

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

JUNE 10, 2004

7 p.m. Regular Meeting
Newberg Public Safety Building
401 E. Third Street

APPROVED AT THE JULY 8, 2004 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

Dwayne Brittell
Dennis Schmitz
Nick Tri

Louis Larson
Richard Van Noord
Mattson Haug

Absent: Phillip Smith

II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Van Noord called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR (items are considered routine and are not discussed unless requested by the commissioners)

1. Approval of May 13, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Tri/Brittell to approval of May 13, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR (5 minute maximum per person)

None.

V. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS (complete registration form to give testimony - 5 minute maximum per person, unless otherwise set by majority motion of the Planning Commission). No new public hearings after 10 p.m. except by majority vote of the Planning Commissioners.

1. **APPLICANT:** Doug Horst
REQUEST: Annexation of .55 Acres
LOCATION: 3612 N. College St.
TAX LOT: 3207AD-00900
FILE NO.: ANX-32-04
CRITERIA: NDC § 151.262

RESOLUTION NO.: 2004-185

Chair Van Noord read ORS 197.763 into the record and called for objections to jurisdictions, ex parte contact or conflict of interest. There were none.

Planning Manager Barton Brierley and Mr. Steve Olson Assistant Planner presented the staff report. Mr. Olson referenced Exhibit B (Where College Street turns into Hillsboro Highway). The site is relatively flat and right before the hill starts rising. Basically it is County property surrounded by the City. It is in the NW Newberg Specific Plan area, which has some modified development standards and a coordinated transportation plan. The previous owners chose to not annex their property at the time the specific plan was created, however, so the development plan had to work around this property. The property is within the UGB, and is covered by the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is requesting annexation of 0.55 acres. The zone would change from AF-10 to R-2/SP and be withdrawn from the Newberg Rural Fire Protection District. The R-2/SP zone is appropriate for the MDR-SP (medium density residential) comprehensive plan designation. The applicant intends to develop a 4-lot subdivision. Mr. Olson presented an aerial photo overhead showing the development around the city. The Comprehensive Plan Map shows that the area is MDR (medium density residential). This site is just a sliver of County AF-10 in the city, and is nearly an island. There are a

few other slivers of County property nearby which are islands. If this site is annexed then the developer will save the existing house, add a new garage, and subdivide the property to create three more lots. The access to College Street will be closed off, and all lots would take access from Hilltop Drive. There would be a half street improvement along Alexandra Drive.

Some of the Goals of the NW Newberg Specific Plan:

1. Primarily single family homes
2. Pedestrian friendly transportation plan
3. Coordinated street improvements

This application meets these goals.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval for the July 19, 2004 City Council meeting. The applicant intends to place the annexation on the November ballot. If approved by the voters, the applicant would apply for a subdivision application. The site is in the UGB and is contiguous with the surrounding area. It is within the city limits and will have adequate services within 3 years (sanitary sewer and water). There will be a condition that they decommission the septic tank and make a new sewer connection for the existing house within 90 days. The other lots will also connect to water and sewer at the time of development. No new roads are required - they will be conditioned to finish the half street improvement on Alexandra, close access off College, and extend the sidewalks. Closing the access on College will improve traffic safety. Police, Fire and School capacities are adequate for the increased demand. The additional students will get additional per student funding. For parks, the new development will add to the tax base and pay Parks SDCs. The application meets the criteria for annexation, fulfills goals of NW Newberg Specific Plan, and does improve traffic and pedestrian safety.

Commissioner Haug said he agrees with findings except:

1. The sidewalks along Hillsboro Highway, Alexandra, and Hilltop raise questions. Do the lot lines exist (Mr. Olson said they were conceptual). The applicant will be required to show lot lines and exact sidewalk designs at the time of the subdivision.

Commissioner Brittell asked about the sidewalks continuing around Hilltop Drive around the corner - do they curve along the curve of the right-of-way? Mr. Olson said it does not appear so.

Commissioner Larson asked about the size of the lots. Mr. Olson said minimum lot area is 5,000 sq. ft and there is 23,000 sq. feet on the site. There is room for 4 lots that are slightly over 5,000 square feet.

Mr. Doug Horst, 3214 NE Fremont Street, Portland, Oregon 97212, owner/applicant of the property said he was available to answer questions.

