

MINUTES

Springfield Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Springfield City Hall—Council Chamber
225 Fifth Street, Springfield

July 5, 2006
7 p.m.

PRESENT: Dave Cole, Chair; Frank Cross, Vice Chair; Steve Moe, Bill Carpenter, Lee Beyer, Gayle Decker, Greg Shaver, members; Bill Grile, Greg Mott, Colin Stephens, Andy Limbird, Springfield staff; Joe Leahy, City Attorney.

Commissioner Cole called the meeting of the Springfield Planning Commission to order.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION

Commissioner Cole had no report.

3. BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Fred Simmons, 312 South 55nd Place, brought up what he asserted was a procedural question that was a discretionary commission decision under Article 14 of the Springfield Code. Mr. Leahy recommended that he discuss Mr. Simmons' concern during the public hearing related to the alley vacation. The commission concurred.

4. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. JUSTICE CENTER—REQUEST FOR VACATION OF ALLEY

Mr. Stephens reviewed the rules for a quasi-judicial hearing and noted the relevant criteria for the application taken from Article 9 of the Springfield Development Code.

Commissioner Cole opened the public hearing. He called for declarations of *ex parte* contacts or conflicts of interest. There were none.

Mr. Stephens said that Mr. Simmons had contacted staff that day and expressed a concern that the conversation the commission had with the City's consultant at the June 20 work session on the site review application for the Justice Center represented an *ex parte* contact. While staff did not agree, he requested that the commission make reference to the work session. Commissioner Beyer pointed out that the work session was a public meeting and could not possibly represent an *ex parte* contact as all had the ability to hear and see what happened. Mr. Leahy said that Mr. Simmons maintained that to the extent information was derived from the consultant, it represented an *ex parte* contact.

Commissioner Beyer pointed out that the consultant in question was acting as an agent of the City. Mr. Leahy suggested that the commission merely put the fact of the work session on the record; it did not have to agree with Mr. Simmons' conclusions.

Commissioner Decker, Commissioner Moe, Commissioner Shaver, Commissioner Carpenter, and Commissioner Cole acknowledged his or her presence at the work session and indicated that would not bias their decision-making. Commissioner Beyer indicated he listened to the tapes of the work session but that would not bias his decision-making. Commissioner Cross said he had not attended the work session and had listened only to the tapes of the June 20 public hearing.

Mr. Leahy indicated that tapes of the work session in question were available to any interested party.

Mr. Stephens clarified that the council initiated the alley vacation and the City was the applicant; in the case of the site review application, the Police Chief was the applicant.

Mr. Stephens indicated the minutes of the June 20 work session would be included in the public record for the alley vacation.

Mr. Simmons asked that the order of procedures be addressed the way it was in the applicable ordinance. He said that the issue was not bias but that the commission attended the meeting, and pursuant to the ordinance, did not declare the conflict prior to the first public hearing. He maintained that procedurally, tonight the commission merely documented the fact it failed to meet the test of the ordinance the first time by noting its attendance at the meeting. Mr. Simmons denied that the consultant, Carl Sherwood, working under contract with the City, was not the same as Development Services staff as outlined in the Springfield Development Code. The chair had the responsibility to act on that information.

Mr. Simmons asked that Commissioner Cole terminate the public hearing and refer the staff report back to the staff for a "complete redo" because of what he maintained were "failures all along the line."

Mr. Leahy suggested it was "a stretch" to call a conversation with a consultant during a public work session an *ex parte* contact. He agreed with Commissioner Beyer a strong case could be made that the contractor in question was acting as an agent of the City and a work session could not be considered an *ex parte* contact. He said that even if the work session could be considered such a contact, the commission had continued the public hearing and disclosed the contact. The individual making the complaint was aware of the disclosure, and had a further opportunity to provide additional information to the commission in response to the contact. He said that Mr. Simmons had indicated to him that he had been aware of his concern for two week and had ample time to present the issue to staff before the meeting. Mr. Leahy further pointed out that the final decision would be made by the City Council. He recommended that the commission proceed as he believed the issues raised by Mr. Simmons had been addressed.

Commissioner Beyer agreed with Mr. Leahy. He said that an *ex parte* contact could not happen in a public meeting because it was in public and all were privy to the information. Speaking to Mr. Simmons' suggested remedy that the process be restarted, Commissioner Beyer believed that the issues would be the same and the end result the same.

