

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION  
Tuesday, November 20, 2007

The City of Springfield Planning Commission met in regular session in the Council Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon on Tuesday, November 20, 2007; 7 p.m., with Frank Cross as Springfield Planning Commission Chair.

**ATTENDANCE**

Present were Chair Frank Cross, Vice Chair Bill Carpenter and Planning Commissioners Lee Beyer, Johnny Kirschenmann, Sheri Moore, Eric Smith and Terri Leezer. Also present were Development Service Director Bill Grile, Planning Manager Greg Mott, Planning Supervisor Mark Metzger, Planning Secretary Brenda Jones, and City Attorney Joe Leahy.

**ABSENT**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

- The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Frank Cross.

**BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

- There was no business from the audience.

**QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING**

- **Marcola Meadows Master Plan – Satre Associates – LRP2007-00028 –**

Chair Cross called the meeting of the Springfield City Council to order and noted the new process the commission would be following and urging civility as all worked together to encourage the growth of Springfield for the benefit of all.

Planning Manager Greg Mott introduced the topic, first noting the location of the property in question. He said the purpose of the hearing was to allow the public to testify about the proposal and to allow the applicant to present the proposal. He noted the criteria of approval for the application, which were taken from Section 5.13-125 of the Springfield Development Code. He asked that those testifying address the relevant criteria, and said those testifying could also raise other criteria from the code that they believed to be relevant. Issues raised in testimony must be addressed with a degree of specificity such that others could understand the issue and respond to it; otherwise, it might not be possible for the issue to be addressed by a higher appellant authority.

Mr. Mott reviewed the criteria of approval.

Mr. Mott also recommended that the commission allow anyone who wished to testify at this time should be allowed to do so and that dialogue between the parties be allowed.

Staff would also be available for questions. He recommended that oral testimony be closed tonight and that the written record be held open one week, followed by a one-week period to allow for staff response to the record. The staff report and all information entered into the record would be available to the public on December 4. The commission would reconvene on December 11 and allow testimony specific to what was entered into the record and the staff report. The commission would make a decision on the application December 11.

Commissioner Cross asked the commissioners for any *ex-parte* contacts or conflicts of interest. Commissioners had none to declare. Commissioner Cross called on Gary Karp, Planner III, for the staff report. Mr. Karp noted that the Marcola Meadows application was the third master plan application reviewed by Springfield. Each application was different in nature. The application in question was a residential/commercial mixed use development that would implement nodal development. The application called for development of 518 homes and 449,600 square feet of retail/office use.

Mr. Karp reviewed the code description of a master plan for the benefit of the audience and commission. He said the purpose of the master plan was to provide preliminary approval for an entire development area in regards to land uses, potential intensities and densities, arrangement of uses, and the location of public facilities when the development was proposed to be developed in phases. The master plan ensured coordination between development phases.

Mr. Karp noted the underlying assumptions listed in the staff report and asked the commission to consider approving the underlying assumptions prior to the close of the meeting.

Mr. Karp noted the submission of two public comments that would be included in the packet for the December 11 meeting.

Commissioner Cross called for testimony from the applicant.

### **Testimony from the Applicant**

**Rick Satre**, Satre Associates, 132 East Broadway Suite, Eugene, Oregon, 97401, thanked the commission for considering the master plan application. He acknowledged that the Marcola Meadows master plan was Springfield's first phased mixed-use master plan development application and new ground was being broken with the application's evaluation. Mr. Satre noted the development approvals that had occurred to this point in regard to the property in question, requiring the submittal of the application.

Mr. Satre overviewed the proposed development using a diagram of the approximately 100-acre site, copies of which were provided to the commission and audience. He identified the location of the residential and commercial development, noting that both attached owner-occupied row housing and detached housing were being proposed. He called attention to the 19 acres of community commercial zoning and 26 acres of mixed-use commercial zoning. The commercial villages would include professional offices, neighborhood stores, and would provide a main street shopping environment. The design of the development would be based on a set of design guidelines provided to the commission in the master plan packet as Attachment 2.

