

Montpelier Planning Commission
January 28, 2008
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Christopher Paterson, Vice Chair; Claire Benedict, David Borgendale, and Alan Goldman and Mark Kaufman.
Staff: Gwen Hallsmith, Director of Planning and Community Development

Review of Minutes:

Mr. Paterson asked if anyone had reviewed the December 10th minutes. Ms. Hallsmith said they reviewed them at the last meeting. There was one missing piece, but no action. Ms. Benedict moved approval of the December 10th minutes, with Mr. Borgendale seconding the motion. The December 10, 2007 minutes of the Planning Commission were adopted unanimously.

Comments from the Vice-Chair:

Mr. Paterson said he contacted Betsy Rosenbooth of the Orton Family Foundation and talked about potential dates and she is holding April 14th date open for the Planning Commission.

Public Appearances:

None.

Election of Chair:

Mr. Borgendale suggested they might want to wait. Anne Campbell isn't present and we may receive a new member. Ms. Hallsmith said they could each nominate someone on paper and then people could speak to their willingness to do it. It is a consent model for elections, and it works. Mr. Goldman said he would hate to nominate someone who has no desire to serve. Ms. Benedict said she would like to discuss the position of Chair.

Mr. Paterson asked if anyone present was interested in serving as Chair. Mr. Paterson said he would prefer not to be Chair. Mr. Goldman said he believed both Mark and Chris would make good Chairs. Mr. Borgendale said he wouldn't be interested at all.

Mr. Paterson said he would nominate Mark and continue to serve in the Vice-Chair position. Mr. Goldman said he would nominate either of you if you felt you wanted the position. Mr. Paterson said every sense he has received from Anne is that she isn't interested in serving as Chair. If we all think Mark is a good Chair, and if Mark is willing to become Chair, then he would suggest moving ahead. Mr. Kaufman said he would be very interested in Chris remain as Vice-Chair.

Mr. Paterson moved that the Planning Commission elect Mark Kaufman as the new Chair. Mr. Borgendale seconded the motion. Mr. Paterson will continue serving as Vice-Chair. Mr. Kaufman was elected Chair of the Montpelier Planning Commission on a unanimous vote of 5-0.

Planning Priorities for 2008:

The Title 24 packets about the purpose, goals and authorities of the Planning Commission are really nice. They are very vague and so solemnly followed. What are the priorities of the Planning Commissioners as we see it from our constituencies in the coming year, especially as we are involved with enVision Montpelier. We have a good strong enVision Montpelier timeline and starting to see some strong interactions between committees and concepts, but we still have to deal with the very prosaic parking standards, changes in the floodplain regulations, and accessory apartments. What do each of you see as the priority for the Planning Commission over the next year and beyond?

Mr. Paterson said they need to have a little bit of time to talk about what issues or topics we feel are important for us to get on the table and deal with at some point in the coming year. What are some of the issues we thought were important when we came to the Planning Commission? What are we hearing? What are we thinking? What

are we feeling about what is important for the group to deal with? Much of it may be encapsulated with enVision and some may not be.

Mr. Kaufman said one of his issues is that we as a Planning Commission are truly helping to lead the enVision process. Where we are going with the goals from enVision the Planning Commission look at it from a more holistic framework and everything fits together and is tied together. If we start hitting things piecemeal, we will be doing the same thing that has been done for decades before. When we look at economic development it needs to be tied to our schools, to the downtown community, to the business environment, to housing, to the environment, etc. It is his goal that we look at this from the upper tier of the umbrella to pull all of those committees together into the goals and action plan.

Ms. Benedict asked if they were at the point in the enVision process where they can do that.

Ms. Hallsmith and Mr. Kaufman agreed they were not even close to that point. Ms. Hallsmith said they had just completed the phase of enVision where we are getting to completion. We have been learning about all of the different areas in each subcommittee. The next phase, which will probably kick off after the March stakeholder meeting, is the goal setting process. They are working on community visioning. Once the community visioning is done, it is likely the Stakeholder Group will set up a special committee to look at all of the data we collected. There are close to 400 people who have responded to the surveys. They will come up with a vision statement, and then each of the committees are responsible for setting goals. From the goals the committees identify targets or indicators, and from there they identify specific strategies they will be trying to implement or the community should implement to achieve the goals. Then, there is an action plan that flows from that which will identify specific institutions, entities and individuals in the community that will take responsibility for some of those action steps. All of it should come together before the summer of 2009.