Commissioner Shaver also agreed with Mr. Leahy. He did not think the commission had any real *ex parte* contacts to declare and suggested the commission proceed.

Commissioner Cole determined that the commission would consider with the public hearing in spite of Mr. Simmons' objections.

Mr. Limbird presented the staff report, revised in response to public testimony and Planning Commission direction at the June 20 hearing. He said the purpose of the request was to vacate a 14' x 214' right-of-way located mid-block between 4th Street and Pioneer Parkway East and between A and B streets. He noted the supplemental information provided in the staff report in response to testimony by Mr. Simmons. Staff had addressed the points raised in Mr. Simmons' testimony and augmented the findings at the commission's request.

Mr. Limbird noted two recommended conditions related to the procurement of temporary easements for existing utilities in the alley and eastern and western ends of the alley.

Mr. Limbird submitted into the record a letter received from Qwest, the last utility to write in acknowledgement of the alley vacation. He distributed copies of the letter to the commission, noting that the struck text was struck at Qwest's behest. Mr. Limbird noted that typically, utility companies were notified of vacations of public rights-of-way but the code did not require notarized letters.

Referring to Mr. Simmons' testimony related to the notice of publication, Mr. Limbird submitted into the record an affidavit of publication of the public hearing notice from the *Springfield News*.

Mr. Limbird entered into the record the minutes of the Springfield City Council meeting of May 15, 2006, reflecting the council's initiation of the alley vacation through the Consent Calendar.

Speaking to Condition 2, which provided for continued access to the ballot box, Mr. Limbird indicated that Lane Elections would relocate the ballot following the November general election.

Addressing the testimony received from Curtis Greer, Mr. Limbird clarified that staff reports were the product of the department rather than a single individual. He was the staff person who presented the report, but the report had undergone both peer review and review by the City Attorney's Office.

Mr. Limbird said that the staff report had been provided to both Mr. Greer and Mr. Simmons but he had received no inquiries from them prior to the hearing and assumed they had no further objections.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Leahy said that the City's lease with the Best Little Print Shop referred to the parking lot and not the alley. It did not discuss a guarantee of access but rather spoke to the parking on lease premises and maintenance of driveways and walkways. Mr. Limbird noted that the lease provided for the relocation of the parking at any time. Mr. Leahy said the City would work with the firm and conduct itself in accordance with the terms of the lease. If the lease was terminated, it would occur in accordance with the terms of the lease. He said that one signed an agreement, that implied the parties would work together to avoid impairing the value of the lease. If the firm needed access, the City would not do anything to impair the value of the lease. Commissioner Carpenter argued that the parking did not convey access. Mr. Leahy agreed. He reiterated that the word "access" was not in the lease. However, as City Attorney, he would advise the council it needed to work with the tenant to ensure that the tenant's interests in the business were continued and had an opportunity to flourish while the lease was in effect.

Mr. Limbird pointed out to Commissioner Carpenter that Condition 2 was specifically written to facilitate access to the commercial space occupied by the Best Little Print Shop through a temporary easement. Commissioner Cross suggested that the condition could be amended with the addition of the phrase "for the duration of the lease." Mr. Leahy said that was implicit and could be added.

Commissioner Cole called for public testimony.

Curtis Greer, 357 55th Street, called the commission's attention to a letter he received from Development Services Director Bill Grile (Attachment 4) that he maintained was not responsive to his concerns. The only question that Mr. Grile had answered regarded who prepared the staff report. Mr. Greer termed the letter "a fabrication and not the truth." There was no mention of why the staff report was submitted with missing data or information about the costs of the report. He asked why highly paid staff was knowingly allowed to submit misleading information. Mr. Greer said the City would not accept such shoddy work from him.

Commissioner Carpenter referred to the attachment mentioned by Mr. Greer, and said he did not see anything in the letter about the costs of the staff report. Mr. Greer acknowledged that was not in the letter. Commissioner Carpenter said that the letter seemed to contain only one question and several statements of facts. Mr. Greer said the statements regarded what was missing in the report. Commissioner Carpenter concurred, and reiterated that there was only one question in the report which staff could answer. Mr. Greer acknowledged he might not have phrased his questions correctly but that was what he was trying to get at. He questioned why the report was done because it was not complete, and that was the question he wanted answered. Mr. Grile had accepted responsibility for the staff report.

