

**MINUTES**  
**CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION**

6:30pm May 14, 2001  
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2<sup>nd</sup>

---

**I. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Vice-Chairman Jim Brown, Commissioners Jean Tallman, Geoff Manley, Paul Thalhofer, Randy Tessman, Tom Sanchez

**ABSENT:** Chairman Keith Stewart

**STAFF:** Clint Chiavarini, Associate Planner, Matilda Deas, Project Planner, Carla Ahl

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Charlie Rosenfeld, Lyle & Donna Pierce, Mary Rock, Laura Lundquist, Dan Criter, Al & Deloris Friedrich, T. McGill, R. Wolf, Tracy Boyce, Dan & Barbara Giddings, Leona Martin

Due to some confusion regarding the early meeting it was decided to alter the agenda and hold the Public Hearings at 7:00pm, to allow time for all participants to arrive.

**II. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON AGENDA ITEMS**

None

**III. FINDINGS**

**SUB 01-01** an application by Westlake Consultants to subdivide a 3.09 acre lot into 17 single family lots.

It was moved by Mr. Thalhofer to approve the Findings for SUB 01-01 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Motion carried 5-0.

**IV. MINUTES**

**March 26, 2001** It was moved by Mr. Tessman to approve the minutes for March 26, 2001 as written. Seconded by Mr. Manley. Motion carried 3-0 with Mrs. Tallman and Mr. Thalhofer abstaining.

**April 9, 2001** It was moved by Mr. Thalhofer to approve the minutes for April 9, 2001 as written. Seconded by Mr. Tessman. Motion carried 4-0

with Mr. Manley abstaining.

Mr. Sanchez arrived at this time.

**April 23, 2001** Mr. Thalsofer asked for clarification of his comments regarding street improvements for Hwy 99E being blended with the downtown core area. It was moved by Mrs. Tallman to approve the minutes of April 23, 2001 as amended. Seconded by Mr. Manley. Motion carried 6-0.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

**MOD 01-03** An application to modify the approved plans for DR 01-01, in regards to the entrance and exit driveways for the drive-up teller facilities.

Clint presented the staff report. He stated Mr. Grady would not be attending the meeting. But if the Commissioners had specific concerns, Mr. Grady would be presenting a modification application for Denny's at the next meeting and the Commissioners could continue this hearing until that time so he would be available to answer questions. The Commissioners decided to hear the modification.

Clint explained the applicant was asking to relocate the drive-thru entrance further east to allow easier turning movements into the bank and lessen the potential for conflicts with vehicles exiting the bank parking area. He stated the exit driveway would be shortened to retain an existing parking space and a planter island. In staff's opinion it would not create a greater traffic hazard than the original plan. Clint stated there would be little impact to the landscaping for the project, one planter strip would be moved, and a small amount of landscaping would be gained around the bank.

Mr. Brown stated the original application provided a 5' buffer between the adjacent properties, he was concerned that this modification would allow that area to be reduced. He asked if property lines had been established for the project, or if the lease lines were just for Gramor's use. Clint believed they were lease lines established by Gramor. Mr. Brown explained that a landscape buffer could be conditioned with the development of the adjacent parcel. Clint explained interior lot lines that share common access drives have no required setbacks or buffers, except for street frontages.

Mrs. Tallman agreed with conditioning future developments to create the 5' buffer, and believed the alignment of the driveway was improved with the modification.

Mr. Manley stated this modification to the entrance would make it easier to access the other site when it is developed.

Mr. Tessman agreed this modification would assist customers making the turn, and have

a positive impact on the access drive for the other pad. He agreed a buffer should be conditioned with the next development.

Mr. Thalhofer believed the gradual turn would be an improvement for customers.

Mr. Brown questioned if the original approved landscape plan would be followed for the modifications. Clint stated that staff would review the landscaping and assure that it matched the rest of the site.

It was moved by Mr. Manley to approve MOD 01-03 from DR 01-01 as written. Seconded by Mrs. Tallman. Motion carried 6-0.

## **VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**DR 01-02** An application by OBC to build a 27,420 square foot warehouse in three phases on property recently acquired as part of a land swap with Essex Management.