Commissioner Beyer referred to the proposed housing units and asked if it was the developer's intent they would be owner-occupied. Mr. Satre said yes. The zoning

ordinance approved earlier in the year placed an upper limit on the intensity of development on the site because of trip generation concerns. The commercial development was capped at 471,000 square feet. The ordinance also capped the residential dwelling unit number at 730. Because 80 of the 100 acres were in the nodal overlay, including the entire residential portion, the development was subject to the minimum net density of 12 units per acre and maximum density of 20 units per acre. The market place responded more positively to traditional detached houses, but it was a challenge to meet to the minimum density requirement with detached housing. Mr. Satre indicated the development would comply with the minimum density requirement.

Mr. Satre said that Marcola Meadows would be an exciting place to shop, work, and live. It would provide residents with alternatives to driving. He noted the new greenway, which would offer fresh air, clean water, and landscaping across the entire development. The greenway would be among the first things constructed because of the need for storm conveyance from the site, particularly in the commercial area. The greenway would not be public open space but it would be accessible by the public and an all-weather, multi-purpose pathway would be installed on either side of the greenway, as well as overlooks and lighting.

Mr. Satre noted that the greenway, intended to provide on-site storm management addressed one of the underlying assumptions. He recalled that storm management on the site was raised as a concern during the zoning hearing. The developers had worked extensively with staff to identify the sources of runoff and the existing conveyance system. Using that information, the development team had modeled the system to lower the hydraulic grade line by close to two feet to ensure that flood level during a storm event would no longer go above the level of the catch basins, but well below.

Mr. Satre said that another assumption the development team and staff worked on was the transportation and traffic needs of the area. The full master plan submittal was being evaluated by staff. In addition to the traffic impact analysis (TIA) submitted for the zone change, the applicant had generated three additional traffic analyses: 1) one specific to the 100-acre site; 2) one specific to the off-site impacts, that is, the on- and off-ramps at I-105 and Mohawk; and 3) one specific to the County facilities to the north.

Commissioner Cross determined from Mr. Satre that all three TIAs were submitted to Springfield.

Mr. Satre reported on outreach to the neighborhood and the school district as well as the Eugene Water & Electric Board (owner of property on which the County-owned bicycle path was located), Willamalane Parks and Recreation District, and the Springfield Water District. He noted that the bicycle path was built with Road Funds and could only be maintained with Road Funds, and the County had not been spending Road Fund money on paths. He recalled that the master plan proposal included open space connections through the residential subdivision and paved connections to the bicycle path for the purpose of improved accessibility. He said that the development team wished to ensure that all the elements of the development worked together and for that reason had worked with the utilities on a joint utility plan.

Mr. Satre identified some of the key factors he believed would support an affirmative commission vote:

- 1) All of the issues raised in previous public hearings had been addressed in the master plan application being evaluated. He referred the commission to the remaining outstanding prior comments in the staff report, Section VIII.
- 2) As noted in Section VII of the staff report, all of the zoning conditions of approval have been or will be met upon the development of findings and conditions of approval.
- 3) As noted in Section VI, the criteria of approval has responded to and satisfied in the application.

Mr. Satre said the applicant aimed to construct a designed master planned community with improved streets, open space, pedestrian enhancements, and proximate shopping and employment opportunities. He believed Marcola Meadows would be a positive addition to the community. He said the commission could be confident in approving the master plan because of the remaining step in the process, the development of the Final Master Plan reflecting all of the conditions of approval and any other changes made by the commission, which was recorded in the same manner as a deed restriction accompanying the property.

Mr. Satre noted the remaining approvals required for the development to go forward, including the tentative and final master plan, public improvement plan, private construction plan, drinking water protection application, erosion control, grading, and stormwater management. Each phase of the master plan must also go through site review. Springfield City staff would be involved with each step. He invited questions.

Commissioner Leezer asked if the master plan included a school. Mr. Satre said no; the development would not generate sufficient students to justify a school. The applicant had been in contact with the district through the application process and the district indicated its long-range plan addressed its needs even with the additional students generated by the development, which it anticipated would be about 202 students. The applicant had a letter from the district stating it had capacity to serve the new students.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if Mr. Satre and staff could be available for commission questions as the audience raised issues. City Attorney Joe Leahy could see no legal objection to the request. Commissioner Cross granted the request with the caveat that he reserved the right to change the process if it did not work.

