

**CITY OF COTTAGE GROVE
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Minutes of the Regular Public Hearing
April 18, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Devine called the meeting to order at approximately 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Recording Secretary Cindy Blacksmith called the roll. The following were:

Present: Vice Chair George Devine, Commissioners Savannah Crawford (late), Mike Fleck, David McClean, Rudy Severns, and Lloyd Williams

Absent: Chair Matt Parsons

Staff Present: Community Development Director Howard Schesser, Assistant Planner Amanda Ferguson, Public Works Director Jan Wellman, Fire Marshal Andy McClean, Water Production Supt. Ray Pardee, and Recording Secretary Cindy Blacksmith

Staff Absent: None

News Media Present: Reporter Joe Hansen – Cottage Grove Sentinel

MINUTES

Commissioner Fleck asked that the minutes of March 21, 2007 be amended to reflect his concern with the cost of the Thornton property (PA 1-07 and ZC 2-07) on the rate payer (\$0.38/month). Commissioner McClean also asked that the amendment reflect his concern.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER FLECK AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2007 AS AMENDED.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Commissioner Crawford	Commissioner Devine	Commissioner Fleck	Commissioner McClean	Commissioner Severns	Commissioner Williams	Chair Parsons
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NAYES							
ABSTAIN							

Staff advised that this hearing had been advertised and publicized and notices posted as required by law. It was asked that any correspondence received be noted as a part of the item on the agenda.

EX PARTE CONTACT

Commissioner Fleck stated that he had a conversation with a neighbor of Robert Earl (V 2-07) but the conversation did not involve any comments and would not prejudice his decision on the item. Vice Chair Devine stated he worked with several of the applicants through his business.

ITEMS TO BE ADDED TO THE AGENDA

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Earl – Variance Application (V 2-07) in R-1 Single Family Low Density Residential District

The applicant is requesting variance approval to the R-1 side yard setback requirement of 5 feet to allow for the retention of a new carport built without permits within 3 feet of the side property line. If this variance is approved, the applicant will apply for a building permit for this carport. If the variance is denied, the carport will be removed.

The carport in question is an 18 foot high front gabled wood-frame structure, attached to the front of an older front gabled garage. This garage is to the north and rear of the existing house, and is situated 3 feet from the side/north property line. Historically there was a low shed roof carport/awning on the front of this garage that was approximately 20 feet by 20 feet and was also located within 3 feet of the side property line.

Last year, the Earl’s began rebuilding this shed-roofed carport. The carport had deteriorated so badley that it needed to be entirely replaced, so the owner’s grandson

rebuilt it using large timbers and a gabled truss roof. If the applicant had only replaced 60 percent of the original material of the carport, the carport would have been covered under the Non-Conforming Use or Building section of the Cottage Grove Zoning Code, even though it was located too close to the side property line. However, as the reconstructed carport is of 100 percent new materials, is substantially higher (18 feet compared to the original 9 foot 11 inches) and is gable-ended rather than shed roofed, it is not considered a remodel or replacement of the old carport under the Non-Conforming Use code. Rather it is considered a new building and hence must meet the 5 foot side yard setback requirement.

The carport/garage is located approximately 3 feet from the north property line. The adjacent property to the north (1341 South 6th Street) also has a detached garage within 3 feet of this property line. The distance between the new carport and the neighbor's garage is 5 feet 7 inches for a length of approximately 12 feet.

This variance request has been submitted to allow the rebuilt carport to remain in its historic location (3 feet from the property line). The adjacent owner, Janice Wojick, has signed a non-buildable setback easement agreement, which has been submitted with this application. In it, she states that she has no objections to the reduced side yard setback.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

No one spoke.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner McClean asked whether the building would require a 1 hour fire wall.

