the town site line does not lie on the boundary line.

Ms. Alvarez remarked that it was a mistake made by Bush and Gudgell, and the City Council made a mistake by not carefully reading the description. At that time surveys were not required.

Ms. Alvarez pointed out that these mistakes happen when the City is not adequately staffed. She believed they were very fortunate now to have good professional Staff to help the City Council and the Planning Commission with their decisions.

Vice-Chair Peek opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Vice-Chair Peek closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hontz was comfortable with Finding of Fact #9 as revised by Commissioner Pettit and with removing Condition of Approval #1.

MOTION: Commissioner Pettit moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the zone change to the east boundary of the HRL zone and SLO boundary between 310-350 McHenry Avenue based on the amended Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and the removal of the Condition of Approval, in the attached ordinance. Commissioner Strachan seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact - 310-350 McHenry Avenue - Zone Change

1. Currently there are four homes located at 310, 320, 330 and 350 McHenry Avenue that are located within three zoning district, namely the Historic Residential Low-Density (HRL) zone, the Estate (E) zone and the Sensitive Lands Overlay Zone (SLO) that currently exists as an overlay on the Estate (E) zone portion.
2. The Planning Department is requesting a zone change to move the HRL and SLO boundary line to the east boundary of the above properties replacing the Estate zoned portion with HRL. The primary reason for the request is to change the zone boundary line to match the ownership property lines.
3. There are no existing HRL properties with the sensitive lands overlay (SLO) designation.
4. The HRL zone was in part created by the residents of McHenry Avenue to specifically reduce the density allowed in the area under the previous HR-1 zone.
5. When the HRL zone was adopted, the description of the zone line followed the East property line of Block 61 of the Park City Survey. It did not follow the ownership boundary that exists within NW 1/4, SW 1/4, Section 15 of the Park City Survey. The property owners of 310, 320, 330, and 350 McHenry Avenue owned the parcels of land East of Block 61 in 1983. These parcels were zoned Estate.
6. LMC Section 15-1-6(B) states, "where the zoning district lines appear to have intentionally divided a lot or parcel between two (2) or more districts, the applicable zoning for each portion of the lot or parcel must be determined by using the scale shown on the map".
7. If the rezone is not approved, any future improvements to these properties would have to follow the HRL zone lot and site requirements in the front yard and the Estate zone lot and site requirements in the back yard. With existing homes, the current zoning creates many instances of non-conformity.
8. No non-complying structure may be moved, enlarged, or altered, except in the manner provided in Section 15-9-6 of the LMC or unless required by law. By moving the HRL and SLO zone boundary lines to the East ownership boundary, the majority of the non-conformities will not exist, due to the decreased setback requirements in the HRL. The structures will be more compliant with the zone.
9. The zone change would allow increased density on Lots 1, 3 and 4 due to the minimum lot size in the HRL zone. The property owners have submitted a subdivision application under which Staff has recommended a condition of approval that a note be added to the subdivision plat being reviewed concurrently with this zone change, that there shall be

- only one house per lot and the lots shall not be re-subdivided. The property owners agree to this condition.
10. Notice for this application was sent to all property owners within 300' of the affected properties and was noticed in the Park Record.
 11. The Park City Zoning Map shall be amended at the time of Council Action.
 12. The findings in the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law - 310-350 McHenry Avenue - Zone Change

1. There is good cause for this rezone.
2. The rezone is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed rezone.
4. The rezone is consistent with the Park City General Plan.

2. 310-350 McHenry Avenue - Plat Amendment
(Application #PL-10-00983)

Planner Whetstone reviewed the application for a four-lot subdivision to create four lots of record for four existing homes at 310, 320, 330 and 350 McHenry. The requested plat amendment would reduce some of the non-compliance issues.

Planner Whetstone remarked that the subdivision is subject to the requested rezone previously reviewed by the Planning Commission. She noted that a dedication of right-of-way from McHenry is proposed, as well as the dedication of a 372 square foot meditation parcel on the west side of the ROW dedication from McHenry. The Staff recommended that the plat identify this parcel as a non-developable parcel that would not be counted in the lot area of any of the lots for the purposes of building footprint calculations, and that a legal description of the parcel be provided on the plat.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing, consider any input, and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council according to the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval stated in the draft ordinance.

Vice-Chair Peek opened the public hearing.
There was no comment.
Vice-Chair Peek closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Strachan referred to Condition of Approval #5 and changed mediation to meditation. Vice-Chair Peek referred to Condition of Approval #6, bullet point one, and deleted, "The cross-hatched area along the east side of the property" and replaced it with, "the eastern most 20 feet of the property is designated as a no-build in which no structures may be erected".

Commissioner Savage stated that if the cross hatched area on the plat is defined as the easternmost 20 feet, Lot 4 is inconsistent with the angle. Based on that definition, it ends up

being a diagonal following the other line coming down the other direction on that lot. He felt that inconsistency should be rectified.