Commissioner Cross called on the audience for testimony.

### **Testimony from the Audience:**

**Dan Egan**, 850 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Springfield, applauded the commission for trying the informal hearing process. He said he was representing himself as a citizen. Mr. Egan recalled that he served on an economic development committee that looked at the property 20 years ago. The time was not right then for development, but there was long-time community interest in the property and he had been aware that at some point something would be developed on the property. He acknowledged the interest of neighbors in the project, particularly since it been dormant for some time. Mr. Egan believed the proposed development was a good quality development and the time was right for it. He said change was not an easy thing for neighborhoods, but if carefully done by the City neighborhoods could be better for change. He hoped the issues related to the project could be resolved so the property could realize its potential and be something the community could be proud of.

**Donald Schindler**, 2443 35<sup>th</sup> Street, Springfield, said he favored the project and hoped it was of high quality. He said that he owned and rented several single-family houses in the area and when he advertised he indicated that the properties were in Hayden Bridge, which brought a good response. He attributed that to the quality of the neighborhood. He hoped the development was equal in quality to what was in place now. Mr. Schindler was concerned about freeway access and questioned whether there had been any access upgrades to the area for some time. He suggested the development would be a ‘city within a city,’ and he feared it could compound the issue of access to the freeway, particularly at peak hours. He hoped the project would lead to some improvements in the area. Mr. Schindler said the neighborhood needed 28<sup>th</sup> Street access to the freeway; at one time, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had indicated to him it could construct a splitter-divider between 14<sup>th</sup> and 42<sup>nd</sup> streets to allow people to get on and off the freeway. He also asked if a gas station could be included in the development as the neighborhood currently lacked one.

**Jean Fraga**, 2074 Lomond Avenue, Springfield, noted the current density of four houses per acre on her street and the much higher planned densities in the proposed development. She asked where families would get rooms. She did not think detached garages made sense in Oregon in the winter. She said if she was doing the development she would make the residential lots larger and the development less dense to give families more room. Ms. Fraga was also concerned about traffic issues given the bottlenecks in traffic on Marcola and Mohawk roads. Ms. Fraga emphasized her concern about the proposed densities, saying they did not make sense. She hoped the children could be accommodated in local schools as she had a difficult time believing so many houses would generate so few children.

Commissioner Carpenter believed that nodal development was supposed to minimize traffic through connectivity and the greater availability of public transit. Mr. Karp concurred. Commissioner Carpenter asked how many trips the residential development would generate in one day or one hour. Mr. Satre asked that the question be deferred pending the release of the staff report.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter, Mr. Karp recalled the zoning on the property was campus industrial and confirmed there was a trip cap that was discussed in the staff report. He noted that the proposed development was anticipated to generate less traffic than the maximum permitted. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Karp said he believed the trip generation was less than would have been expected at full build out under the campus industrial zone. He recalled that was a requirement for the amendment to the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan General Area Plan (Metro Plan). He recalled that ODOT had imposed a requirement for improvements to the eastbound off-ramp on I-105; that was the only condition imposed by ODOT on the property. The agency had not required an additional on- or off-ramp at 28<sup>th</sup> Street.

Commissioner Smith asked Mr. Satre to discuss the density requirements governing the plan. Mr. Satre said the zoning on the north half of the property was Medium-Density Residential (MDR). He reminded the commission that 35 acres of the property in question was already zoned MDR. MDR had a minimum of ten lots per acre. He said the development patterns on Lomond Street were typical of low-density residential zoning. The nodal overlay had increased the minimum in the MDR to 12 units per net acre. He defined net acre as the gross acreage minus the right-of-way.

Speaking to Ms. Fraga’s concerns about open space, Mr. Satre pointed out that there were 20 acres of open space on the development site because Springfield’s cluster subdivision

ordinance required that 20 percent of the site be set aside for open space. He said that the only way the developer could meet the minimum density and have some detached houses was to employ the cluster ordinance.