Fire Marshall McClean replied that the wall along the property line will have to have a 1 hour rating up to the undersheathing of the roof.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER FLECK AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEVERNS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE APPLICATION FILE NO. V 2-07, BASED ON THE CRITERIA, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS STATED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Commissioner Crawford	Commissioner Devine	Commissioner Fleck	Commissioner McClean	Commissioner Severns	Commissioner Williams	Chair Parsons
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NAYES							
ABSTAIN							

Schneider – Variance Application (V 3-07) in R-1 Single Family Low Density Residential District

This applicant is requesting variance approval to create a new lot that is less than the minimum lot depth required in the R-1 zone (70 feet deep rather than 80 feet).

This variance application has been made to meet a condition of approval of Minor Partition MP 18-06. This partition application requested the division of a 14,600 square foot lot into two lots. Parcel 1 would be a vacant lot, 70 feet deep by 100 feet wide, accessed off of Adams Avenue. Parcel 2 would be a 6,600 square foot lot with an existing 1437 square foot home, accessed off of 15th Street. The new property line will be 5 feet from the side of the existing home. As the new Parcel 1 will be located off of Adams Avenue, which is an unimproved 20 foot wide public road at this location, 10 feet of frontage along Parcel 1 will have to be dedicated to the City of Cottage Grove as part of the right-of-way of Adams Avenue (the property's fair share towards widening the right-of-way to the required 40 feet). This condition of MP 18-06 reduced the depth of Parcel 1 from 80 feet to 70 feet. As 70 feet does not meet the minimum lot depth standards of the Cottage Grove Zoning Code, this variance application was required as a condition of MP 18-06.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Sean Swanson, Geomax, 1660 Harvey Road, speaking on behalf of the applicant stated that the conditions were typical for property on a gravel road and asked that the Commission approve the variance request.

Brad Passenger, 1428 East Adams Avenue, stated he had concerns and was unaware that they might have to pay for paving Adams Avenue. His issues were with the unimproved street, water pressure, storm water runoff and hydrant access.

Kristy Meyer, 1325 East Adams Avenue, stated she is against having to pay for paving the street and was very concerned with the storm drain which she stated is often plugged. She felt that paving of the street would cause more problems for her. She was also concerned with the granting of a variance for a lot that had so many issues.

Patrick Hughes, 1426 East Adams Avenue, stated he was concerned with the future development of the street, including the need for upsizing of the water line for more fire hydrants.

Sean Swanson, Geomax, spoke in rebuttal stating that the conditions of approval for the minor partition should have no impact on whether or not the variance was granted. He stated that clearly the applicant would have to deal with the storm water and other issues at the time of development.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Fleck pointed out that Local Improvement Districts could occur at any time, with or without development.

Commissioner Severns divided the issues into immediate and future; he felt that most of the concerns centered on future development. The immediate issues with storm water will be reviewed with the new house and that the City does not maintain gravel roads.

Commissioner Fleck stated he agreed with Commissioner Severns that discussing future development was putting the cart before the horse. He felt the new lot was large enough and in character with the neighborhood.

Commissioner McClean agreed that the lot was underutilized.

Commissioners Severns and Devine expressed their hope that the City would look at all these issues during development.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER FLECK AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CRAWFORD THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE PPLICATION NO. V 3-07 AS PRESENTED, BASED ON THE CRITERIA, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS STATED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Commissioner Crawford	Commissioner Devine	Commissioner Fleck	Commissioner McClean	Commissioner Severns	Commissioner Williams	Chair Parsons
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NAYES							
ABSTAIN							

Stevens – Design Review (DR 1-07) for Industrial Rental Shops (Repair/Light Manufacturing) Buildings in M-2 Heavy Industrial District

The applicant is proposing to develop Lot No. 6 of the Cottage Grove Industrial Park to build two buildings and their accessory parking/loading areas. Proposed Building No. 1, located to the east/center of the parcel will be 100 feet by 140 feet, 12 feet high, metal building. Proposed Building No. 2, located adjacent to the western property line will be 50 feet by 150 feet. Both buildings are proposed for miscellaneous industrial uses, such as auto repair, mobile machinery repair, woodworking shops, etc. The expected building occupancy is F-1. Restroom facilities and interior wall separations will be added based upon individual tenants needs – the current plan is for the exterior shell and accessory parking/landscaping only.