Commissioner Strachan pointed out that Exhibit A was attached with the zone change application, which was a surveyors description of where the zone line would be. He suggested basing the line 20 feet west of that zone line. He pointed out that it would still not address Commissioner Savage's concern.

Ms. Alvarez thought the point of their discussion was only to clarify the language and make it the 20 feet west of the zone line of the eastern boundary.

Commissioner Hontz believed the language as written was correct. She suggested replacing the word "property" with "subdivision", to read, "The cross-hatched area along the east side of the subdivision is designated as a no-build zone in which no structure may be erected. This area shall not be included in the maximum building footprint calculation". She understood that the Planning Commission was only trying to delineate that it was 20 feet.

Assistant City Attorney McLean remarked that the plat is an exhibit to the ordinance which is being approved. The Planning Commission could amended the condition of approval to add the language stated by Commissioner Peek, "the eastern most 20 feet of the property is designated as a no-build...", with additional language, "as indicated on the plat map.

Commissioner Strachan pointed out that in looking at Lot 4 on the plat map, the cross-hatched area is the same amount of square footage. Planner Whetstone agreed with Commissioner Hontz to change the word property to subdivision, because Lot 2 is a property. Commissioner Strachan felt the plat map was specific enough to address their concerns. Vice-Chair Peek read the amended bullet point, "The easternmost 20 feet of the subdivision as indicated on the plat map, is designated as a no-build, in which no structures may be erected. This area shall not be included in the maximum building footprint". The Commissioner concurred with the revisions as read.

MOTION: Commissioner Pettit moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the subdivision for 310-350 McHenry Avenue according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as amended in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Savage seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact - 310-350 McHenry - Plat Amendment

1. The property is located at 310, 320, 330, and 350 McHenry Avenue within the HRL zoning district.

2. The Plat Amendment is for the existing lots 1-9 of Block 61 of the Park City Survey and nine parcels of land located in the southwest quarter of Section 15, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian in Park City, Summit County, Utah.
3. The proposed Plat Amendment will create four (4) platted lots of record. The minimum lot area in the HRL zoning district is 3750 square feet. The minimum lot width in the HRL zone is 35 feet. Each of the four (4) lots complies with the minimum lot area and the minimum lot width of the HRL zone.
4. There is an existing non-historic home located on each of the proposed lots and the density is not increased with this subdivision. One home is allowed per lot.
5. The neighborhood is characterized by single family and multi-family homes.
6. A right-of-way dedication of 976.52 square feet will be dedicated to the City upon recordation.
7. The Planning Department is processing an application for a zone change at this location. The existing lots are split within two zones; Estate and HRL. The zone change, if approved, will designate the four lots within the HRL zoning district in their entirety.
8. The applicant has proposed a cross-hatched area along the east side of the subdivision. This area is twenty (20) feet in depth from the property line. The applicant is proposing that this area be a no-build area in which no structures may be erected. This area may not be included in the maximum footprint calculation.
9. All findings within the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law - 310-350 McHenry - Plat Amendment

1. There is good cause for this subdivision.
2. The subdivision is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed subdivision.
4. As conditioned the subdivision is consistent with the Park City General Plan.

Conditions of Approval - 310-350 McHenry - Plat Amendment

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer review and approval of the final form and content of the plat for compliance with the Land Management Code and conditions of approval is a condition precedent to recording the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval and the plat will be void.
3. A ten-foot wide public snow storage easement may be required along the front of the property. The City Engineer will make a final determination during his review and approval of the plat prior to recordation.
4. No remnant parcels are separately developable and a note shall be included on the plat indicating this.
5. The meditation parcel shall be legally described on the plat and a note shall indicate that it is not a developable parcel and that the area of the parcel shall not be used in the calculation of maximum building footprint for any of the lots.

6. As a condition precedent to recordation, plat notes shall be added to the plat stating the following:
 - The easternmost 20 feet of the subdivision as indicated on the plat map, is designated as a no-build, in which no structures may be erected. This area shall not be included in the maximum building footprint;
 - The quit claimed parcel shall not be utilized for access;
 - The quit claimed parcel shall not have any structures(s) built upon it;
 - The quit claimed parcel shall not be included in any calculation for building footprint now or in the future.
 - The meditation parcel is not a developable parcel and the area of the parcel shall not be included in calculations for building footprint for any of the lots.
7. If the sale of the quit claim parcel is not executed and sold to the owner of Lot 1 prior to plat recordation, then the quit claim parcel will be removed from the plat.
8. A note shall be added to the plat as a condition precedent to recordation of the plat stating that there shall be only one house per lot and the lots shall not be re-subdivided.

The Planning Commission returned to Work Session for the training overview with Legal. The training discussion is found in the Work Session Notes.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____