**Tony Saxman**, 2709 21<sup>st</sup> Street, Springfield, Oregon, said he favored the development proposal. He perceived the development as an opportunity for Springfield. The development could benefit multiple components in the community. The development provided an opportunity for people to live and work in the same place and interact with each other in the open spaces and pathways. He thought it provided an opportunity to develop a community within the larger community. He said the property would develop in some way, and the master plan was a way to look at the entire property as opposed to smaller pieces of it in separate processes. Mr. Saxman thanked Mr. Satre for his involvement with the community as he tried to make the project work, and thanked the commission for the opportunity to participate.

**Greg Vik**, 304 Biltmore Drive, Eugene, supported the project as he believed there was a place for well-planned mixed-use development following the nodal concept. He noted his own background in construction and said his family's long-term residence in Springfield. He said the development offered quality housing with the added community benefit of the mixed-use orientation. He thought the proposed densities meant the land would be used effectively and efficiently. Mr. Vik thought the development was a symbol of Springfield's successful effort to transform into the city of the future in regard to both function and aesthetic. He also cited the benefits of new dollars to the community from construction jobs, employment opportunities, places to live, work, and shop within walking distance, the new greenway, additions to the tax base, and stormwater system improvements. All around, he thought the development would be "another something cool" for Springfield.

**Tony Dandurand**, 3050 Yolanda Avenue, Springfield, anticipated some increased traffic from the development but was most concerned about the light pollution he anticipated it would produce. He said the brochure produced by Satre appeared to show the type of street light that projected glare into the night. He noted recent development near him that prevented one from viewing the night sky. He wanted to know if his concerns about light pollution would be addressed in the planning for the property.

**Nick Shevchynski**, 2347 Marcola Road, Springfield, expressed concerns about increased traffic on Marcola Road as a result of the development. He said that people traveling to and from Lowe's would create more traffic. Retail development in the project would add more traffic and the road was already in poor condition. Mr. Shevchynski also asked about fire protection. He averred that many of the hydrants on Marcola Road did not work.

**Donna Lent**, 1544 E Street, Springfield, expressed concern that more commercial and residential development was not needed because there was sufficient vacant retail space in the area, the need for a home improvement center was satisfied by the location of Jerry's in Springfield, and because two houses in her neighborhood had not sold in the last year. She said the area lacked a park where residents could walk their dogs and children could play.

**Don Gray**, 3324 Montebella, Springfield, also was concerned about traffic from the new development. He said traffic had worsened over time with the construction of new developments. He was also concerned about truck traffic as the truck route was 42<sup>nd</sup> Street and trucks would travel to Lowe's in the evening, disrupting neighbors. He

expressed concern about the bicycle path at the location it crossed 28<sup>th</sup> Street, saying it was dangerous for bicyclists to cross now and more children on the path would increase the problem. Mr. Gray liked the idea of an off ramp at 28<sup>th</sup> Street. He liked the development overall but did not support a Lowe's store given the fact of the Home Depot being constructed nearby.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter about the chances the developer could work with Lane County to improve the bicycle path where it ran through the area, Mr. Satre said that he had spoken to representatives of EWEB, which owned the path, about the applicant's hopes to connect to the path, and EWEB had indicated the applicant must apply for and receive an access permit to construct the connections. He believed that EWEB might wish the applicant to do some improvements to the bicycle path in return for that access permit.

Mr. Leahy clarified for the Planning Commission that the Ballot Measure 37 claim filed on the old Winco site was likely to be superseded by the passage of Ballot Measure 49. If that interpretation was correct, it was unlikely that a Home Depot would be constructed on that site without further land use actions.

Commissioner Cross asked what could go on the site if the economy did not support a new Lowe's store. Mr. Satre said that any use that fit inside the community commercial zone could locate on the site.

**Nancy Falk**, 2567 Marcola Road, Springfield, spoke of the permanency of development once constructed. She noted the history of Albertsons in Springfield and the fact that it left behind empty buildings when it moved to new locations. She noted the long time the Winco building had sat empty. She said that competition was good, but she thought Springfield had enough local businesses to support. Ms. Falk believed residents owed local businesses some allegiance. Big non-local businesses could write off their losses but the community was left with big empty eyesores that were difficult to fill. Ms. Falk criticized the type of high-density housing being proposed on what she said was river-bottom land with cornfields and noted similar housing that had been constructed in Eugene, which she found unsightly.