Along the eastern property line (to the east of Building No. 1), the applicant is proposing 15 parking spaces, one of which will be van accessible. Between Building Nos. 1 and 2, the applicant is proposing two lanes of additional parking (2 ADA van accessible and 26 regular spaces). No fencing is proposed around the site as all equipment and tools will be secured inside. The applicant states that there will be no outdoor storage of machinery or garbage.

Landscaping is limited to a screening hedge of arbor vitae along the southern property line (which backs up to Emerson lane) and 5 foot wide planter strips on either side of the access corridor off of Getty Circle.

No signage is proposed at this time. This is a long term rental facility that does not serve the public and will be rented on a monthly basis. No business signs will be installed by the owners or tenants.

City Planner Ferguson advised that a letter from Dennis and Kay Tucker (attached) and an email received from Celia Barry (attached) from Lane County Transportation had been received. Both documents were concerning Emerson Lane which is a County road that is immediately adjacent to the Industrial Park on the south.

Director Schesser stated that Emerson Lane was a 30 foot wide road at the present time, is outside the city limits and outside the urban growth boundary. At the time that the subdivision was done there was a public hearing held and it was determined not to add any additional land to the property at that time. The County has been advised, they were advised when Lot No. 5 was developed (the mini storage development) and no comments were received. The City's position is that the lots are there and at the time of the subdivision is when the dedication should have been done, if it was to be done. At the time the subdivision was approved without it. Director Schesser further stated that he was not an employee at that time and he didn't know if any issues had been brought up at that time with reference to the road. The applicant has bought the property and is now before the Planning Commission to develop pursuant to City code. With regard to the County comments, if they don't take any access during construction or during any permanent access there's nothing that applies. The rest of the comments are just more informational than anything else. There is no requirement of the City at this time to require extension. If in the future, that property comes into the city and development occurs then you are looking at either a 30 foot wide right-of-way, with probably 25 foot road with no parking or you're looking at relocation of utilities on the south side.

Vice Chair Devine asked staff if the issues the County was bringing up would have an impact.

Director Schesser replied no, and they weren't raised with Lot 5 which is already developed within the same approximate 3 feet of the line. When "R" Street was extended through to Highway 99, there will be an intersection with Emerson made at that point so access won't be cut off. The City has purchased land to extend "R" Street to Highway 99, but access to Emerson from "R" Street will occur, the portion from "R" Street to Highway 99 will most likely be closed.

Commissioner Severns asked if the present project had any impact on what happens to Emerson.

Director Schesser replied only if you take the position, as the letters do, that all the widening to 50 feet in their opinion should come off of the property to the north which is this property – the City disagrees. The time that should have occurred was at the time of the subdivision and to his knowledge the County didn't raise the issue at that time.

Vice Chair Devine asked if the widening were to occur it would come off both.

Director Schesser replied that it would not and that Lot 5 is already developed.

Commissioner Fleck asked if there was a map that showed the situation.

Director Schesser replied that he could get the subdivision map.

Vice Chair Devine asked City Planner Ferguson if that was the content of both letters was the potential widening.

City Planner Ferguson replied that was correct, that the County requires a 50 foot right-of-way for a county road and Emerson is currently only 30. She restated that the City's opinion is that this is something that should have occurred during the subdivision of these lots if the County was going to request that the City expand the right-of-way. One of the letters states that when the Industrial Park was formed that at that time Emerson Lane may not have been actually designated as a County road. The County has changed the designation of the road to up it to a county road. It just used to be public right-of-way. So that 50 foot standard may have not actually come into effect until after the subdivision was created, which may be part of the problem. So the standard on that road and the right-of-way has increased since the time the Industrial Park was created.

Commissioner McClean asked if Lot 5 was currently on the east side of the proposed project site and the road was on the south edge.

City Planner Ferguson replied that was correct and the application on Lot 5 started off as a Lane County application. It started off as an application by Lorin Bailey for a mini

storage facility on property that is actually off of Emerson Lane (end of tape/start of tape)

Director Schesser came back into the room and showed the subdivision map to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Severns asked if the property to widen Emerson would come from the properties to the south, because it can't be taken out of the property on the north because of existing development.