Fred Simmons, 312 South 55th Place, rebutted Mr. Limbird's remarks, saying the staff report and the process was riddled with errors. He maintained that in contradiction to the staff report, there were ten parcels involved, not nine. The code required that public notice be published ten days before the hearing in an application where there was a hearing before both the commission and the council. That requirement was not met. He further maintained there was evidence in the report that the affidavit of the mailing did not include a required mailing to the Washburne neighborhood association.

Mr. Simmons said staff recommended that the City Surveyor confine itself to the dimensions of the alley only, and that was flawed because it did not delineate the right-of-way for 4th Street or Pioneer Parkway East.

Mr. Simmons maintained that the staff report was so flawed that the commission would not permit a private developer to submit it.

Mr. Simmons referred to a letter from the Fire Department in the staff report related to the site plan application, Exhibit 15-1. He said that the letter was based on the original site plan, not the one currently under consideration. It did not properly allocate the hydrant spacing; it merely talked about water flow. He believed the proposed building mass would be difficult for the Fire Department to attack in the case of fire.

Mr. Simmons requested that the following information be entered into the record: DRC 2006 0033, the tapes of the work session, the staff report from the first hearing, the record of the first hearing, the staff report for the July 5 hearing, DRC 2006-0013, and any and all e-mails, letters, minutes, records, and communications produced by Springfield staff, officials, committees, photos, plans or received by staff from others. He requested all Justice Center data in all formats.

Mr. Simmons asked the commission to reject the application because it did not meet the test of a complete record of filing and because of the defects he pointed out both earlier and tonight.

Commissioner Decker asked what ten parcels Mr. Simmons was referring to. Mr. Simmons maintained that Tax Lot 1800 lost its access to the alley by the action, so was an affected party as described by the code and the Oregon Revised Statutes. It did not have to be co-joined or directly abutting the alley to be impacted. He said the City owned ten, not nine parcels, along the block.

Commissioner Beyer asked Mr. Simmons if he believed the alley needed to be vacated for the Justice Center to be built. Mr. Simmons said yes, but the process must be done in accordance with the code and State law. The access to the Best Little Print House must be protected. He said that rejecting the application would not delay the construction process, and would "reflect properly on the City that they're willing to be players in an even field."

Commissioner Beyer asked if Mr. Simmons believed that any one with an interest in the application did not know where the alley was. Mr. Simmons said that was

not the question. The alley had been in place since 1872. Commissioner Beyer pointed out that the purpose of the public notice was to notify people so they know exactly what was under discussion. The commission was talking about an entire block of land owned by the Springfield citizens, and the vacation request reflected the community's desires for a new Justice Center. Mr. Simmons said that the process allowed for the necessary communications and citizen participation in the decision making process as outlined by Goal 1. Commissioner Beyer suggested that most people would have a pretty good idea of what was proposed when they heard the phrase "alley vacation," perhaps more so than if they were handed a legal description. Mr. Simmons responded that his were process and procedural concerns.

Commissioner Cole determined there was no one else wishing to speak, and called for staff rebuttal.

Addressing Mr. Simmons' testimony, Mr. Stephens clarified that there were only nine parcels that abut the area for vacation and were considered affected. The statute contained a definition for "affected properties," which were those properties receiving benefit from the right-of-way and the owners of those properties must participate in the petition. Because the council initiated the vacation, the term "affected properties" was not germane to the request.

Mr. Stephens said the code called for neighborhood associations in standing to receive notice of land use applications within their boundaries, but the area in question was not within the boundaries of the Washburn Neighborhood Association.

Mr. Stephens addressed Mr. Simmons' testimony about the fact that the legal description did not include 4th Street or Pioneer Parkway East, and indicated staff's disagreement with Mr. Simmons' assertion that those areas must be included.

Regarding Exhibit 15-1, Mr. Stephens said that the comments in the letter were based on the current site plan rather than any earlier version and it did contemplate the alley vacation.