Vice-Chairman Brown reviewed the hearing process, procedure and format. He referred to the applicable criteria posted on the wall and on page 2 of the staff report. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none was stated. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, none was stated. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Clint gave the staff report. He explained this application is a result of the land swap between OBC and Canby Square, which will require the removal of their pipe bending building, relocating the entrance and the existing parking.

Clint explained the applicant is proposing to build a 27,420 square foot warehouse in 3 phases, which could feasibly be completed in 2 years. But the applicant has stated that is not a practical time frame for them, and most likely they will only complete Phase I this year and maybe Phase II next year.

Clint explained the matrix:

- The parking analysis showed the proposed parking will be adequate for all three phases.
- The realignment of Berg Parkway will require additional right of way and the applicant has stated they are willing to do this.
- There are no new signs proposed.
- Landscaping will be irrigated, but the applicant had proposed removing more than 3 trees and had not provided an arborist report.
- The proposed building will be similar to what is currently out there.

Clint stated that gave the applicant a score of 64.3 percent with a score of 65 percent needed. He explained the applicant could make up the needed point by showing the lawn area was over 25%, or by obtaining an arborist report recommending removal of the trees because

they would not survive. Mrs. Tallman suggested the applicant could plant 2 3" caliper trees to obtain bonus points.

Clint stated that public services are available but will need to be relocated, the Fire Marshall has required an additional fire hydrant, the location to be determined by the Fire Marshall and the cost to be divided between OBC NW and Canby Square.

Clint explained a right of way dedication is required by Public Works and staff recommends the applicant make the necessary modifications to their fence and landscaping at the time of development.

Mrs. Tallman questioned where the proposed roadway easement was located. Clint explained that it would run between the eastside of Canby and the Performing Arts Center.

Mr. Brown questioned a map received from Curt McLeod showing the existing building being crossed by Berg Parkway. Clint explained Mr. McLeod had written a memo stating he was confident the building could be avoided.

**Bob Wolf**, Jerry Robinson, Architect, presented a drawing that showed the buildings relationship with Berg Parkway after it is built out. He stated the proposed new building would be a 60' X 152' warehouse of similar design to the existing buildings. He explained how the internal traffic system functioned.

Clint explained Canby's ordinance requires any areas used for maneuvering to be paved, and that using the area for storage would require the maneuvering of trucks and forklifts.

**Charles Rosenfeld**, Landscape Architect, addressed the matrix points, He explained the proposed lawn area is over the required 25 percent. He stated that trees "E", "F", and "G", do not need to be removed at this time. Mr. Rosenfeld stated he could also reconfigure the sidewalk to save tree "A". He believed, with those adjustments, they had met the required matrix points. Clint agreed that put the applicant three points over the requirement.

**Tracy Boyce**, Owner of OBC NW, explained he is trying to utilize the property to accommodate the company's future growth. He stated it was unlikely that Phase II or Phase III could be done in the next 2 years, due to the costs in getting the power and water relocated. He explained they had planned on moving the pipe bending operation to the area to the east of the proposed warehouse, and to store items there that they are currently storing outside at this time. Clint explained that storing those items outside on a gravel pad was a "grandfathered" use but if they remodel they would have to conform to the existing code. Mr. Boyce stated they would look into the situation.

Mr. Thalhofer asked what type of vehicles would use the new entrance. Mr. Boyce stated their delivery trucks and vans would use the entrance, maybe one or two semi-trucks a day. Mr. Thalhofer stated the School District had commented the development would have no impact on the school.

Mr. Brown asked if the intent was for vehicles to turn off of highway 99E, take the "S" turn into a driveway located between Canby Square and the Performing Arts Center onto their property and then exiting on Berg Parkway. Mr. Boyce stated it was.

**PROPOSERS:**

None

**OPPOSERS:**

None

**REBUTTAL:**

**Mr. Boyce** stated that a traffic pattern could be developed for large trucks that would allow them to enter off of Berg Parkway, turn around and exit out the same way, and only smaller delivery vehicles would use the new entrance.

Mrs. Tallman stated her concerns regarding having the large vehicles driving past the school, but questioned if the applicant had enough room on their site for a semi-truck to turn around. She believed the area to be used for storage needed to be paved.

**Mr. Wolf** explained currently with the wider property a semi could come in and turn around on site, but with the narrowing of the site, and the location of the parking he was unsure there was an adequate turning radius.