It's a long process, and the reason it is a long process is because it takes some time for even the committees to be able to work together and come up with a shared idea. In the fall of 2009 she is hoping they will have all of these pieces together and tentatively started planning a conference with the Cities Plus Network, which are a group of cities from around the world that are doing this type of plan.

The zoning will come after all of this is done, but there will certainly be recommendations for the changes that might be needed for the zoning.

Mr. Goldman said the Master Plan and zoning regulations have taken so long. Do we wait until June and July of 2009, or do we work on some of the Master Plan drafting?

Ms. Hallsmith said what they are going to be doing for the next year is the action plan, goals, etc. The Housing Task Force has already put together a package for housing they worked through on the Infrastructure Committee. The Planning Commission's job is to pull it all together into a coherent package, present it back to the public so that people in the community can prioritize what we are going to be working on. By the time we are done there will be a list of recommended action steps.

Mr. Goldman said we need to get City Council involved in this.

Ms. Hallsmith said they have been involved in every step. That is why she recruited four members of City Council to be on the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is running parallel to the Planning Commission in terms of keeping on top of the process. Several of them attend some of the subcommittee meetings. Ms. Hallsmith has been working on an All Board meeting for April because that is another opportunity to catch people up on where we are with the process, what are some of the recommendations and getting everybody on the different boards together.

Mr. Borgendale said he wanted to echo what Mark is saying but also add to it, that the Planning Commission's priority has to be to try to develop a coherent whole. He has thought from the very beginning that one of the real issues they faced was making decisions with a very narrow vision of what the factors were in making the decisions. We have ended up doing the same thing with the planning process, and he hopes enVision does not

turn out that way. There are so many times we make decisions based on some type of community crisis that is very narrow in scope, and also too often based on advocacy groups' narrow focus. He is hoping this body can come up with some good ideas long term for counteracting that tendency within city government and community.

Ms. Hallsmith said by developing a broad base of stakeholders with a wider knowledge about all of the different moving parts in the city as a part of that process she is hoping that is one of the anecdotes to that kind of planning. It is problem driven planning. This is supposed to be asset driven planning. We are supposed to find what the things are in our community that are strengths that we can build on rather than just chasing problems all of the time.

Mr. Kaufman said they can come up with, through the enVision process, a rational parking plan far into the future that also addresses the needs tomorrow. The planning process is so important because we can deal with things before there are 5 angry citizens waving their fists at a Council meeting. The Planning Commission can present a unified plan or set of recommendations based on data, scientific or statistical studies, and there is an evaluation process tied into it.

Mr. Borgendale said talking about those kinds of issues it makes him think about the governance subcommittee he is serving on. If you change the structure of governance, it is quite possible to undo that sort of thing. How do we restructure decision making in the community so it isn't totally reaction to a crisis?

Mr. Goldman said they need to keep it in line with Title 24 because that will govern everything.

Mr. Kaufman said in general he worries that we as a Planning Commission at times may appear to be irrelevant, if we get so focused just on enVision that there are problems happening now that people want and need responses around. Some of the conversations he has had are around the pedestrian issues and ways to help with pedestrian issues.

Mr. Borgendale said the city hasn't found a good way to deal with the conflicts between automobile traffic and pedestrian traffic. A lot of it is geography, but this is a community where almost all of the automobile traffic and all of the pedestrian conflict is forced into conflict in specific areas. It is miserable to be crossing the street in the downtown, and it is miserable to drive through the downtown.

Ms. Hallsmith said that is something we need to look at. How do we make the community more pedestrian friendly?

Mr. Goldman said he is working at the Lash building in Barre where they don't have the river separating the city with the highway on the outskirts of the city. There are 17,000 cars a day going right through the downtown. He never realized how good it is here, even with our current conflicts, until he tried to do something with Main Street in Barre. We're just lucky that Route 2 is on the other side of the river.

Mr. Borgendale said he is worried that his kids growing up here are going to move to other communities and get run over. The real problem is that Route 12 goes right through the middle of town.

Ms. Hallsmith said the Farmer's Market is looking to close the street on Saturdays, which would give us a chance to try it out.