Speaking to Mr. Simmons' records request, Mr. Stephens noted that typically, staff requested that those requesting that such items be included in the record provide copies rather than require staff to go through an internal search for such documents. Mr. Leahy said that Mr. Simmons appeared to have requested every document related to the Justice Center be included in the record. Those documents were a matter of public record and if Mr. Simmons wanted to review those and select those he wished the council to see he was welcome to do so. However, Mr. Leahy did not think that staff could go through every piece of paper related to the Justice Center without discrimination as to their relevance to the criteria.

Mr. Stephens suggested that if the commission believed it had enough information to make a decision tonight, it could do so, and staff could follow-up with any additional information for the council's review.

Commissioner Cole called for additional staff rebuttal.

Mr. Limbird reiterated that staff had used the input previously provided in testimony and by the commission to revise the staff report and add additional findings and conditions. He recommended approval of the alley vacation request.

Commissioner Carpenter determined from Mr. Limbird that the City provided notice of alley vacations to the utilities but did not care if they approved or denied of the proposal. Commissioner Carpenter asked who owned the storm and sanitary sewer lines involved. Mr. Limbird said the City of Springfield owned them. The Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission owned no lines in the immediate area.

Commissioner Cole closed the public hearing and called for commission discussion on the alley vacation request.

Commissioner Shaver thought the revised staff report greatly improved, particularly in regard to the findings, which more accurately reflected the existing conditions and addressed the concerns raised in testimony. He endorsed Commissioner Cross' suggested revision to Condition 2. Mr. Leahy concurred as long as it was understood that the condition applied while the lease was in duration.

Commissioner Shaver, seconded by Commissioner Beyer, moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the signing of the recommendation to the City Council, Exhibit 3-1, with the minor language change to Condition 2 as it affected the Best Little Print House while the lease was in affect.

Commissioner Beyer said that while the staff report might not have been the greatest report, he did not think it inadequate. Perhaps it had some technical flaws. However, he believed that a resident would have had to be out of town for the last four years not to be aware of what was going on. He suggested that the intent of the notice was to ensure that those with an interest in the project were notified and had a chance to comment to their representatives. Commissioner Beyer pointed out that the site was entirely owned by the City and the residents supported the facility for which it was being vacated. He was not eager to spend scarce City resources to go back and repeat the process when the result would be the same. Commissioner Beyer said that the commission would be kidding itself if it believed that the council, which supported the Justice Center, would not support the application.

Commissioner Decker believed the revised staff report addressed the issues that had been raised in testimony.

The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

b. FORMAL INTERPRETATION—INDUSTRIAL USES

Mr. Stephens reviewed a request from Jim Spickerman that the Planning Commission provide a formal interpretation of whether a home improvement center was a permitted use in the Heavy Industrial (HI) zoning district, as permitted by Article 4 of the code. That article allowed the director to elevate such an interpretative decision to the commission because of reasons of complexity or where the commission's discretion was desired.

Mr. Stephens reviewed the rules of the public hearing and briefly noted the criteria governing the application from the Springfield Development Code, Section 4, Section 4.030.

Commissioner Cole opened the public hearing. He called for declarations of conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts. There were none.

Commissioner Beyer determined from Mr. Leahy that the interpretation would apply to all HI zones.

Commissioner Cole called for the staff report.

Mr. Stephens said the applicant's rationale was that the code permitted retail uses in the HI zone that sold products similar to the products being sold in home improvement stores. He referred the commission to Section 18.020(13) of the code, which detailed the allowed uses, in support of that rationale. Staff believed that the request was supported by criteria (a) and (c), but it was unclear whether criterion b was met (*is similar to other permitted uses in operational characteristics, including but not limited to, traffic generation, parking or density*). He said that a home improvement center was similar to those uses and could have a lesser impact than those uses. Mr. Stephens compared the peak hour trip generation from a building materials and lumber store (673 vehicle trips) to the peak hour trip generation from a home improvement super store (457 vehicle trips) but cautioned that smaller building materials stores were not included in the ITE manual, the comparison was not a straight square footage calculation.

Commissioner Carpenter noted that Section 18.020(13)(m) included uses listed under automotive and retail which are wholesale uses, which implied that any retail listed under automotive and retail do not qualify. Such uses must be a wholesale use in that regard. Commissioner Carpenter questioned what was listed under automotive. Mr. Stephens said that Article 18 contained a fairly long list of automotive uses, which he reviewed.