Mr. Manley stated he would like the landscape architect to adjust the sidewalk and save tree "A" if possible. He asked if a sight obscuring fence would be appropriate with the school next door to the development. Mr. Brown stated there is an existing chain link fence along the east boundary, and asked if slats in the fence would be adequate. Mrs. Tallman questioned what type of landscaping was planned for the area. Mr. Rosenfeld stated the area is heavily landscaped, and the fast growing plants would obscure the lot within 2 years.

Mr. Brown stated his only concern with the application was that it did not have a way for semi-trucks to enter and exit the site except for the new entrance, which requires them to pass by the high school. Mr. Wolf stated that given the opportunity, these issues could be worked out. It was agreed by the Commission to continue the public hearing until May 29<sup>th</sup> 2001, 7:00pm.

**SUB 01-02** An application by Barbara Giddings to subdivide 2.5 acres into 11 single family lots.

Vice-Chairman Brown reviewed the hearing process, procedure and format. He referred to the applicable criteria posted on the wall and on page 2 of the staff report. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none was stated. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, Mr. Manley and Mr. Brown had visited the site and read an

article in the paper but had drawn no conclusions. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Clint presented the staff report, explaining the site is located on N. Juniper and NE 9<sup>th</sup> Street, the existing home will be on a lot of 18,590 square feet. Lots 9-10-and11 will access off of 9<sup>th</sup> Street the remaining lots will access either Juniper Court or Juniper Street.

Clint explained that Juniper Court has a hard surface but is not improved, off site improvements to Juniper Court are not a part of this application, they may take place in the future through an L.I.D. or if the City has the funds. The Public Works Department has plans to redevelop the intersection at N. Juniper and NE 9<sup>th</sup> Street. He explained the Church located there has bonded for the improvements and the applicant will be required to bond for them also.

Mr. Manley questioned if the lot the existing house sits on could be divided in the future, Clint stated it was possible.

**APPLICANT:**

**Barbara Giddings**, stated she is willing to meet all of the criteria the City requires, and is opened to any comments the Commission might have.

**PROPONENTS:**

None

**OPPONENTS:**

**Lyle Pierce**, stated he has been a neighbor of the property for 28 years. He is not opposed to the development, but believed now was the time to improve both Juniper and 9<sup>th</sup> streets due to the increase in traffic, to address the drainage problems in the area, and was concerned that the development would fit into the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Brown explained that Oregon Land Use laws will allow the Planning Commission to condition street improvements such as curbs and sidewalks along street frontages, but they cannot require the applicant to put improvements on property they do not own.

Mr. Pierce stated the City should be concerned about improving the roads in that area. Clint explained the City has a plan for coordinating the improvements at the intersection, but was unsure when the City's finances would allow it.

Mr. Pierce questioned why the road curved instead of going straight through. Clint stated this was the design the applicant presented, and no concerns were stated by the utility providers for this design. Mr. Brown explained that street improvements are expensive and applicants try to provide legal access to as many lots as they can.

**Mary Rock**, stated she has lived on the south side of the pasture for 9 years, it was the main reason she bought her property. She is concerned the new developments in the City are changing the hometown farming community feeling and hoped this subdivision would be consistent with the existing neighborhood. She stated she would be impacted the most because the development goes along the side and back of her house. She stated her main concern is that Canby is developing like Beaverton and Tigard has.

**Lee Martin**, agreed with Ms. Rock's comments. She questioned the Commission on how the development would impact her property since Juniper Court runs along the back and side of her property and Juniper Street is along the front. Clint explained his application did not propose any off site improvements. Mr. Brown stated Ms. Martin would not be required to pay for improvements on her property at this time.

Ms. Martin questioned if there would be an increase in traffic by her house. Clint stated Juniper Court makes a loop, and the improved road would more likely be used than the road in front of her property.

**Laura Lundquist**, stated her family will be affected by this development, not only in increased traffic, but the aesthetics of the neighborhood will change. She stated she had wanted to purchase the property herself and keep it a horse pasture, but realized if they were getting 11 building lots she wouldn't be able to afford it.