Mr. Paterson said where he lives on the other side of town he is separated by the Capitol Complex. There is a dead zone there. how do we as a community think about how we can continue to maintain some vibrancy and connectiveness between folks on this side of the Capitol Complex and folks on the other side? Also, we need to think about the gateway coming in along Route 2.

Mr. Goldman said it is really challenging to see how far people are willing to walk. The average person will only walk about 1,200 feet; they just won't do it.

Mr. Kaufman suggested that each member come up with a couple of major issues, whether they be concerns or areas we want to look into, compile them over the next week and revisit them the following meeting. He loves downtown pedestrian malls. Church Street is great, but he doesn't know how we would do it here. Home Depot is going to be on the list. Ms. Benedict said we don't know what the impact is going to be, but it will have a big impact.

Mr. Goldman said what he has learned over the years is that we won't stop it from coming. The best we can do is shape it well with the traffic, impacts and come up with ways to protect our smaller people.

Zoning Revisions Needed:

Floodplain regulations: We need to revise this by April or the city will lose its discount on flood insurance. The Regional Planning Commission has gone through our current floodplain ordinance and identified those features that need to be changed or modified to bring us into compliance with current federal standards. It is pretty simple. There are more definitions in the back. It references the new FEMA maps that are coming out, adds something on recreational vehicles and enclosed areas. Basically, we need to do this or we lose our discounted flood insurance, and possibly even our flood insurance. There isn't a lot of debate about this; we have to do it.

Mr. Borgendale said he doesn't understand how anybody can get flood insurance in the downtown.

Ms. Benedict said she isn't sure too many people have flood insurance. It doesn't cover your inventory or basement. It only covers the building.

Ms. Hallsmith said they should just pass it on to City Council because it has to be done. We need to have a public hearing first.

Mr. Borgendale moved that the Planning Commission set a date for a public hearing. Mr. Goldman seconded the motion. Ms. Hallsmith said they could do it on the February 25th Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Borgendale said they also have to do a report for City Council. Title 24 says things the report has to address and it has to come from the Planning Commission. Ms. Hallsmith said she would draft something for the next meeting and warn it from there.

Parking Standards: Mr. Goldman said he totally agrees that requiring 1.5 parking spaces is arbitrary and doesn't make sense, but if you get more and more units what do we do? One unit is one space and two units need three spaces. To say that an 8-unit building would only have 8 parking spots will cause a disaster. Ms. Hallsmith said what she is finding is that the regulations aren't necessarily going to drive the parking that people will develop with their buildings. The market is going to drive that. The Land Trust down on their Stone Cutters Way development are looking for parking that goes above and beyond what our regulations there would require because they know they need it to sell the office space and sell the condominiums. In the vast majority of redevelopment that we see in Montpelier is redevelopment for affordable housing. With this regulation we are putting a priority on land for an automobile over and above a unit for people to live in. There have been proposals that have come before the Planning Office that have not been able to be approved or stuck in a position of having to get a variance because there isn't 1.5 spaces per unit. To put up an accessory apartment up on Cliff Street there is no way to add a parking space to some of those houses without pouring cement off a cliff.

Mr. Borgendale said he doesn't think we can effectively deal with this issue until we deal with the ordinance about banning on-street parking for four months out of the year. He thinks that is a real issue. Other snow communities manage to deal with snow removal without having such a draconian solution. It impacts this issue significantly. City Council looks at it and then say they have to spend money on lights or warning systems so they can't do it.

Ms. Hallsmith said on the issue of affordable housing one parking space per unit ought to be enough as a baseline rather than two, which is what we have here.

Mr. Goldman said if it's not, where do they park?

Mr. Kaufman said they have people screaming for affordable housing and say they aren't making a lot of money, and they are probably working two jobs, we don't have the world's best public transportation system so they might need two cars in order to survive. What do we ask them to do with their second car?

Mr. Goldman said even though they say it's not our problem, it becomes our problem because the parking is really a premium.

Mr. Kaufman said we may wish for a world that doesn't use cars, but right now some people depend upon them.

Ms. Hallsmith said in most cases where it is possible the people who are doing the development know that in order to have a certain rent they can charge they have to provide that parking. By reducing the requirement we aren't necessarily going to force everybody into doing less. It's not a maximum we're setting, but a minimum. Out in Sabin's Pasture there is a big development going in. With this requirement we are going to be dedicating right off a whole lot more of the land that is developed out there to parking than we are to other development.