Commissioner Carpenter suggested there was duplication between sections 18.020(13)(f) and (j). Mr. Stephens agreed, and noted the duplication for later follow-up.

Commissioner Shaver proposed that the commission consider the issue in terms of a primary/secondary use approach that allowed the inclusion of other uses, such as

kitchen cabinets or garden centers, if 80 percent of the uses involved in a home improvement store were included on the list of permitted uses. Mr. Stephens said it was within the commission's ability to make that interpretation. He added that the City currently did not have such a numerical standard. Mr. Leahy said there were many situations where entrepreneurs entered into ancillary businesses to make more money, but the primary use was what they had received permission for.

Commissioner Beyer recalled that the introduction to the section listing the uses mentioned similarity of impact. He suggested that for that reason the list was not exclusionary. Mr. Stephens read the relevant part of the code, which stated that "uses similar to those specifically listed may be permitted at the discretion of the director, in accordance with Article 4 interpretation." Commissioner Beyer suggested that the list of retail uses could be much longer if impact was considered. Mr. Stephens agreed. He suggested that the discussion, as part of the legislative record, would guide staff in the future.

Jim Spickerman, 975 Oak Street, Eugene, Gleaves Swearingen, the applicant, pointed out that the commercial section of the code did not allow home improvement stores and for that reason he looked to the section of the code where similar uses were allowed. Regarding the issue of primary and secondary uses, Mr. Spickerman suggested that the City simply could not list every possible use in the code, and the issue of what could be allowed often involved such secondary uses. He said that garden centers were a good example; it was not listed in the commercial districts, so either it would be allowed in the HI district or it would not occur. Some blending of industrial and commercial uses, given the national trend toward home improvement, seemed appropriate.

Commissioner Carpenter suggested the distinctive element of a home improvement store in comparison to the other items on the list was its size. He also saw nothing in the code that prevented those uses from growing to the same size as a home improvement store. Given that lack of a restriction, he did not see anything preventing the commission from granting the request.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Spickerman said he did not know how Eugene addressed such uses, but he believed it was more restrictive.

Speaking to the issue of size, Mr. Spickerman suggested that the owners of large structures such as warehouses in industrial districts would not likely object to a home improvement center.

Commissioner Cole called for additional testimony. There was no one else wishing to speak. He called on Mr. Stephens for the staff response to testimony.

Mr. Stephens stated that he believed that the request satisfied criteria (a) and (b) and asked for the commission's discretion regarding criterion b. Based on his review, he did not see any reason the application could not be approved. He indicated that due to the nature of the item he had not prepared findings, and said he would return to the commission with findings consistent with its action for

adoption on July 18.

Commissioner Beyer believed that Mr. Spickerman made a good case. He asked Mr. Stephens how he would address a Bi-Mart store application for location in the HI district. Mr. Stephens said that his review would focus on the warehousing element of the use, and whether the use could meet the threshold of 15 percent of floor area being in warehouse merchandise. Commissioner Beyer believed it was getting increasingly difficult to tell the difference between light industrial and commercial uses.

Commissioner Beyer did not agree with the staff analysis of the traffic issue as he thought there was a difference in magnitude in the traffic going to and from Home Depot as compared to a building materials store. However, he did not think it was enough of a difference to argue against the application, and assumed that the issue would be addressed through a traffic study. Mr. Stephens concurred. He said the numbers provided to the commission were p.m. peak hour trips, and his discussion with the City's traffic engineer indicated that such uses tended to peak on weekends and later evening hours as opposed to p.m. peak hour times. The Transportation Division was not concerned about the weekend peak because other uses within the industrial district were generally not operating weekend hours.

Commissioner Cole called for rebuttal from Mr. Spickerman.

Mr. Spickerman noted that he also represented Bi-Mart. He said that he felt he could make a case for the use in question because it was not listed in the code, and pointed out that Bi-Mart was addressed by the commercial element of the City's code.

Commissioner Cole closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Shaver said that he did not like giving up industrial land for commercial uses but given the list of permitted uses he did not think it a stretch to allow home improvement stores in the district. He did not think that Bi-Mart would qualify for location in the district given its focus on such items as clothes, drugs, and sundries.