Commissioner Haug asked about adding a condition about the transition from one neighborhood to the next. It appears to be an abrupt 90 degree angle - he would prefer more of a smoother sidewalk. Mr. Horst said that he would not have a problem with it.

Mr. Olson said staff recommends approval and adoption of Resolution No. 2004-185 approving the annexation subject to the conditions previously mentioned.

Chair Van Noord closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Tri/Brittell to approve Resolution No. 2004-185. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried.

MOTION: Haug/Schmit - to add Condition #4 - at the time of development, staff will ensure smooth continuity of sidewalk, for aesthetic and safety reasons. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried

Mr. Brierley said that it would be referred to the City Council for the July 19, 2004 meeting.

2. **APPLICANT:** MJG Development Inc.
REQUEST: Annexation of 20.58 Acres
LOCATION: Fernwood Road
TAX LOT: 3221-4300,4301,4390,4400
FILE NO.: ANX-33-04
CRITERIA: NDC § 151.262

RESOLUTION NO.: 2004-184

Chair Van Noord noted that he previously read ORS 197.763 into the record at the previous meeting and asked if there was any objection. He called for objections to jurisdictions, ex parte contact or conflict of interest. There were none.

Mr. Barton Brierley said the property is along Fernwood Drive, in the eastern part of the City - Fred Meyer and Brutscher Road, Corral Creek Road and Fernwood Road. The current City limits is shown in red on the map. The current UGB is shown in green - the properties are within the UGB. The map shows the surroundings - an approved 9 hole golf course, and the City Council has approved an UGB amendment for an 18 hole golf course to the south of Fernwood Road. The aerial photo of the property reflects two homes on the property, the bulk of the property is undeveloped. The property was brought into the UGB through the County and Council approval several months ago. One important feature is its relationship to the 235 lot subdivision to the north, shown on the map. This subdivision is called the Greens at Springbrook. It surrounds a 9-hole golf course, and will be under construction soon (Phase 1). When the City did the Springbrook Oaks Specific Plan, the property really depended upon access through other property to get to Fernwood Road. In fact, the subdivision required an easement to be dedicated through the property and a County CUP to be allowed because it is outside the City limits - they have been approved. The subdivision of this property would fit nicely in the subdivision of The Greens and would be owned by the same parties and developed by the same parties. It would accommodate 50 lots, more or less, roughly the number of lots that can be constructed on the property. As part of this development, The Greens will extend sewer and water lines to the area that will be available to serve the newly annexed area. In addition, a condition is the improvement of Fernwood Road and the stream crossing. The stream crossing area is narrow and is a hazardous situation. The developer will be replacing the culvert and improving the road and providing sidewalks to the entrance. The site is contiguous and inside the UGB and the site complies with the comprehensive plan designation (LDR - SP designation - allows a 5,000 minimum lot size but an 10,000 average size (flexibility in the designs of the lots). The proposal also complies with an adequate level of urban services: the roads are of adequate designs, the other services are available, and it will improve the level of police and fire service. The request does meet the criteria and staff recommends approval of the annexation.

Commissioner Haug said the sidewalk on Fernwood road would not be extended - what about the sidewalk from Lot 13 to the end? Mr. Brierley said the Springbrook Oaks Specific Plan and the sidewalk end at the same point because that is where the UGB ends. That sidewalk would be brought up to the entrance road but would not be extended beyond that. Discussion was held concerning pedestrians walking on Fernwood Road - the property is partially in the City and partially in the County. Discussion was held concerning the annexation including sidewalks up to the corner. Mr. Brierley said at some point Fernwood Road dips away from the property and turns south, so the sidewalk cannot be extended all the way to the corner of the property.

Mr. Brierley said they were concerned about pedestrian access and a condition of approval of The Greens is that they will be creating a pedestrian access to Corral Creek Road. There will also be pedestrian access through The Greens and a trail through the golf course, which will hook up to the trail system. Discussion was held concerning expansion to the east. Commission Haug said he was concerned about similar expansion off Wilsonville Road and how would it be handled? Mr. Brierley said the property to the east is not within the Urban Reserve Area (URA) and was not planned for future expansion. The Planning Commission could require sidewalks all along the annexation. Commissioner Haug said that citizens have noted and complained about the lack of sidewalks in other areas.