She stated her concern that the developments in Canby were destroying the hometown quality. She expressed a desire to form a conservancy to purchase the property and bequeath it to the City for a park. She questioned once the subdivision is approved if it would allow 2 story homes. She preferred the character of 1 story homes be maintained.

Mr. Brown stated most people who purchase homes are unaware their properties have 2 zoning designations, the existing zoning, and the comprehensive plan designation. Some areas may have single family homes on them, but are zoned high density, which would allow apartments to be built next door to them.

Mr. Brown stated the existing code has the requirements for what is allowed in the R1 zone, setbacks, height restrictions, etc., and 2 story homes are allowed. Ms. Lundquist asked if the property could be rezoned. Clint stated that R1 is the most restrictive of the residential zoning, R1.5 and R2 allow multiple family dwellings. Clint explained there have been community meetings where this issue has been discussed, and it is being looked at as part of the Periodic Review.

Mr. Brown stated that the code is being looked at now, and if citizens are concerned he encouraged them to come to the Planning Commission meetings and let the Commission know what they think. Clint stated developers have control over their subdivisions, and can have approval over every house plan that is built. Mr. Brown encouraged the neighbors to talk to the applicant, and see if some of their concerns could be worked out.

**Don Axmaker**, 146 NE 9<sup>th</sup>, stated his family has enjoyed the horses that have been on the property, and is glad it will be single family homes going in and not an apartment complex. He stated his concern that there is no drainage system for the area, at this time one side of Juniper turns into a lake during heavy rain and believed this development could make the problem worse.

Mr. Brown explained the applicant will be required to put in storm drains, sanitary sewer, and all other utilities, plus curb gutter and sidewalk, which could solve the drainage problem on that street. Mr. Axmaker stated those improvements will only be done on half of the street, and that would direct the water to the neighbors on either side of the development. Mr. Brown explained that a civil engineer will design the system and will be done in conjunction with City staff.

Mr. Axmaker stated there needs to be coordination between Canby Utility and other service providers to prevent one agency from paving the street and another one coming in and tearing it up. Mr. Manley stated that contractor would be required to coordinate with all entities during the construction phase.

Clint stated that is why the church and the applicant are responsible to bond for those improvements, so that when the City is ready to begin the improvements can all be coordinated together. Clint was unsure of the timing, and suggested interested persons could contact Roy Hester, Public Works Supervisor for more information.

Mr. Brown stated there were 19 conditions applied to this application and all must be met prior to construction of this project. Clint explained that once the contractor puts in the services they become the City's responsibility, so it is in the City's best interest to assure the improvements are done correctly.

**Don Crites**, 602 N Juniper Street, suggested relocating the access to the development further to the north, creating a cul-de-sac to minimize the disruption of the neighborhood. He stated this would require larger lot sizes, which would closer match the existing homes.

Mr. Brown asked if the neighborhood wouldn't benefit by having an additional access. Mr. Crites stated it was his impression that the neighbors didn't want an additional connection. Mr. Brown asked what size lots would fit in the neighborhood, Mr. Crites suggested 11,000 square foot lots.

**Mr. Al Frederick**, stated he has lived next to the Duponts for 47 years, and has always known the property would be developed. He stated he was pleased with the plan that the applicant was proposing and glad there was not going to be apartments across the street.

#### **REBUTTAL:**

**Barbara Giddings**, addressed the audience and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. She wished the horse pasture could stay, but believes this development will benefit not



only the community but also benefit people who will enjoy walking the City and using the parks.

Mrs. Giddings stated she would not be opposed to selling the property to a conservancy for a park, and would talk to an appraiser regarding the price. She stated she thought the application was complete and asked if the Commissioners had any questions for her.

Mr. Brown closed the public hearing and opened Commissioner deliberations.

Mrs. Tallman stated the condition in the report that required an landscape planter strip was not appropriate due to there being no other planters strips on that street. Clint stated it was decided by staff and Mr. Hester, that a sidewalk behind the curb was appropriate in this situation. He suggested removing the reference of a planter strip from the conditions.

Mr. Thalhoffer stated based on the criteria for a subdivision, and the current zoning it looked like the application had met all the requirements for approval.

Mr. Sanchez asked if alternative plats had been submitted. Clint stated this was the only plat that was submitted. Mr. Sanchez stated he has a similar situation at his house, where there is a nice pasture with horses, but it is developed on all sides and will be developed in the near future, so he sympathized with the neighbors and thanked all who had attended the meeting.