Mr. Karp responded to testimony. He said that there were many cities that regulated light pollution; Springfield was not one of them. The light poles and fixtures featured in the brochures were an alternative lighting approach currently permitted by the City.

Commissioner Beyer acknowledged Mr. Karp's remarks about street lighting in residential area but said under City Code the street lights in commercial areas were screened and focused onto the use below to avoid casting illumination in other areas. Mr. Karp agreed.

Commissioner Cross asked if the master plan depicted who would occupy the big box on the site, or did it make a difference. Mr. Karp said it did not make a difference. The media had reported that Lowe's was interested in the site.

Commissioner Moore asked if staff had information about tax base impacts from the development. Mr. Karp said the Lane County Tax Assessor provided that information, but there was no code requirement for that information. Mr. Satre might have some information about that.

Commissioner Carpenter asked how the public could address the TIA in its absence. Mr. Karp responded that the TIA was generally a very specialized document and the staff review process responded to issues raised by the report; those issues were addressed in the staff report. The public had the opportunity to review the file, and to his knowledge, no one had made the request. Staff could make the studies available to the commission and public on CDs. He noted that one person had requested a copy of the CD. Mr. Leahy reviewed the period of time left for public comment, and Commissioner Carpenter indicated his concerns were addressed.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if Springfield had received any comments from the Lane Transit District. Mr. Karp said that LTD submitted some testimony in regard to the need for bus stops on the collector street, Martin Drive. That would be included in the staff report.

### **Response from the Applicant**

Mr. Satre reported that he had met with representatives of LTD and they indicated LTD would want two bus stops to be installed on the north side of Marcola Road when the development occurred. The development team had been asked not to preclude an opportunity for LTD to provide stops on the new collector at sometime in the future when ridership levels justified them.

Mr. Satre emphasized that the traffic studies were available to the public and were part of the record.

Mr. Satre spoke to the issue of light pollution, saying the development team continued to study light designs with the aim of ensuring there was a cut-off.

Mr. Satre discussed fire protection, saying the development team would design adequate utilities, including hydrants.

Mr. Satre reviewed the actions requested of the commission by staff and confirmed the end dates for the submittal public testimony.

The commission briefly discussed whether new information could be introduced into the record. Mr. Leahy believed that the nature of what the commission accepted was at the discretion of the commission; for example, if someone came in with a new TIA, he believed the commission had discretion to accept. He did not think the commission had to be bound by timelines if it felt it received information germane to its decision and needed more time. He pointed out that the process the commission established made it more difficult to enforce how information was received.

After consultation with the applicant's attorney, Mr. Leahy posited a situation in which someone in opposition to the development included a lot of new information in the record that required analysis by the applicant and asked what the applicant was to do. Commissioner Carpenter pointed out that the staff report and rebuttal information would be received simultaneously by the commission on December 11. Commissioner Beyer suggested that the applicant could ask the commission to delay its decision. Mr. Leahy agreed.

Commissioner Carpenter asked if the staff report could be placed on the City's Web page at the earliest possible time. Mr. Karp said yes. He reiterated Mr. Satre's offer of the CD with the application and traffic analyses.

Commissioner Moore thanked all those who attended and encouraged them to submit written statements.

Commissioner Cross asked Mr. Satre if he was comfortable with the process. Mr. Satre noted that the commission had the ability to make a decision tonight, but indicated his acceptance of the timeline. He confirmed that the record for new evidence closed on November 27, but on December 11 anyone could rebut anything in the record, even if that rebuttal constituted new evidence.

*Commissioner Beyer, seconded by Commissioner Leezer, moved to use the underlying assumptions as set forth in the staff comments, to close the oral record, and hold the written record open until November 27. The staff report would be ready for public review on December 4, and the Planning Commission would convene on December 11 to consider the application and render a decision. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.*

Commissioner Cross called for a brief meeting break.

## **LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING**

- **Annexation Transition Code Amendment – City of Springfield – LRP2007-00026 –**

Mr. Mott clarified that the commission would be making a recommendation to the City Council. He called attention to the criteria of approval associated with the amendment, noting they were addressed in the staff report.