Commissioner Shaver thanked staff for seeking the commission's interpretative guidance in the matter.

Commissioner Cole perceived home improvement stores to have characteristics very different than industrial use. For example, he believed that the proposed use would draw families with children to the HI zones, which he did not think the City wanted to do given some of the existing uses in those zones. He pointed out that such companies often conducted things like toys and children's workshops, and they frequently included restaurants and finance institutions. That did not fit his interpretation of a heavy industrial use. Commissioner Cole did not know the answer to where such uses should be allowed.

Commissioner Beyer agreed with Commissioner Shaver regarding the need to maintain a supply of industrial lands. However, given the list of permitted uses, he

could not say that a home improvement center was an inappropriate use for the district in question.

Commissioner Carpenter agreed with Commissioner Shaver's remarks about the fact of the permitted uses. He also agreed with the staff analysis related to the traffic impact on weekends. He suggested that such mixed zoning might actually complement traffic flows. He was somewhat concerned about issue of potential harm to children in the district from neighboring uses, but that was a minor issue for him.

Commissioner Cross disagreed with Commissioner Shaver's remarks about the industrial lands. He said the City needed to pay attention to business trends if the community was to be remain viable. He said that there were many communities that died when industries left, and there was nothing to replace them. He saw no reason to deny the application.

Commissioner Moe expressed support for the application. He said that businesses trends change all the time and businesses evolved that were not foreseen at the time the code was written.

Commissioner Beyer, seconded by Commissioner Cross, moved that the Planning Commission find that home improvement centers were consistent with the uses found in Code Section 18.020(13), subsequent to adoption of findings of fact at the next meeting.

Commissioner Cole believed the operating characteristics of a home improvement center differed from the other businesses allowed in the district.

Commissioner Decker suggested that the concerns raised by Commissioner Cole could be addressed by the physical design of the facility at the site review phase of development. She saw no difference between the listed uses and a home improvement center.

Commissioner Moe said he understood Commissioner Cole's concerns but he believed such centers were so large that they created their own environment and the customers would not even be aware of the neighboring business. Commissioner Decker agreed.

Commissioner Cole noted that he frequented home improvement centers and would like to see more of them.

The motion passed, 6:1; Commissioner Cole voting no.

5. BUSINESS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR

Speaking to the alley vacation application, Mr. Grile clarified that none of the department's staff reports was the work of single planner, and all reports underwent a peer review. Three levels of supervisor reviewed the report in question. Mr. Grile said that whether a report was short or long depended on the nature of the application. In the case

of a major rezoning or a master plan, there would be far more analysis in the staff report than there would be in the case of an alley vacation.

Mr. Grile said that the department could always expand and improve on the quality of its work and that was its goal. In this situation, because the application was initiated by the City Council, the work done by staff was in effect reviewing work done by the City itself.

Mr. Grile noted that under Oregon law, the burden of proof was on the applicant. He had witnessed many hearings where much information was submitted into the record, but not every minute piece needed to be evaluated for a decision to be made. In many cases, the decision-making body will make a decision and ask the applicant to return with proposed findings of fact. He said that in this case, it was easy to co-mingle all the issues because it was a City initiated project.

Commissioner Beyer observed that he did not have the same problem others expressed with the report. However, he believed that because the City was the applicant, the report would be held to a higher standard. Mr. Grile agreed.

Commissioner Shaver concurred with Commissioner Beyer. He believed the second staff report was an improvement over the first report.

Commissioner Shaver asked Mr. Grile to discover why a letter from 2005 was included in the commission's meeting packet. He also questioned why the commission had not received a copy of the letter in 2005.

Speaking to the remarks of Commissioner Beyer and Commissioner Shaver, Mr. Leahy agreed that the City's application would be held to a higher standard no matter the project involved. He suggested that if one cared about the application and really wished to engage the commission in a dialogue about it, he recommended that they contact the staff before the hearing with their questions or issues so that the problem or question could be addressed at the hearing.

6. BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Shaver raised a long-standing concern he had regarding the issuance of temporary emergency medical use permits for mobile homes that lasted beyond the length of the medical emergency. The commission agreed to an ordinance addressing the issue at an upcoming meeting.

7. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)