Commissioner Schmitz said once approved, are we approving the use of the land (subdivision). Mr. Brierley said they are approving the annexation and the zoning - but not the conditions of the sidewalks, etc. and would be picked up at the next phase of the application.

Mike Gougler, MJG Development, 5241 Windsor Terrace, West Linn, Oregon 97068 (applicant). Said that they appeared before the Planning Commission in 1999 and he made it a point at the time of development that they proceed immediately with the annexation to make sure Fernwood Road is within the City along with the property that is subject to the proposal. Sidewalks - they are planning to place a sidewalk to the curb where it dips back into the county, which is as far as they can extend the sidewalk. There is a road that serves the neighborhood that goes to the eastern border of the property such that when and if the property to the east is annexed, there would be a sidewalk that will dead-end to Mr. Beckwith's property without having to go around the serpentine curve. There may be other developers as conscientious as they are - but there is no one better. The other part to bring out - they made arrangement for crossing along the stream corridors and designed the golf course and open area parkway far in excess of the development standards. The paths would be through wetlands and would be on 10 foot wooden walkways that provide safe passage for golf carts and pedestrians. The purpose of the annexation is to make sure they can do a comprehensive development - the development to the north can make use of underground utilities, and share the open spaces and driveways. The utilities are designed so that when the properties to the east are annexed - they would have access without having to go down further to Fernwood Road.

Commissioner Haug said that he has concerns that people will want to walk down Fernwood Road. Discussion was held concerning the pathways. Mr Gougler said they will have a sidewalk to the edge of the City to the point where Fernwood Road leaves the edge of the property and goes southeast. That road section is never going to be acceptable without a great deal of work. That part of land is solid rock and would require major engineering to accommodate a

sidewalk - better for east/west connectivity. Commissioner Haug said that along Hesscreek Court - under the trestle - there is a walkway - he was concerned that if someone happened to be on the roadway - the proposed issue would be a safety problems. Mr. Gougler said that would be a problem for the County, since all the road east of the site is within the County.

Commissioner Schmitz asked about the connectivity to the two golf courses. Mr. Gougler said there was no intent to separate the two. Under the development, there will be additional parking and staging facilities for golfing at both ends. Discussion was held concerning the design of the connectivity for golf courses and pedestrians, likely under Fernwood Road.

Harry and Loretta Bestwick, 30575 NE Fernwood Road, Newberg, is a property owner adjoining and has a problem with the southeast corner. The survey that the developer did shows the corner is on a driveway - which shows a temporary or approximate corner. He said a permanent corner should be established.

Mr. Bestwick said the survey marker needs to be established (it is presently on the roadway that services his barn). Mr. Bestwick said the fence was at the edge of the cavity where the gravel pit was. He put the fence at the same place and they have a conflict where the property line is. The issue is that there is a question where the property line lies, where the fence is, and if that established a new property line.

Mr. Gougler said that Mr. Bestwick said the location shows the southeast corner (that spit of land is rock) and at one time the left elbow of the driveway was dug out to build the road. The survey corner was taken out. The surveyors set another point where that line was. At the time the gravel pit was in use, the fence was moved along the western edge of the gravel pit and went on to the property of Mr. Werth. As it was, Mr. Bestwick re-fenced it on the old property line. The fence was moved to accommodate a physical feature of the property and no objection was taken to the taking of the land because it did not have any farming value. Since the survey was done, Mr. Bestwick is concerned. The pin was resurveyed by Alpha and is probably within 3 inches of where the corner should be. He talked with Mr. Bestwick about some solutions, which he is considering. The application is for annexation of Tax Lot 4300 and not a specific surveyed property line. Discussion was held concerning how long the fence had been there. Mr. Bestwick said it has been about 50 years.

Commissioner Haug said he knows someone that has moved a fence onto another's property and at some time, the fence becomes the property line. Mr. Gougler discussed Mr. Bestwick's situation, and assisting him with other solutions rather than going through adverse possession proceedings. He will identify the corner and placed a white mark in the corner (in Mr. Bestwick's driveway - to where the accurate property line is). Mr. Gougler said that determining the property line corner is not a Planning Commission decision and the property owners can do lot line adjustments. It is not a feature that would affect in any way a request for annexation.