Mr. Paterson said we probably aren't the most diverse set of people in this community. If we want to propose this ordinance change, this is one that is not deserving of a fast track.

Mr. Goldman said he takes care of a lot of units, and almost all are just 2 bedrooms and all of the people he rents to both people work. They are going to have two cars.

Ms. Benedict asked if as a builder would he build a 2-bedroom unit and only put in one parking space.

Mr. Goldman said no. The market is not really going to encourage people to stop providing adequate parking. Mr. Goldman said as a builder who is going to sell the property it won't be his problem.

Mr. Kaufman said other communities have a variety of approaches to this. They set a minimum, period, and let the market drive it. Others do a scaled approach up to certain maximums. In the Houston area if you are looking at a 200-unit apartment complex that has 100 parking spaces for 200 2-bedroom apartments, and there are a lot of complaints and yet it goes because the market allows it. He would like to see some more information gathering about what other communities have done and a mixed use matrix. If it needs to be 2, make it 2 and not 1.5.

Ms. Hallsmith said they should look at the lead standards for this, leads both in terms of their neighborhood development and their building development standards.

Mr. Goldman said if we aren't going to come up with a solution for public transportation we are always going to have a car problem. Don't we have to attack it at the root of the problem? How are we going to get people to and from work?

Ms. Hallsmith said that is why they thought the March 5th meeting would be on parking and transit, not just parking.

Mr. Kaufman said they have something very specific in front of them now. We can choose to table it, get more information, get some public input in March, but we need to take action. Parking is such a hot button issue for all of us.

Mr. Paterson asked what is driving this issue. Gwen's idea of what is driving this issue right now is primarily is the idea of accessory apartments. Ms. Hallsmith said accessory apartments is one, and Sabin's Pasture is another. We are going to be looking at Sabin's Pasture proposals, and with this structured this way we are going to see a lot more of that very small area dedicated to automobiles and asphalt than we will housing. Tonight is the first presentation of the development ideas for Sabin's Pasture, and one of the things they are doing is proposing mixed use. There actually would be closed commercial space down along Barre Street that could serve as overflow parking for the residential area potentially.

Ms. Hallsmith said if they adjust their minimum parking standards to be more flexible and understand the market is going to dictate quite a bit of it over time, we could go to a lower minimum standard just because we did that on Stone Cutters Way. The people on Cliff Street who are putting in the accessory apartment have two parking spaces but need three because of this standard. They will put one car in the garage, one car in the driveway, and then they need a third. There is nowhere on their property to put a third, so the Planning Office tells them to apply for a variance.

Mr. Borgendale said anywhere you build at Sabin's Pasture you are going to have housing built on slopes. For example, under unit parking underneath the living area is a very efficient way to do that. That is what they did on Barre Street. He doesn't think when they did the zoning regulations that they did enough to encourage that sort of parking, and perhaps they should be looking at giving people some kind of bonus if they build that way.

Ms. Hallsmith said the performance zoning approach says to show us the market and the demand is for parking and show us you are actually meeting the needs in this area. She is always going to want to tend toward the performance zoning side because there are going to be different circumstances and different neighborhoods and different appropriate approaches in a variety of areas in the city. She is struggling with the 1.5 per unit.

Mr. Goldman said he feels strongly that the market will sell the building anyway. He doesn't want to encourage design that doesn't really work and just sell cheaper. If he builds a 4-bedroom home, and it only has 1 bathroom, it won't sell so quickly and you'll have a house that is very dysfunctional when it comes time to getting up in the morning.

Ms. Hallsmith said if she is a young family moving to Montpelier looking for an affordable unit and that extra land dedicated to that extra parking space puts it over what she can afford, does she choose between parking her car in a rental garage somewhere, or off site somewhere that she can walk to in return for having a house? That is the kind of tradeoff we're talking about, because we are talking about land dedicated to parking.

Mr. Borgendale said there are three separate situations. You have commercial development, but this is talking about residential requirements. Then, there is the whole issue of infill. If you are going to have accessory apartments the rules should be different.

Mr. Kaufman asked Gwen to have Clancy draft some language on performance based and market driven parking guidelines for the Planning Commission to look at on February 11th. In the meantime, he would like to see how this is handled in other similar sized cities. He would like to look outside of Vermont to see what might be out there.

