



City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Stewart Senior/Community Center
855 N. Sherwood Boulevard
September 17, 2002
Regular Meeting -7:00 PM

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
2. **Consent Agenda – September 3, 2002 PC Minutes**
3. **Agenda Review**
4. **Community Comments** *are limited to items NOT on the printed Agenda.*
5. **Public Hearings:** (Commissioners declare conflict of interest, ex-parte contact, or personal bias) **Public Hearings** before the City Council and other Boards and Commissions shall follow the procedure identified in Resolution 98-743, adopted June 9, 1998 (copies available on table):
 - A. **PA 01-06 Changes to Use Designations Plan Text Amendments:** to Part 3, Zoning & Community Development Code, Chapter 2, Section 2.109 Retail Commercial, 2.109.06 Community Design, 2.110 General Commercial, 2.110.06 Community Design, 2.111 Light Industrial, 2.112 General Industrial. Churches as a permitted and conditional use in commercial and industrial zones; chemical production as permitted use in GI zone; recreation facilities as a permitted use in the LI zone; and define allowed mixed uses in commercial zones.
(Dave Wechner, Planning Director)
6. **New Business**
 - A. **Report from Council Liaison**
7. **Adjourn**

**ITEMS NOT COMPLETED BY 11:00 PM WILL BE CONTINUED
TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING**

APPROVED MINUTES

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes
September 17, 2002

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Adrian Emery called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Commission Members present:

Patrick Allen
Adrian Emery
Kevin Henry
Jean Lafayette
Lee Weislogel

Staff:

Dave Wechner, Planning Director
Roxanne Gibbons, Recording Secretary

Commission Members absent:

Ken Shannon
Bill Whiteman

2. Consent Agenda – September 3, 2002 PC Minutes

Chair Emery asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. There were no changes to the minutes.

Patrick Allen moved the Planning Commission accept the September 3, 2002 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented. Seconded by Lee Weislogel.

Vote for Passage of Motion: 4-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain (Henry)

3. Agenda Review

Chair Emery announced that Council President Keith Mays was in attendance to address the Commission. The Commission agreed to hear Mr. Mays prior to opening the scheduled public hearing.

Mr. Mays thanked the Commission for asking him to attend the meeting. Kevin Henry and Jean Lafayette attended the City Council meeting last week and heard the Council continue two plan text amendments that were recommended for approval by the Commission to the November 26, 2002 Council meeting. He could not speak for the Mayor regarding his e-mail.

Mr. Mays wanted the Commission to know that he appreciates all of the work they do. He had concerns with some elements of the two plan text amendments. He thought it would be in the best interest of all parties to schedule a joint Council and Commission work session to discuss the contents of these amendments as well as any other issues and/or goals the Commission may have. A tentative date for this work session would be October 29, 2002.

The Commission members in attendance agreed to October 29, 2002 date. It was noted that Jean Lafayette will be out of town. They would like to start at 7:00 PM. The Council will be polled for acceptance of the date and time for the work session.

Mr. Allen asked what happened to the process the Council and Commission had previously agreed to that if there were complex issues there would be a Council study session prior to their meeting that Commission members could attend to discuss issues that are raised.

Mr. Mays said they talked about going in that direction, but in this case it was not done. However, it is good for Mr. Allen to bring this up again. He thought a joint work session would be appropriate.

Mr. Allen said he did not have a problem with holding a work session. The Commission inserted some text that may have overreached somewhat, but on the point of principle he thought the Commission was correct. He did not react favorably after reading the Mayor's e-mail or his comments.

Mr. Henry said if the Mayor is unable to attend the October meeting, maybe he would want to speak to the Commission at a future meeting.

Mr. Mays reiterated that he was aware of the Commission work program and knew they were working on the two plan text amendments. There were more items in the final product than he expected.

Mr. Wechner asked the Commission to send him a list of specific topics for the work session from which an agenda could be prepared.

Mr. Mays said he wanted to convey to the Commission that the work they do is very important and he hoped that there would not be any on-going negative feelings.

4. Community Comments

There were no community comments.

5. Public Hearings

Patrick Allen read the hearings disclosure statement and asked that Commission members reveal any conflicts of interest, ex-parte contact or bias.