Director Schesser replied that was correct.

Commissioner McClean asked if the buildings on Lot 5 were right up to the south property line.

Director Schesser replied that they were about 3 feet from it.

Commissioner Severns stated so that is already blocked by existing buildings.

Commissioner McClean asked what the nature of the properties on the opposite site of Emerson were, residential?

Director Schesser replied there might be some development related to Lot 5 that's toward the front and fenced in, he wasn't sure what was going on there. It is in the County and there was a County application.

Commissioner Fleck asked if that was the property traded.

Director Schesser replied a portion of property was traded for half of Lot 5 for what the City got for "R" Street.

Commissioner McClean stated that the City planted a tree right in the middle of where a driveway would be located.

Staff replied that trees were literally placed every 30 feet.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Wade Stevens: George, I'm Wade Stevens, which you know and the one developing it. What I'm going to say

Vice Chair Devine: Would you state your address for the record?

Wade Stevens: PO Box or you want a physical address?

Vice Chair Devine: PO.

Wade Stevens: 35741 Springhill Road in Creswell. And what we did – I developed the mini storage that's lot Lot 5 and we followed all the criteria that you guys recommended and that's exactly what we've done on this project as well. They're the same type of buildings, just a little bit larger. Everything's done the same. Landscaping, everything, the setbacks, the whole (unable to understand). So we already knew what was the criteria to go by and that's what we did. So hopefully that stays the same, unless you guys want to change it, we're going to do exactly the same thing on Emerson. We have a 5 foot setback. It's will be all arbor vitae and landscaped along that back side to Emerson. There's been no problem with it and that's what you guys - we took a year to get that thing approved and that's what we've got so.

Vice Chair Devine: Very good. Thank you. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak in favor of this item? Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak against this item?

Dennis Tucker: I'm Dennis Tucker, 31857 Emerson Lane, and to start with if you look at the map that the City sent out there's no footage mark on how wide the easement is. There's no way anyone would know if this was a 60 foot right-of-way or 50 foot right-of-way. When they sent the paper out on the first building, there's no way anyone would know if you looked at the way it was there was no way you would know but you were going to have that right-of-way at 60 foot dimensions unless it was on the paper. If you look at – I checked with the road department. If you'll look at what the Lane County road code 156.97 it says that anything over 26,000 lbs. and on that road has to have a 50 foot right-of-way and it goes from the center of the road out and instead that should have been 35 feet, not 5 feet according to the County. On top of that when they developed this Cottage Grove development, Emerson was supposed to go out towards Getty before the road was built. It was going to be cut off from 99 altogether and then that didn't happen so that's there no way to know building that building there that the road wasn't going to go out another way. Now you can obviously see that the building can be built right on the road, there's no room for expansion, it's an illegal road at 30 feet. Even the City doesn't even allow 30 foot roads. I've got better than 40 acres back there and I'm sure that in 50 years something's going to be different there. That's the only access I've got and the City knows it.

Vice Chair Devine: Okay, is that it? Thank you. Is there anyone else that wishes to speak against this item? Alright, is there any rebuttal from those speaking in favor? Okay at this time we'll close the public hearing and bring it back to the Commission.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Vice Chair asked if there were any questions or comments for staff?

Commissioner Williams asked if there was access to the map that Mr. Tucker referred to because he did not see a map in the staff report that showed anything about Emerson Lane right-of-way.

Vice Chair Devine stated he was also going to ask this question.

Speaking from the audience Mr. Tucker asked if they wanted his copy.

Vice Chair Devine asked him to pass it to City Planner Ferguson.

City Planner Ferguson stated it was the same map that the Commissioner's had received, it was just a smaller copy of the same site plan that the applicant provided staff and that Mr. Tucker was correct, Emerson was not shown on that map.

Vice Chair Devine clarified that it was the same map in the back of the staff report and asked that Mr. Tucker's map be returned to him. Devine stated that the hearing was closed and no further public testimony could be taken.

Speaking from the audience Mr. Tucker stated that their information was not right.