Design Review – Renewable Energy Issues: Because the zoning talks about solar and wind she included it. She doesn't think we'll see any wind turbines proposed for the downtown in the near future. It's not a wind compatible area. Vermont College is also in the design review district, and that might be an area where a wind application could be used. She has talked this over with the Design Review Committee and they are fine with it. In the design review district there are certain types of things which are exempt, the mechanical bits going in on top of the buildings that go with the ventilation equipment. There is nothing they can do about those. They are required for the mechanical equipment to work properly. The same thing goes for solar and wind. There is no way to make a solar panel different.

Mr. Goldman said his only concern is that there are a lot of "do-it-yourselfers" that might start building monstrosities on their buildings. He doesn't want it to be an open window to do whatever you want. What if a guy puts up a 30 foot collector on top of his roof? Ms. Hallsmith said it would still be subject to administrative review and approval, but they wouldn't have to go through design review.

Mr. Goldman said manufactured panels are great. Ms. Hallsmith said everybody would still have to go through the administrative process.

Mr. Borgendale asked Gwen if she was suggesting that we have design review refusing to okay solar panels because they destroy the historic character. Ms. Hallsmith said the potential is there. She said in her tenure here there have been two proposals for solar panels. One she convinced the Design Review Committee to let it slide because it wasn't visible from anywhere. That was the one on the school and they needed to have it done quickly. The other was on Barre Street, and she doesn't know the result of that. Frankly, as soon as people find out they have to go through the Design Review Committee to get solar panels on their buildings, some just stop right there.

Mr. Goldman said he wanted to do solar on Court Street but he has a four-story building that has been zoned out of compliance. You are only allowed to do three-story structures even if the building is 100 years old.

Mr. Paterson said if he wanted to put a 19 foot diameter blade set in his back yard, out of view of his neighbors on Berlin Street. Ms. Hallsmith said he isn't in the design review district so it wouldn't matter. Right now he would be exempt. She could add language on both of these cases that if it falls within the broad range of circumstances that would be exempt, then the administrator could approve it but it is up to the option of the administrator to give it to the Design Review Committee if it is going to have an impact.

Mr. Borgendale said sooner or later this is going to get resolved by economics, anyway, because if energy becomes expensive enough the historical stuff will go out the window and we'll adopt new technology, which is what our society has always done.

Mr. Kaufman asked if they could invite the Design Review Committee to come and talk with the Planning Commission and tell them we want to promote alternative energy within downtown Montpelier. How can we do this to maintain the historic and aesthetic character of the downtown? Again, we can do this with better coordination and communication between the boards and committees. This could be a useful conversation and ask them if we could do this in a way that would be collaborative.

Signs: The only thing there is on signs is clarifying a definition.

Dead End Street: Montpelier doesn't have a definition of a dead end street. Mr. Goldman said there is a definition that there will be no project with a singular access more than 1,800 feet. With Sabin's Pasture because of a bunch of railroad right-of-way issues and topography there is no way to have two entrances into the whole development. It is a single access point on this road. The reason we don't want to have long dead end streets is because if for some reason there was an accident and fire the fire engine isn't able to get there. But we don't define what a "dead end street" is. Now a new development is required to be sprinklered, so why are we so worried about fire hoses.

There are definitions for everything in zoning, but not for dead end street. It is an important definition. This has already come up with the Capital Heights Development. None of the neighbors wanted to make it a through street because they liked their dead end street.

Zoning Chart: This is the chart of major and minor PUD's. Ms. Hallsmith said she was handed a zoning bylaw that did not include this chart even though the bylaw passed by the City Council did. She had never seen this chart before last week.

Mr. Kaufman said Mary Hooper had e-mailed something about a vacant building ordinance which should be thought of in conjunction with a zoning ordinance. Ms. Hallsmith said she drafted a vacant building ordinance so she is aware that City Council is looking at it. There is another issue that Mary raises, which is really a building code issue. We can look at building codes, although they are different ordinances than the zoning ordinances. It is a separate set of enforcement mechanisms. It isn't an addition to the zoning.

February Stakeholder's Meeting:

The February Stakeholder's meeting is on February 12, 2008 at the Trinity Church instead of the Vermont College gym. Judy Walke is going to be leading the meeting. It's a Human Development group that is going to be talking about networks and neighborhoods. What are all the ways we come into contact with each other in our

networks and neighborhoods in this city? If you have never done a world café before, they are a lot of fun. Judy is an expert in leading them. There are going to be chocolates and a Valentine's Day theme.