There were no Commissioner disclosures.

5A. PA 01-06 Changes to Use Designations Plan Text Amendments

Chair Emery opened the public hearing on PA 01-06 and called for the Staff Report. Dave Wechner referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated September 17, 2002, a complete copy of which is contained in the City Planning files. He noted:

- Several issues regarding “permitted uses” in certain zoning districts have occurred through communication with local businesses and property owners and the Commission over the last year. The main focus of these requests has been in the industrial and commercial zones.
- The Commission held several work sessions and narrowed it down to the issues they wanted to address in a work program through the plan text amendment process.
- The Commission agreed that it would be timely to review the following issues first:
 - Churches as a permitted use in Commercial or Industrial zones.
 - Chemical production as a conditional use in the General Industrial zone.
 - Recreation facilities as a permitted use in the Light Industrial zone.
 - Defining allowed Mixed-Uses in the Commercial zones.
- The Commission agreed that the tables of uses for all of the zones would be created at a later date.
- The Staff Report contains references to planning designation objectives and the purpose of some of the zoning districts. The policies of the Comprehensive Plan are also cited in the report.
- An analysis of the objectives of the commercial and industrial zones begins on page 6 of the Staff report.
- The Commission heard both sides of the issues during their work sessions. Several interested parties were in attendance at these work sessions.
- He referred the Commission to two additional exhibits:
 - September 16, 2002 letter from Jerry Lindsey, Pastor of the Timberline Baptist Church.
 - “White Paper” on industrial lands policies prepared by Brenda Bernards, Metro. Metro asked that the Commission review this paper as a part of this hearing.
- Specific code language has been included in the draft text amendments. However, the Staff report does not have a specific recommendation of approval or denial of the proposed amendments.

Ms. Lafayette asked if Metro had prepared a map that shows the regionally significant industrial areas.

Mr. Wechner responded that Metro has a map that includes some of these concepts, but it has not yet been adopted. This would be part of Title 4 compliance with the Functional Plan.

Chair Emery called for proponent testimony.

Bob Code and Joe Price, Cascade Columbia, 14200 SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Mr. Price is the on-site manager at the Sherwood facility. Mr. Code’s home address is in Seattle, Washington. Mr. Code noted:

- The Cascade Columbia site plan was approved in 1994-95. Two years after they spent several million dollars to build the facility, the City changed the zoning for their particular use from permitted to non-conforming or prohibited.
- They are a proponent to change the zoning for their business back to either a permitted or conditional use.

- They need to be able to make changes to their business in the future. It would be very difficult for them to address safety issues, to grow and change with business conditions when they are a non-conforming use in the existing zoning district.
- A business must be able to change in order to follow its customer base. Not being able to change anything on their site because they are a non-conforming use unduly restricts them, and in some cases, would preclude them from making safety improvements to their facility.
- He referred the Commission to a report dated September 16, 2002 which he had prepared.
- A chemical facility in today's environment does not operate by itself. It has a number of different regulatory authorities which allows the community to feel more comfortable that the business is following the rules. The report includes a list of these regulatory agencies.
- Their site plan approval included a number of conditions that had to be met. He thought there were 30 conditions. At that time, these conditions exceeded both the fire code and building code requirements for their type of business.
- They have a more up-to-date and environmentally friendly facility than any comparable facility in the area.
- They built the facility with the cooperation of the City Planning Department.
- The zoning definitions include several classifications of chemical businesses. One is chemical manufacturing and another is chemical compounding. There is also chemical storage and handling. They tried to define what those different categories mean to them as a chemical business.
- Chemical manufacturing is when you mix two raw ingredients together and end up with a different chemical than what you started with. Compounding is where you mix something together and the chemicals that are mixed together are still the same chemicals, but together they work and do a certain function. The hand-out lists several examples.
- Another issue is safety. They know that one of the Commission's primary functions when looking at different industrial users would be what is safe and what would the community consider a compatible use to be located in the proximity of residential areas. The report identifies what Cascade Columbia does to be safe and what they are required to do.
- They are a member of the National Association of Chemical Distributors (NACD). The NACD has a very high level of expectations for their members. The report included information on the *Guiding Principles* and *Code of Management Practice*.
- The fourth section discusses economic impact. They started with three employees when they moved to Sherwood. They now have 35 employees and it has only been seven years. They have never laid anyone off and their business prospects look promising.
- The report includes a list of different companies that they sell to. Almost every industrial company in this area uses chemicals in some way or another. Cascade Columbia services all of these people, from food manufacturers to the Boeing plant in Portland.
- They are a necessary business for manufacturers to exist and to grow and succeed.
- They would like the Commission to know that they are trying very hard, they believe that they have a very safe operation and they do not think their type of business is anything to worry about.
- They have a good record in Sherwood and they would like to be reclassified to a use that would allow them to make changes to their facility.