Mr. Brierley said that on the property line issue, he had a good chat with Mr. Bestwick today and it is not unusual, especially in an area that has been rural up until now - whether it be part of the City - for fences, driveways, etc. to go over property lines. It is not an atypical situation and can be resolved in a number of ways - work with each other and resolve the matter without having to go to court - the annexation of the property does not prejudice Mr. Bestwick's property rights. He still owns the same property and any claims, and can still work the property and has the ability to resolve the issue one way or another. The applicant meets the approval criteria, and requests that the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Council for annexation.

Commissioner Haug asked if the corner of the property is or is not in the city. Mr. Brierley said it is a discrepancy in the deed and the proposal is to annex where the deed shows. The deed is the Werth property and if a slim portion is acquired due to adverse possession then the portion could be out of the property. Mr. Horst's property previously had the same situation (prior boundary dispute with the property owner to the north).

Discussion was held concerning taxation by the City for whatever property would be inside the City.

Chair Van Noord closed the public hearing. Commissioner Haug said he is comfortable with going forward and is convinced that the boundary issue will be resolved. Commissioner Schmitz said the parties seem to be working together toward an amicable solution. It is not an issue for the Planning Commission.

MOTION: Haug/Tri to approve Resolution No. 2004-184. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried.

Mr. Brierley said it would go to the City Council at the July 19, 2004 (de novo hearing).

VII. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items

Mr. Brierley introduced Dawn Nelson, who will be starting next month taking the minutes. She will also be doing the City Council meetings.

Discussion was held concerning the recording/technology of the meetings.

Mr. Brierley said on May 17th - the Council approved the Grahn annexation on Springbrook Road, to be voted on at the November election. At the June 21st meeting the Council will be presented with the N.Main/Harrison annexation, and the July 19th meeting will have the two annexations discussed today up for approval.

Mr. Brierley said there was a training opportunity available for the land use planning: beyond basics course. The City has formed an ad hoc committee on the City's future and has a charge to make a recommendation to the City Council on what to do with their UGB, URA and any changes in the zoning within the City - to meet over a year's time and making some determinations and then ultimately making recommendations. The Council will then make decisions and schedule hearings before the Planning Commission (first step in the process of changes). The ad hoc committee will continue to meet over the next 9 months. The next meeting is June 17th 5-7:00 p.m.. They will be doing a larger public open house in August, which would be an appropriate time for the Commission to attend. Discussion was held concerning the qualifications of the committee members (none are professionals). The appointments were made for a broad range of individuals: there was the Lewis & Clark property to be brought in, which had some people concerned, a GFU rep., a land use person, several citizens, and a representative of the Austin family who owns quite a bit of property (total of 11 people). The urban reserve study is going to continue. Mr. Brierley said there are less than 5 communities in the state that still have URA's that have not been brought into the UGB. Who feeds the committee information regarding the economics and transportation issues and in what direction are they to grow? Mr. Brierley said there is a consultant hired (Johnson Gardner) to help and another consultant from PSU. So far they have received future population growth projections, land needs, and they are working with the Park and School Districts to gather information on their needs. This coming budget year they hope to continue that and to do the next phase of that.

Mr. Brierley said that in the July 8th meeting - there is a joint meeting with the City Council to discuss proposed policies and code amendments regarding the protection of the bypass interchanges along the southern alignment (Hwy 219 and Hwy 99W). Throughout the bypass process, there is a lot of concern about the land uses around the interchanges. The state and others are concerned that those land uses not compromise the functioning of the bypass. The state has proposed some policies to deal with the areas, which will be presented at the July 8th meeting. Commissioner Haug said that he will not be attending the July 8th meeting.

Commissioner Brittell said that in regard to the transportation plan update and the northern bypass plan - is there something in the Planning Commission's packets showing the recommendations of the studies. The Transportation System Plan Update - first draft is being reviewed and hearings are scheduled for late summer and early fall. Discussion was held concerning responding to the state during those interchange points in connection with the Transportation Plan. The discussion on July 8th will be reviewing land uses in the area and not preclude more transportation planning. Mr. Brierley said the draft will not be available at the July 8th meeting.