Parking & Transit Public Forum:

This is going to be held on March 5th. Ms. Hallsmith said she had reserved National Life Cafeteria for this meeting. It's kind of like the Town Meeting discussion this year. The consultant working with us on the parking and multi-modal center is going to be preparing lots of interesting drawings describing what could be possible with a parking garage development for Montpelier. Carl Ettenier will also be talking about things like stranded investments and why would we want to invest \$10 million in a parking garage that may be obsolete before it is built.

The Planning Commission, City Council and Infrastructure Committee are the conveners of the forum. It has been a discussion that the Planning Commission had agreed with the City Council a long time ago that we would do. They are finally starting to creep forward on the Carr Lot Project as the EPA has approved the characterization plan. Pretty soon we are going to have to deal with the question of what we are going to do. With the Carr Lot Project we had always envisioned building a parking garage, and yet we don't have a place to put it that anybody can agree upon. There are lots of places to put it, but there are objections to all of them with different groups of people. Part of the idea was to put it out in a big public meeting and look at all of the possibilities, and then have the public weigh in on what they like and give the decision makers more information to move forward with. One alternative has been proposed and everybody comes out of the woodwork against that, and so on and so on. Maybe then we'll get a preferred preference.

Mr. Borgendale said that wasn't accurate because when it started out there were at least three or four different proposed designs and sites that people were asked to look at.

Ms. Hallsmith said it is true that the Carr Lot Committee has considered a number of different options, but still none have any legs.

Mr. Borgendale said he thought the whole Carr Lot transit center proposal had gotten decoupled from the parking issue, anyway. Didn't City Council do that? There was an administrative decision that if we were going to take that much parking away in order to build a transit center we have to replace it.

Ms. Hallsmith said last year when the state shut down the parking lot is what decoupled it. We have the money to build a transit center, but we don't have the money to build a parking garage. We need to raise an additional \$10 million if we are going to build a parking garage.

Mr. Goldman asked if it was too late to talk about the state taking more responsibility.

Ms. Hallsmith said that would be a good subject for March 5th.

Mr. Goldman said he looks at Court Street and sees a parking lot that is sunken 20 feet below grade. He can't imagine why they wouldn't want to have more parking there. It's not the greatest point of access, but that is where they are parking. The state is parking up on Terrace Street.

Ms. Hallsmith said the state is what drives the parking problem in Montpelier. We actually don't have a parking problem most of the year when the Legislature isn't here. It is really obvious to most people that the state is the ones that need to deal with the parking issue, but they don't. Bill Fraser is going to invite the new Buildings and General Services Commissioner to come to the meeting to talk about what the state is planning in terms of parking.

Mr. Goldman said the state has bought up all of these properties over the last 25 years and turned all of the Victorian homes into offices yet they have no responsibility for dealing with what is going on. It just isn't right.

Ms. Hallsmith said when the Court Street proposal was made, and when this monstrosity proposal was made right where the multi-modal center is planned, apparently the citizens of Montpelier came out in force in opposition to the proposed parking garage.

Mr. Goldman said Court Street has been mostly changed into offices.

Mr. Kaufman asked who is in charge of designing and facilitating that discussion.

Ms. Hallsmith said the Planning Commission and the Infrastructure Committee are.

Mr. Kaufman said if they are successful in generating an interest in this meeting that it be designed and facilitated well. Maybe we should have a professional facilitator for the parking forum.

Ms. Benedict said all they have talked about is the parking garage. Are we limiting ourselves to the parking garage?

Ms. Hallsmith said they are talking about parking and transit. She is thinking about a couple of formal presentations.

Mr. Borgendale said he would love to talk about movement and transportation issues without having the discussion totally focused on parking and bike paths.

Mr. Peterson said they would have Betsy from the Orton Foundation to come in on April 14th. Sometime in advance of that meeting if there are specific things the Planning Commission would like to take with her about we should let her know.

Adjournment:

Mr. Borgendale moved adjournment, with a second by Ms. Benedict. The Planning Commission adjourned.

Respectively submitted,

Gwen Hallsmith, Director
Planning & Community Development