Mr. Price said he is the local manager of Cascade Columbia and would be the local contact.

Mr. Code noted that the City of Tualatin Development Code classifies their type of business (chemical storage, distribution and some manufacturing) as a permitted use. The Tualatin zoning code is fairly consistent. Cascade Columbia is located just a few hundred feet away from where they would be a permitted use in Tualatin. This seems grossly unfair.

Chair Emery asked Mr. Code if they were looking at the compounding aspect for expansion of their business.

Mr. Code said there is some mixing in their business as well as storage. There is some dissolution which is also considered mixing. It is conceivable that they could do some simple manufacturing. There are different levels of manufacturing. The Commission may not want to preclude manufacturing because if the City ever wants to attract a bio-tech company, they would be excluded if chemical manufacturing was not an allowed use.

Chair Emery noted that they have an annual DEQ inspection. He asked what type of monitoring they do at their facility with regard to leak detection or spill containment.

Mr. Price said with regard to spill containment, when the facility was designed, it was designed so that each building is a containment area in and of itself. Everything is sloped down. If there is a spill within a building the sprinkler system has a large containment capacity. They also have a one-half million gallon retention pond on-site. They capture all of the rainwater on-site that goes into the pond where it is checked, analyzed and then discharged into the wetlands as normal rainwater. None of the water on-site leaves unless they allow it to leave. They have a number of different regulatory agencies who supervise them. The Tualatin Valley Fire District and Clean Water Services are two of these agencies.

Ms. Lafayette said there is a lot of area between permitted and prohibited uses in the Code. There are different levels of manufacturing and a difference between compounding and chemical reactions. She asked if it would be feasible to base the use on a manufacturing level such as the number of gallons or percentage that would safely fit into the community versus creating a hazardous use.

Mr. Code said if a business was a conditional use, the Commission would have the opportunity to examine each request on a case-by-case basis depending on what is being proposed. Putting the level of manufacturing into the Code could make it too rigid when taking into consideration that the technology is changing all the time.

Ms. Lafayette asked if the Code should make a reference to the Fire Marshal Code for uses that are permitted, conditional or prohibited based on the level of danger or hazard.

Mr. Price said he did not know of any standards that separate the manufacturing of chemicals into such a fine category.

Mr. Code said the City's Development Code has other sections that could prohibit a business if it does not meet certain environmental or noise criteria.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Code if certain chemical uses were moved to a conditional use from prohibited uses, if that would meet his needs.

Mr. Code said this would adequately meet the needs of Cascade Columbia. He said herbicides and insecticides could be eliminated from conditional uses in the zone. Mr. Price said there are various places in the Willamette Valley that buy herbicides and pesticides in bulk and then blend them.

Mr. Wechner said most of what Cascade Chemical does would fall under the category of compounding, processing, assembling and packaging. Manufacturing would mean raw materials going through a chemical reaction to create something else.

Mr. Code said it would not affect them if manufacturing was removed. The Commission may not wish to do this because it seems somewhat limiting.

Mr. Wechner said the Staff report makes a distinction between manufacturing and compounding. After talking to the Fire Marshal and DEQ, he tried to separate things that seemed relatively innocuous from a compounding, processing and distribution standpoint and other things such as explosives and radioactive materials that usually have an emission associated with them. He discussed with Mr. Code where the line should be drawn, such as a threshold issue based on size, based on type of chemicals or should it be based on what the company is doing with them. It was concluded that it is actually a little of all three. The LI and GI zones allow under permitted uses, the manufacture of plastics and plastic products. During the work sessions, the Commission discussed “performance zoning”.