Mr. Mott reviewed the existing record for the item, which was to amend the Springfield Development Code to implement changes in State law related to annexations. The staff report including findings addressing the three relevant criteria taken from Chapter 5 of the code. He noted the ordinance received by the commission and posted on the City's Web page, and said that subsequent to that staff had made further revisions to avoid having to make additional changes in the near-term. He acknowledged it was likely staff would still have to return with changes.

Mr. Mott reviewed the ordinance and noted the changes made to the ordinance since the commission meeting packet was mailed. Commissioners asked questions clarifying the details of the ordinance. Mr. Mott recommended that the commission recommend the proposed changes to the City Council as submitted.

Commissioner Cross opened the public hearing.

**Jerry Ritter**, 1895 Yolanda Avenue, represented the Springfield UGB Chapter of Oregon Communities for a Voice in Annexation, saw nothing in the proposed ordinance that raised any concerns for him. He said the ordinance did refer to public rights-of-way in annexations, which was a "hot topic" in Eugene. He said the law had changed as far as the use of rights-of-way for boundaries for territories to be annexed. He confirmed, in response to a question from Commissioner Beyer, that he was referring to island annexations and changes made to Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 222.750. He said the City appeared to have limited itself to the annexation protocol found in ORS 222, and he

thought the commission should be aware that was not the only allowable approach. Mr. Ritter said the public hearing was being held because the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission was abolished and because of significant changes in annexation law. He attributed those changes to a few Oregon municipalities with overly aggressive annexation policies, and said Springfield was not one of those municipalities. He expressed appreciation for that and hoped the tradition continued and the City did not pursue the aggressive annexation recommendations contained in the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan General Area Plan.

Commissioner Cross asked Mr. Mott about other approaches. Mr. Mott acknowledged there were other approaches and indicated City staff would continue to work on the issue for the next six to eight months, and that work could include examination of those other approaches. However, ORS 222 was very similar to the process employed in the past except that annexation proposals would go to the City Council rather than the boundary commission.

Commissioner Beyer observed that the council had not been overly aggressive with property owners in the past. Mr. Mott said the City distinguished between the activities permitted on land with an UF10 overlay as opposed to land without that overlay. The UF10 overlay permitted a certain level of development activity, for example, a single-family home, without annexation. Property owners seeking to partition a lot would have to seek annexation to divide the property because they were increasing the potential density of the property. The City did not allow subdivisions to occur without annexation.

There being no other requests to speak, Chair Cross closed the public hearing.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Kirschenmann about the reference in the State legislation that indicated it amended “most” of ORS 199, Mr. Mott said that was specific to the references in the law to the boundary commission.

*Commissioner Beyer, seconded by Commissioner Carpenter, that the commission recommend that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to Chapter 5 of the Development Code as outlined by staff, incorporating the findings of fact included in the staff report. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.*

- **Springfield Development Code Amendment – City of Springfield – LRP2007-00027–**

Mr. Mott entered the transmission memorandum to the Planning Commission, the staff report and findings, proposed amendments to the code, and a recommendation to the council supporting the changes into the record. He said that he items listed in the staff report were items that were missed when the Springfield Development Code was reformatted, which was not atypical when such a process occurred.

Commissioner Beyer observed that when the State legislature made such errors, the Legislative Counsel had authority to make corrections without a formal proceeding. City Attorney Leahy confirmed that the City had the same ability, but he had not had the opportunity to review the amendments because staff was interested in seeing them enacted before the end of the year. He briefly outlined the usual process. He indicated he would review the amendments before they were reviewed by the council.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Carpenter regarding the staff commentary on page 5 of Attachment 2, which referred to subsections that did not appear in the

document, Mr. Mott indicated staff would amend the text before the amendment was considered by the City Council.

Commissioner Beyer, seconded by Commissioner Kirschenmann, moved to recommend the amendment with the corrections identified by Commissioner Carpenter to the City Council. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

### **BUSINESS FROM THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR**

- Development Director Bill Grile was not present to make the report.

### **REPORT OF COUNCIL ACTION**

- Chair Cross deferred the item to a future meeting.

### **BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION**

- Chair Cross recalled that the commission had agreed to continue its work session discussion at the close of the public hearings but he advised that the commission defer that discussion to the next meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.