Mr. Tessman stated he also liked the open spaces, and the feel of living in the country, but there are restrictions on what the Planning Commission can do. He stated one of the issues brought up at the neighborhood meetings was the neighborhood aesthetics, having the new development match existing homes.

Mr. Manley stated he was glad they will be keeping 3 of the large trees located on the property, they will help keep the neighborhood looking nice.

Mr. Brown explained the Planning Commission can only base it's decision on 4 criteria:

- whether the application conforms to the comprehensive plan,
- whether it is in compliance with the local planning ordinances,
- that the overall design and arrangement of lots shall adequately provide building sites and utility easements,
- that the subdivision will have public utilities available for the development.

Mr. Brown explained that the application had met all the above criteria.

Mr. Brown addressed the size of the lots the applicant had proposed, and stated there is no other community in the Metro area where a person can buy an 11,462 square foot building lot. He explained discussions at the neighborhood residential zoning meetings showed this is the type of developments citizens wanted to see in Canby, larger lots with single family homes. He suggested the neighbors talk to the applicant to explain their concerns and to see if things could be worked out.

Mr. Manley moved to approve SUB 01-02 as amended. Seconded by Mr. Thalhoffer. Motion was approved 6-0.

**CPA 01-03/TA 01-01** Continued from 4-23-01, an application by the City of Canby to adopt the Canby Downtown Plan and amendments to sections of the Transportation Systems Plan, the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance to implement the Canby Downtown Plan.

Matilda Deas, Project Planner presented the staff report. She explained the Transportation System Plan would be revised by the addition of a Downtown Street designation, which streets would be given that designation, and the streetscape standards that will apply to them.

Matilda stated there have been minor changes to the verbiage for bicycle parking. Mr. Brown suggested removing the ribbon rack style bicycle rack from the approved list and only allowing the staple style bicycle racks in the downtown area. It was agreed by the Commission to require staple style racks in the downtown area, and not have long term bicycle parking downtown.

Matilda explained the changes to the C1 zone had to do with the percentage of space a residence can occupy on the ground floor, how much frontage allowed, and that the access to the residence would not be allowed through the main entrance to the business.

Mr. Manley stated the wording regarding mixed use is unclear, and sounds as if residential uses are required. Matilda suggested the wording "residential uses shall be permitted only as part of a mixed use development". It was agreed that wording was clearer.

Mr. Brown questioned whether a Doctor or Dental office would be allowed on the street level since the plan stated only retail uses allowed on the street. Matilda agreed that was not what was intended and suggested removing the word retail and replacing it with "as listed".

Matilda stated that to reserve prime parking spaces for customers, the code will encourage parking to the side or rear of the business. There was a discussion regarding private alleys, it was agreed to allow public alleys only.

The Planning Commission agreed Churches should be a conditional use in the downtown area, the transit center should be an allowed use, and to relocate the park and ride area away from the downtown core.

Mr. Manley questioned in what situation the minimum sidewalk width of 11 feet couldn't be achieved. Matilda explained it would be an existing building that would have a problem with a streetscape, not new developments.

Matilda asked if the Commission wanted some wording added stating that awnings are subject to building code regulations. It was agreed that it should be added.

Matilda stated the code would prohibit internally lit, aluminum, box style signs. Mr. Brown suggested the sign issue could become a problem and the code should be more specific regarding what it allows and what it doesn't. Matilda asked the Commission if they wanted specific language for the plan at this time, or were recommending the work to be done for the entire sign code. Mr. Manley suggested the sign code be looked at as part of the Periodic Review process and added as an addendum to the downtown plan. Mrs. Tallman suggested all signs come before the Planning Commission. Matilda explained that clearer language is needed so staff could review sign applications .

The Planning Commission asked if the sign code could prohibit certain things such as neon signs, moving digital signs, etc. Matilda explained that needed to be looked into because there have been some rulings regarding First Amendment rights that affect what the City can and cannot regulate.

There was a discussion regarding at what point traffic studies would be needed. It was decided to keep the requirement at 15 or more units for residential, and at 200 vehicle trips generated for commercial developments.