Commissioner Schmitz said it makes sense to study the interchanges (heart of the process) and he has a piece of property in the middle of one of those. He had a person that is interested in the property and asked him if the bypass planning would stop the development. He said he did not have the answer. It seems they would be key places for the right of way purchases and first placement for interchanges. What is the state's planning and what are their next steps. Mr. Brierley said the State has no designs on stopping development. They are trying to get funding for strategic right-of-way purchases. Estimated time for the bypass - Mr. Brierley said in 8-10 years it could be constructed, and right of way purchases could happen between 2-8 years.

A Commissioner asked if they change the development rules - is that a taking that State would have to pay the owner? Mr. Brierley said the State is trying to avoid taking property and limiting development. Mr. Brierley said they have done some design workshops, and it will be discussed at the July 8th meeting.

Commissioner Brittell said that he has attended those meetings and he assumes that Kittelson and the State of Oregon have a good handle on the Hwy 219 interchange. Commissioner Haug said ODOT has no plans to redesign Hwy 219 and they would have to do a Crestview extension and he is not sure how it will come out. Mr. Brierley said that if the Planning Commission wants to go that route they could pursue it. Discussion was held concerning the need to adhere to the comprehensive plan unless updated. Commissioner Haug said they will have to demonstrate support for improvements to the public officials. Commissioner Brittell said that it has been done through the comprehensive plan. Mr. Brierley said the State will coordinate with local planning. The Planning Commission and the City Council can coordinate and work through issues. Discussion was held concerning upholding the governance of the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to the planning issue in terms of the re-routing of Hwy 219. There are several conditions and Commissioner Brittell asked that they be brought to the attention of the Council at the July 8th meeting. The Crestview and Northern arterial is a major transportation avenue concerning the northern route to the Hwy (99w). He is not sure how people are going to drain off from the north to go onto the bypass. Mr. Brittell said that it would be an appropriate discussion to have at the hearing. He said that he would reserve further comments till that discussion.

Mr. Brierley reviewed the changes in the meeting schedules:

July 8th - joint meeting with the City Council and the State to make their presentation and hear from the citizens. Separate Planning Commission special meeting in July (July 29th) or they could do it on a Tuesday or Wednesday (20th or 28th). Discussion was held concerning conflicts. Wednesday the 28th was settled on. Commissioner Haug said he would like to see the meeting minutes for the July 8th meeting available as he will be not attending. August 8th - Chair Van Noord will not be attending.

Chair Van Noord addressed issues involving the cell tower situation. Commissioner Haug said that it is an indicator that some of the rules are aggravating to citizens - too close to residential areas and not enough set back. If you look around, there is adequate space available elsewhere which would not cause problems for surrounding residents. Discussion was held concerning other available property. Mr. Brierley addressed other models and provided copies of other models (Eugene) - he said it is not radically different from Newberg's - put up tower, provide ability to co-locate (another antenna's to limit other towers, that other companies can use). Newberg is pretty close to the right track on the ordinance as a whole to address the specific issue.

Commissioner Schmitz said the recommendation that is popular now is to modify the land use to exclude cell towers within a certain area. It seems that we can get to work on that. Discussion was held concerning setbacks. It could be a conditional or approved use and adjustments to the code can be useful in helping to benefit the community. The Planning Commission heard the matter because it was appealed, not because it was a design review. Discussion was held concerning the details of approval. A community group could file a petition to not allow cell towers. Discussion was held concerning how to pro-actively fix problems. Commissioner Brittell said that there are problems with the Code being consistent and if the staff feels they need to be changed, the ordinance needs to be amended. To walk away would not be appropriate. Commissioner Haug said that if they want to proceed they need to have the Council follow up on the recommendation.

Commissioner Brittell asked about when changes to the Code had been made over the past 5 years. Discussion was held concerning making changes (about 20 or so and prioritizing). Chair Van Noord said that he would like to see the list of the issues, as the cell tower is an important local issue. Mr. Brierley said the cell tower did not get appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Discussion was held concerning processing code changes that are not related and could result in a significant delay. He thinks it is important to not further delay.

Commissioner Larson said he does not disagree with the comments, but noted that he does not want to set a pattern personally that every time that people oppose what is going on that the Planning Commission has an immediate action rather than have a pattern of regular updates to the code. He would suggest that philosophically a one time event did not have to cause a change in the development code.