Mr. Allen said if the Commission was concerned about excluding bio-tech manufacturing, they could include an additional conditional use for the manufacture of bio-medical compounds using processes licensed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. He said the Commission had decided not to base the use on performance zoning.

Mr. Code invited all of the Commission members to make a site visit to Cascade Columbia to see what they do and how their business is set up. They should contact Joe Price for this purpose.

Jerry Lindsey, Timberline Baptist Church, 17134 SW Stellar Drive, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He referred the Commission to his letter dated September 16, 2002 and noted:

- The request is to allow churches as a “conditional use” in existing Light Industrial zones.
- They looked at the conditional use criteria to answer the Commission’s concerns about truck traffic, forklifts, and other businesses that may be impacted by a church using these types of facilities during business operating hours.
- There are several cases in Washington County where churches are allowed in existing buildings, but they are not allowed to “build” a church in the light industrial zone. They are allowed in existing spaces, providing the space is available and it does not conflict with any other business.

- Prior to the plan text amendment being introduced, they had asked the question, “Could we do it?” The response of the Commission was without any formal plan text amendment this is our position. We would like to preserve those facilities for industrial businesses.
- The Timberline Baptist Church currently employs six people and have two more planned to be hired after the first of the year.
- They would like to keep their church in Sherwood because that is where most of their congregation comes from. Right now they could locate in Tualatin, but they want to be in Sherwood. This is their first and foremost priority.
- The conditional use criteria allows the Commission to review the use of a church to see if there are any conflicts.
- Allowing churches to locate in the light industrial zone would help landowners fill vacant facilities through leases.
- They have already submitted a certified set of drawings to the Building Department and met with the City Building Official to see if their plans would be acceptable. The Building Official said the plans looked good, but that they would have to go through land use process.
- The second question is what if we allowed a church to move in and the economy changed creating a greater demand to light industrial space. He understands this position. The two gentleman that they have been working with for space are true businessmen and they are going to lease the space for as much as they can get for it. They would like to have a 3-5 year lease. Their intention is not to be there in the long term. This is an expensive proposition in the short term. They want to have their own land. They are already looking at a piece of land, but even if they own the land it would take them 2-2-1/2 years to complete the project on land that is outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
- The local supply and demand will dictate whether the building would be leased to them.
- The third question is what the criteria would be, such as how much square footage would a church be allowed to use in the LI zone. There could be some limitations on the amount of square footage. They would not have a problem with this.
- Another concern was what if the church wanted to have a Christian school or daycare. They have no desire to start a school or daycare. Currently, the Code allows daycares and trade schools in the LI zone.
- The fifth question was changing the LI space permanently to some other use. Their type of modification would not require any structural modifications and would consist of a few interior non-load bearing walls that could easily be removed at the end of the lease.
- This is the second letter they have submitted. They are not challenging the Commission and appreciate all of their hard work.
- They would ask the Commission to consider their request to allow churches to locate in the Light Industrial zone.

Chair Emery asked if there were any other proponents. There being none, Chair Emery called for opponent testimony.

Robert J. Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He noted:

- He asked for a two week extension on the plan text amendment prior to the Commission making a recommendation to the City Council.

- He wanted to explain his concerns. They will have the happy circumstance some time in the foreseeable future of beginning to depose some of the Commission members on more than one suit.
- Every time the Commission writes land use rules there are three ways in which they can do it. Rational relationships, intermediate or strict scrutiny.
- When you move it to rational relationships there is the presumption of constitutionality. What the Commission is doing tonight is trying to pass this under rational relationships.
- If it were under intermediate or strict scrutiny, you would have to have some kind of study to document what is being done or some kind of substantiation.
- The Commission is passing some rules when they do not have a clue what the results of those rules will be. As a result, each month, the City gets turned more and more over to the Staff.
- He provided an example of why the Commission should vote against the proposed plan text amendments.
- He has three properties on the highway and not one of them is now developable. The Commission will be in a lawsuit over all three of them. It is just a matter of time.
- One of them, Mr. Wechner and his colleagues want to steal from him because it is a wetlands. He has taken his discretionary power to go to a developer and to tell the developer, "Don't put the roads and don't put the utilities there because you can't develop that property." It is a violation of the Code, but he is doing it under his discretionary power.
- Secondly, they have moved densities out of there and said Mr. Claus never really had anything and the Commission went along with it. He did not think most of the Commission had brains enough to know what they were doing, but that is another problem.
- The second issue is where he had deeded ingresses and egresses in development plans, they have now been told that Mr. Wechner and Mr. Keyes, knew all along