Both staff and Vice Chair Devine restated that the hearing was closed and discussion was among the Commissioner's and staff only.

Commissioner Williams stated he still did not see which map it was.

Vice Chair Devine showed Commissioner Williams the map in his staff report.

Commissioner Williams stated he was not sure anything was missing and was there any reason to show Emerson on the map.

Commissioner McClean asked what process would occur if Emerson was developed by the City or the County.

Director Schesser replied it was whoever needed the development and whose jurisdiction it was. That right now it's in the county and not in the city.

Vice Chair Devine asked if Emerson was in the City's jurisdiction?

Director Schesser replied it was not the City's jurisdiction. If in the future the urban growth boundary goes south and it comes within the City, then development of that road would be looked at. It's just like other places in the City with 30 foot rights-of-way, then you still development it. You get a 28 foot paved section and you prohibit parking or you look at the south side by getting more land for access. He did not know what was going on with the south side because the City did not see those permits.

Commissioner McClean asked if it usually involved forcibly taking property, or purchasing property.

Director Schesser replied if it was development leveraged, then it may then be required by the development to the purchase property.

Commissioner McClean asked staff if the County process was the same.

Director Schesser replied it was there process as well, as they have the same tools and procedures that the City has, their ordinances are different depending on where it's located and what the demand is.

Commissioner McClean asked if building were there . . .

Director Schesser replied you would either have to go on the south side or you work within a 30 foot right-of-way which would probably mean there would be parking restrictions.

Commissioner McClean replied that he understood.

Commissioner Severns stated that Lot 5 is already developed and the restriction in width is already established by structures in-place right now.

Director Schesser replied that was correct on the City side. Lane County Code 15.6.07 doesn't apply unless this developer takes access while he's under construction or permanent access. There's no permanent access proposed and he was not aware of the developer taking temporary access during construction.

Vice Chair Devine asked if this would be an issue if the developer did that and the Tucker's would bring that to the County's attention.

Director Schesser that was correct and he would need a permit from the County. Vice Chair Devine asked if the City had jurisdiction.

Director Schesser replied no.

Commissioner McClean asked if a condition of approval could be added that access be taken off Getty Circle and not off of Emerson.

Director Schesser replied that a condition could be put in that access be taken off Getty Circle unless a permit is obtained from the County.

Vice Chair Devine stated he did not think that would be a big condition to add to help allay the fears of the other property owners.

Director Schesser replied that he did not know if the condition was necessary because the information is there, the developer is here and he understands the requirement.

Vice Chair Devine stated that was true.

Commissioner Fleck stated that he thought the other persons are more concerned with future development than the actual development of this parcel.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER FLECK AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE APPLICATION NO. DR 1-07 AS PRESENTED, BASED ON THE CRITERIA, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS STATED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Commissioner Crawford	Commissioner Devine	Commissioner Fleck	Commissioner McClean	Commissioner Severns	Commissioner Williams	Chair Parsons
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NAYES							
ABSTAIN							

Black and Veatch/City of Cottage Grove – Conditional Use Permit (CUP 1-07)

This application is for the upgrade of the City of Cottage Grove’s Water Treatment Plant (WTP).

The subject property is part of the East Regional Park, a City-owned nature park that is zoned RS Residential Suburban. Public and semipublic buildings that are essential to the physical, social and economic welfare of the area are listed as Conditional Uses in the RS Residential Suburban zone (18.08.030). Consequently, the proposed expansion of the WTP requires conditional use permit approval.

The City of Cottage Grove intends to build a state-of-the-art water treatment plant that will produce high-quality effluent which meets or exceeds water quality standards mandated by regulatory agencies. Currently, the City’s potable water is supplied by the Layng Creek WTP and the Row River WTP. The Layng Creek WTP is located approximately 20 miles east of Cottage Grove and it is unable to consistently produce treated water which complies with turbidity removal requirements. The Row River WTP produces treated water which complies with all drinking water standards. As a result,

the Layng Creek WTP will be decommissioned and the Row River WTP will undergo improvements to increase plant capacity.