Chair Van Noord said that an immediate action would not be appropriate. However, the cell tower issue has been an issue for some time. Commissioner Larson said there has been only one meeting that has shown discourse, they had one hearing and some objections.

Commissioner Haug said that there are issues relating to physical structures being constructed permanently. He thinks that the matter needs to be cleaned up and resolved because of the strong feeling in the community for larger setbacks. Discussion was held concerning allowing preventive measures. Commissioner Haug said he was on the Commission at the time the cell tower situation was discussed through the Development Code. Commissioner Larson said that if every time we get people that object, that within a short period of time we change it, he was not sure if that was a good idea.

Chair Van Noord and Commissioner Larson discussed willingness to agree to getting something started for the changes. The issue is going to be distances and how far from a residential area should a 100 foot cell tower be allowed (500 feet, 1 mile, etc.). Discussion was held concerning deliberation and consideration of making it conditional with some criteria. Commissioner Larson said he would like some sense of what a business factor could be. Discussion was held concerning listening to the community, doing some studies on it and then initiate approval from the City Council to review those issues.

Commissioner Brittell said that a knee-jerk reaction is appropriate if the matter was one of public safety, but that this was an aesthetic decision. It is not that kind of concern. There are so many things in that neighborhood other than the cell tower. There were objections raised concerning health concerns which have not been proven. Commissioner Haug said that setbacks are an issue. It is a livability issue and he was in favor of addressing it now for a process for Council approval, staff review, public hearings and set for the Planning Commission (pro-actively following up on the issues raised).

Commissioner Schmitz said that he is in agreement in trying to find public input (primary agenda of getting the public involved). He is not sure if the Commission has the answers - it has to do with the setbacks, where it is and whether or not it is a conditional use. They can get a couple of hearings with public involvement and come tell us why and how and where and get involved -it is the public's responsibility to help make the change.

MOTION: Haug/Schmitz to ask Barton to ask City Council if they can proceed with public input and hearings whether adjustments to the cell tower program needs to be made. (6 yes/1 Absent) - Motion carried.

Commissioner Brittell asked about amending the Motion to include other code issues. Discussion was held concerning the specifics of the cell tower only - separate from that would be reviewing all issues and prioritizing the revisions. There are other pressing issues (Hwy 219 interchange - much higher priority than the setback for cell towers).

AMENDMENT Brittell/to prioritize the other ordinance changes/amendments and handle more than one at a time.
MOTION failed for lack of second.

Mr. Brierley said that the type of changes discussed are not difficult to draft or go through the process. Commissioner Haug said the Commission has to have a passion to resolve the issues. Mr. Brierley said it may take 1-2 meetings and then go on to the City Council meeting (next available agenda) and get out to the public.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: (5 Yes/1 No [Brittell]/1 Absent [Smith]).

MOTION: Brittell/Schmitz to get the list at the next meeting (20 or so things) to address the issues and then determine when to get them resolved.

Commissioner Haug said that in the past the Commission did take time later in the year to review code changes/issues in a workshop. Commissioner Brittell said that rather than one item, the Council may decide that they can talk about 5 or so items and he would like to prioritize them. He wants to be more specific in other ordinance requirement changes.

Commissioner Haug said that prioritizing all the possible issues in front and where they want to go - Commissioner Brittell said not to prioritize planning goals, but the changes to be addressed. Mr. Brierley said he can make a mailing separate from the joint meeting. Discussion was held concerning gathering a consensus prior to the joint meeting with the Council and keep the meeting to the task. Commissioner Brittell said that he would like to have the council and commission review the priorities of the revisions. Commissioner Haug said the July 8th meeting is transportation/bypass.

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence
3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: July 8, 2004

MOTION: Chair Van Noord adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried.

VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

MOTION: to approve. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried.

IX. ADJOURN

MOTION: to approve. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Smith]. Motion carried.

Approved by the Planning Commission this 8 day of July, 2004.

5 AYES:

0 NO:


2 ABSENT: Haug
(List Name(s)): Van Noord

ABSTAIN:
(List Name(s)):

A Test:

Philip D Smith

Z:\PLAN\PC-Min\2004MIN\PC 061004min

 Sam A. Nelson
Planning Recording Secretary

Dawn A. Nelson 7/8/04
Name Date