Mr. Allen corrected Mr. Claus on his pronunciation of Mr. Wechner's name. Mr. Claus asked Mr. Allen to bear with him because he had a little better education than Mr. Allen. He said the mispronunciation may be for a reason.

Chair Emery advised Mr. Claus that if he had any other insults, that he would be asked to discontinue with his testimony.

Mr. Claus said he could stop him as long as the record was kept open for another two weeks and that it was clear that Chair Emery did not like him and he did not like the Chair. He would like to have it on the tape that he has been interrupted and the Chair tells him that he is going to be interrupted, they are closing the meeting. When he goes after him in the deposition, he can make it clear it is hostile. He asked Chair Emery to throw him out or to tell the side remarks to stop until his testimony is finished.

Chair Emery said all he is asking is that Mr. Claus not make any more insulting comments. Mr. Claus said then don't insult and interrupt him. This is the simple rule. Mr. Allen started the insult and he was interrupted.

Mr. Claus said he would continue with his testimony as long as he was not interrupted. He noted:

- The problem with the conditional uses that the Commission is giving is simple. They are giving power to the Staff to act discretionarily. The Staff does this. As of a date certain, the Staff sat down with ODOT and decided they were going to have a loop road.
- The City Council did not know about it and the Commission did not know about it.
- The Commission is developing more and more discretionary power for the Staff.
- The Commission now has a series of properties that they cannot develop now that they are in litigation over. He suggested the Commission not aggravate their own problem for a number of reasons.
- The simplest reason is, the Commission does not have any study on any of this to back up one single thing the Staff is telling them. The Commission has no research, they have just more of the Staff's opinions and those Staff are sooner or later going to get the Commission into more and more lawsuits.
- He is not here because he thinks he can change anything. He is required to notice them and to tell them that he intends to start appealing these things.
- He is also well aware of the hostility that any landowner suffers in Sherwood today. "They are looked at as your willing victims where the City is going to extract their fees and spend them in other places. If the landowner objects, they are going to have their permits pulled. The day has come and gone for that."
- He would guarantee the Commission that within the next year as some of them sit in depositions and find out what they don't know, they are going to start restraining this Staff.
- "The City is down to no building in this town at all to speak of." They have gone from 30 houses per month in permits to where they are barely filling out 120 lots left. This is just the start of it.
- What is happening is that more and more activity is taken off their land and it is the discretionary control that is causing that. He is sick of it and secondarily, he has enough money to litigate it.

Chair Emery asked if there was any other testimony. There being none, Chair Emery closed the public hearing for discussion by the Commission.

The Commission recessed the meeting at 8:02 PM for a 10-minute break and reconvened the meeting at 8:15 PM.

Mr. Allen said he would support the Staff recommendation that certain chemical uses be included as a conditional use. The safety standards that are in place are adequate when reviewing under the conditional use process. The Fire District and Clean Water Services would have an opportunity to submit comments during this process. He does have a concern with herbicides and pesticides and would prefer to keep these on the prohibited list. This would be in reference to compounding and processing and not so much as the packaging and distribution of the finished product.

Ms. Lafayette noted that the conditional use review no longer includes the "need" criteria. She first looked at the uses as compounding, processing and assembling versus manufacturing.

Mr. Wechner said one option would be to split out manufacturing from the other list. Compounding and processing would be much the same.

Mr. Allen said he would like to add to conditional uses the manufacturing of biomedical compounds using processes licensed by the USFDA. This would allow the Commission to review each request under the conditional use process. Biomedical compounds may need to be defined in the Code.