Planned improvements to the Row River WTP include constructing a new surface water intake north of the existing surface water intake on the north side of the Row River Road bridge, and a new water distribution line. The City proposes renovating existing facilities and expanding the capacity of the Row River WTP by installing membrane filtration equipment.

The installation of new treatment equipment will require the construction of a 35 foot by 75 foot addition to the existing treatment building, two new backwash/filter cleaning waste treatment ponds to the south of the existing backwash pond, and a new intake structure next to the bridge on the banks of the Row River.

The Row River WTP will be connected to the City' existing distribution system through the construction of approximately 2,900 feet of 12 inch diameter distribution line in the right-of-way of Row River Road. A new 8 inch lateral will be installed connecting this 12 inch distribution line to the Row River WTP. The main line in Row River Road will continue east across the Row River Bridge and outside the UGB to supply existing services up to the Dorena Mobile Home Park. This distribution line is outside of the scope of this conditional use permit, as it is located in the Row River Road right-of-way.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Jeff Lindgren, Black and Veatch, spoke representing the City. He review each of the conditions showing how they would or already have met all of the conditions. Mr. Lindgren asked for exceptions to allow parts of the project that do not impact the Row River to go forward while waiting for USACE/DSL approval for the intake.

Jamie Andrews, 78414 Sears Road, spoke in opposition. She was concerned about the effect on the river of removing 8 million gallons of water/day. She asked to see impact studies and USACE/DSL and National Marine Fisheries approval prior to issuance of any permits.

Karen Thomas, 78420 Sears Road, spoke in opposition. She wanted to see the environmental assessment and NIMS response. Ms. Thomas was also very concerned over the impact of the water removal on the sand bar, the intake's effect on swimmers and fish, changes to the hydraulics of the river and about proper monitoring of in-water work.

Larry Thomas, 78420 Sears Road, spoke against the application. He made reference to the work done to protect the water pipe from Layng Creek two years ago which caused lots of turbidity and was performed without any concern for the surrounding habitat.

He wanted assurances that his concerns over contamination and turbidity and their effects on the wildlife would be addressed.

Karen Thomas spoke again and asked the Commission to make sure the proper permits were in-place and to not rush the job. She stated that the Environmental Impact Study had not yet been reviewed.

Jan Wellman, Public Works Director, spoke in rebuttal on behalf of the City. He stated that Row River's flow is controlled by USACE and they would only be transferring 2 million gallons of water rights at this time and that will increase up to 8 million gallons over the next 20 years. The intake structure will be screened as required by NIMS. NIMS, USACE and DSL have been on the ground at the project and have given a tentative go-ahead. He clarified that the pipe project two years ago had been an emergency situation and the City had not received any fines from USACE, but has agreed to remove the pipe and rip rap once this project has been completed. He confirmed that no work will begin until the permit is issued.

Jeff Lindgren speaking in rebuttal outlined the permits that the City has applied for thus far, including the biological assessment performed for NIMS.

Commissioner Severns asked about the 30 day comment period for DSL.

Mr. Lindgren stated that two comments had been received which would not impact the project. He summarized the safety aspects of the intake and gave a rough estimate regarding amount of water being pulled out versus water in the river (12 CFS vs. 200 CFS low flow).

Commissioner Severns asked what the property owners' recourse would be if they see erosion of their property in the future.

Mr. Lindgren replied that he thought the property owners on the Sears Road bank would continue to see erosion of their bank, as the river is naturally shifting towards Sears Road.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Director Schesser asked the Commission to clarify Condition No. 4 to add "in relationship to the intake structure".

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER FLECK AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SEVERNS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE APPLICATION FILE NO. CUP 1-07, BASED ON THE CRITERIA, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT AND THE AMENDED CONDITIONS.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Commissioner Crawford	Commissioner Devine	Commissioner Fleck	Commissioner McClean	Commissioner Severns	Commissioner Williams	Chair Parsons
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NAYES							
ABSTAIN							

INFORMATION REPORT FROM STAFF

None.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSION COMMENTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:50 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED

Cindy Blacksmith, Recording Secretary

George Devine, Vice-Chair