Matilda explained that she and John Williams had scored three buildings using the new matrix system, the Mangus Building had failed, City Hall and Thriftway had passed. Mr. Brown suggested setting minimums on each section so a developer couldn't fail one section and make it up in another. It was decided applicants would have to score at least sixty five percent of possible points with a minimum of one point scored in each category.

Mr. Brown stated the matrix should represent what the City wants the downtown to become, and then encourage developers to build it. This matrix says the City wants blade signs on a brick building, with flat parapets, display windows, planter boxes and awnings. Matilda added there is also a preferred historic palate for paint colors.

Mr. Brown asked why there is nothing historic required in the code. Matilda explained there is a limited supply of historic buildings in downtown. Design standards were developed during the design workshops that met project criteria. The standards will help unify the look of the downtown.

Mr. Brown stated there needed to be a way to decline projects for aesthetic reasons. Matilda explained it is very difficult to create standards so specific that you always get exactly what you want. She explained the stakeholders had not wanted to have one specific time period overlaid on the downtown since there is not an established style to recreate. Money is better spent on focusing on an image for downtown and creating a pedestrian friendly environment.

Mr. Tessman stated if it is too restrictive, it might discourage potential businesses from relocating in the downtown area. Mr. Brown agreed that you cannot impose an aesthetic that the community is not willing to accept. Mr. Brown suggested for downtown design reviews, the Planning Commission would be the hearing body and request comments from Canby Business Revitalization, the Downtown Business Association, and the Chamber of Commerce. Matilda

stated she believed there had been some discussions regarding doing that, and that the task force had not made that recommendation. She would revisit the task force discussion on that matter to clarify their position. The design matrix would technically accomplish architectural compliance with the design standards.

Matilda stated that as the downtown develops and they find out what works and what doesn't the code could be amended to facilitate those changes. Mr. Manley agreed that this process will take time, and that changes could be fast tracked with the City Council if it becomes necessary.

Mr. Tessman asked if the building heights would have to be changed to allow for 3 story buildings. Matilda stated that 45' height could possibly accommodate 4 story buildings.

Mr. Sanchez questioned the parking matrix, it looked like an applicant could be penalized twice for having parking in the front, and not having off street parking.

Mr. Manley stated there is only one item in the parking section of the matrix, if there was a situation where the applicant had no options for off street parking they would not be able to pass the matrix. There was a discussion on how to create a mechanism that would allow an applicant to pass the matrix if there were no options available for off street parking. It was decided that staff would look into rewording the matrix.

The Planning Commission discussed the recommended public projects. Mr. Brown proposed that there should be treatments at the intersections on South Elm, Grant, and Ivy Streets on S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue such as the proposed treatments in the downtown core. It was agreed by the Planning Commission to include S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue for future streetscape improvements, but it would be a low priority for implementation.. Bureau

Mr. Manley suggested the intersections on Hwy 99E be more clearly marked. Clint stated that issue was being addressed because new signs were being installed on Hwy 99E today.

There was a discussion regarding the landmark building in the railroad property. Matilda stated that as soon as the City can come up with the funds, the railroad would sell the property. She added the price has been estimated at \$4.00 a square foot, which figures out about \$390,000, which is down from the first estimate of \$600,000. Matilda stated this is not an official appraisal, but the official appraisal should be received from the railroad soon.

**Mr. Finden**, CBR President, asked if he could address the Commission. He complimented the efforts of the Planning Commission, Matilda, and her staff on this long process, and appreciated the comments that the Planning Commission had for the matrix. He explained this has been a very public process and that creating a certain style or establishing a certain era had been discussed but a target era could not be found as Canby doesn't fit one certain time era. He explained that there have been many discussions regarding what to do with South 2<sup>nd</sup>, there are a lot of issues involved in making those decisions. Mr. Finden believed it should be decided as a community based on how Hwy 99E is impacting traffic and travel on S.

2<sup>nd</sup> St.

Mrs. Tallman moved to recommend approval of the Downtown Plan to the City Council as amended. Seconded by Mr. Thalsofer. Motion carried 6-0.

## **VII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Clint stated the City Council will be discussing the SDC fee increases at their next meeting.

It was decided to discuss the Public Notice formats at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Clint announced that John Williams and his wife had a new baby girl named Celeste Rose.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**