Ms. Lafayette said in response to the opponent testimony, the Commission has been fine tuning the industrial and commercial uses for some time; trying to come up with an industrial zone that enables industrial uses to come into the Sherwood community. The Commission is looking at the available industrial uses that would bring in more than the minimum wage, retail counter clerk jobs. The Commission is trying to develop a usable Code that would enable businesses to come into the community. This is part of what the Comprehensive Plan wants – to diversify and broaden the City’s economic base.

The Commission concurred with her comments.

Mr. Allen said the fact they are talking about churches or recreational facilities is immaterial to him. He would still have the same feeling. They are talking about commercial uses in the industrial zones. Commercial uses in the industrial zones inherently present a conflict with the industrial use and they represent a dissipation of a scarce resource. Mr. Lindsey was correct in saying that the landowners will lease for as much as they can get. This is why you zone restrictively in an industrial zone to protect this land resource from going to higher paying uses. Commercial uses typically pay more than industrial uses. He is completely supportive of the Staff recommendation to make churches conditional uses in the commercial zones, but he is against the Staff recommendation to include these commercial uses in the industrial zone.

The Commission discussed daycares or preschools as permitted uses in the industrial zones. The daycares would meet the immediate needs of the other uses in the zone.

Mr. Allen also brought up allowing glass installation and sales, government offices, and post offices in an industrial zone.

Ms. Lafayette said another consideration in an industrial zone would be the trip comparison, e.g., parking and infrastructure needs.

The Commission noted that there were two verbal requests to continue the hearing or keep the record open on these plan text amendments.

Mr. Weislogel said he was supportive of the chemical uses being conditional in the industrial zones. He would like to find a way to accommodate churches in other zones.

Mr. Henry said he supported chemical uses being conditional uses in the industrial zones. He shared Mr. Allen’s concerns about churches in industrial zones. He was not sure daycares belonged in industrial zones. He thought these uses are commercial. A distinction would have to be made for a daycare that is integrated into an existing business operation.

Mr. Wechner read the criteria for conditional uses from the Development Code, Section 4.302.03.

Ms. Lafayette said a church is a product or service for the community and is best described as a commercial use. The industrial zone has the potential to have a positive impact on economic development.

Mr. Allen said he would be willing to draft changes regarding churches that would incorporate his position and bring these back to the next regular Commission meeting.

The Commission noted they were in agreement on the plan text amendments proposed for chemical uses.

Ms. Lafayette said a reiteration of the findings of fact that this is an on-going process to enable the Sherwood community to have more economic diversity should also be included.

Patrick Allen moved the Planning Commission continue PA 01-06 Changes to Uses Plan Text Amendments to the October 1, 2002 Regular Commission meeting. The public hearing is closed and the written record will remain open until September 30, 2002, 5:00 PM. Seconded by Jean Lafayette.

Vote for Passage of Motion: 5-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

6. New Business

Mr. Henry said he attended the last Council meeting where the two plan text amendments were continued. He sent an e-mail to fellow Commissioners relating the events of this meeting. He was not happy with the tone that the Mayor set and the accusatory language used in either the meeting or the Mayor's e-mail. He discussed his concerns with Council President Keith Mays. He looks forward to having a joint work session with the Council.

Mr. Henry said the Council decided to form a committee to study the feasibility of developing a municipal golf course for the City of Sherwood.

Mr. Wechner said originally there were five sites that he visited and evaluated for soils, transportation access and utility extensions. The price of land was not included in this analysis. The sites have been narrowed down to two favorable alternatives. The preferred site is outside the Urban Growth Boundary. More information will be developed through the Committee.

Ms. Lafayette asked for an update on the Highway 99W Sub-Area Study.

Mr. Wechner reported that he had sent out a memo to three planning consulting firms requesting preliminary figures for preparing this type of study. The Commission agreed to place this item under New Business on the October 1, 2002 Commission meeting agenda.

The Commission agreed to discuss items for the proposed October 29, 2002 joint work session at the October 15, 2002 Commission meeting under New Business.

Mr. Wechner gave a brief report on the status of the Langer land use applications that include the proposed Target store. The applicant may be proposing modifications to the original application. The Council will determine if these modifications constitute a “major” or “minor” change to the PUD. A major change will require the Commission to review the proposed changes and make a recommendation to Council. A minor change would require only Council review.

7. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, Chair Emery adjourned the regular meeting at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Department