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**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Scully called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Chair Scully, Vice Chair Craft and Commissioners Maul, Moss-Thomas and Mork. Commissioners Malek and Montero were absent.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of August 20, 2015 were adopted.

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no general public comments.

**STUDY ITEM: 145TH STREET CORRIDOR STUDY**

Chair Scully reviewed that when the proposed 145th Street Station Subarea Plan was presented earlier to the Commission, they recommended that no action be taken until the corridor study was completed. The City Council unanimously adopted the Commission’s recommendation. He said the Commission is particularly interested in timeline updates and any substantive information that has been reached thus far before they resume their discussions relative to the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan.

**Staff Presentation**

Mr. Seemann, Project Manager, provided an overview of the 145th Street Corridor Study, noting that it is the City’s only east/west corridor that extends across the City, providing connections to Interstate 5 (I-5), Lake City Way (SR522), and Aurora Avenue North (SR99). 145th Street is a principal arterial that will soon provide critical access to the new light rail station that will be located on the east side of the freeway. It has been neglected in recent years, and it is past time the City took a good look at what the future of the corridor could be.

Mr. Seemann reviewed that there is currently a lot of traffic congestion on 145th Street, particularly at the freeway interchange; the pedestrian and bicycle environment is deficient and even non-existent in many places; and there are high collision rates at some of the intersections. Unless these problems are addressed, people will have difficulty accessing the new light rail station. He shared pictures to illustrate the roadway’s existing problems. He explained that it is built very close to the edge of the right-of-way (ROW), leaving very little room for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Many of the existing pathways are not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible, and the congestion and poor pedestrian walkways have resulted in a lack of transit and bus stop facilities.

Mr. Seemann advised that the City’s goal is to create a corridor that supports all modes of travel (bicycles, pedestrians, single-occupancy vehicles, bus transit and light rail). The City Council developed 11 specific project goals to guide the corridor study, which has been in progress for over a year. City staff met with representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and a consultant (CH2M Hill) was hired to help design the corridor. The design team provides on-going briefings to the City Council. The study is currently funded, and funding ($4.6 million PSRC Grant) has also been set aside for the design of the Aurora Avenue North to I-5 section in 2016. More recently, the State set aside $25 million for the entire corridor, which is currently programmed for 2025. The City is working to obtain clear information about what the money can be used for and possibly moving it up so work on the corridor can take place prior to the light rail coming in 2023.

Mr. Seemann reviewed that the first open house for the corridor study was held on May 20th, and the next open house is scheduled for September 30th at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall. A final open house will likely be scheduled in December. The intent is to present a recommendation for a preferred alternative to the City Council in January. He noted that the Citizens Advisory Task Force (CATF), the Interjurisdictional Technical Team (ITT), and key stakeholders have also provided valuable input throughout the process. Project partners include WSDOT, Sound Transit (ST), King County, the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and the Cities of Bothell, Kenmore, Shoreline and Lake Forest Park. He emphasized that the City of Shoreline does not control any of the roadway, itself. The north half is in King County, the south half is in Seattle, and it is classified as a State highway. The study is just the first step in the process of improving the corridor. Approval of a preferred alternative will be followed by environmental review and design, ROW and property acquisition and then construction. At this time, the study team is gathering information and developing the alternatives that will be presented to the public at the September 30th open house. Following the open house, the alternatives will be refined and a preferred alternative will be presented for City Council and public review before the end of the year. The goal is to obtain final approval of the preferred alternative in January 2016.

Commissioner Malek said his understanding is that the necessary ROW and property acquisition had already been accomplished. Mr. Seemann answered no. He explained that there is only 60 feet of existing ROW, and all of the alternatives will most likely require more.

Mr. Seemann reported that the first open house in May was attended by a good cross section of citizens from throughout the region (58% Shoreline and 40% Seattle), and most of the interest came from people who own property within five blocks of the corridor. The biggest concerns voiced at the open house were traffic congestion and lack of pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities. Those in attendance stressed the need for a safe pedestrian environment and improved ADA accessibility. Bicycles facilities could be provided both along and off the corridor, and transit needed to be improved.

Mr. Seemann reviewed each of the four alternatives as follows:

1. **Study Concept 1** is consistent with the current conditions and would be considered the no-action alternative.

1. **Study Concept 2** would utilize a 60-foot ROW and the curb-to-curb street width would be 44 feet. That leaves about 16 feet for narrow sidewalks that do not meet the City’s standard (5-foot landscape strip and 8-foot sidewalk). In addition, the power poles would be in the middle of the sidewalks making it difficult to negotiate. Study Concept 2 is very similar to Study Concept 1, and it attempts to stay within the 60-foot ROW as much as possible while adding slightly wider sidewalks. The concept would improve the situation to some degree but would not require a lot of change. This is good from a property acquisition standpoint, but would not improve access for the various modes of transportation. Off-corridor bike lanes could run parallel with the roadway.
2. **Study Concept 3** would utilize a 94-foot ROW, with a curb-to-curb street width of 58 feet. The concept identifies four lanes with a continuous turn lane, which could be a landscape median when not needed. Aside from the additional travel lanes, there would be 13-foot sidewalks with 5-foot striped bicycle lanes on each side and 5-foot planter strips separating the sidewalks from the street. The shared sidewalk (pedestrian and bicycle) concept shown in Study Concepts 3 and 4 are meant to be mixed and matched. The design team will also continue to evaluate other options for the roadway, such as road diets and Bus and Turn (BAT) lanes.
3. **Study Concept 4** would utilize between 101 and 117 feet of ROW, with a curb-to-curb street width of 69 feet. The concept identifies a six-lane roadway, with limited left turn lanes and right turn/bus lanes. The shared sidewalk (pedestrian and bicycle) concept identifies 8-foot sidewalks, a 6-foot bicycle lane on one side, and 5-foot planting strips. This concept addresses all of the multi-modal needs identified in the goals, but it would require nearly twice as much ROW as what currently exists. Another option would be to run the buses down the center lanes, with two vehicular lanes on each side. Because it is so important to provide good pedestrian access to the new light rail station, it has been suggested that a pedestrian/bicycle bridge be provided.

Mr. Seemann provided a matrix that is being used to evaluate each of the study concepts by addressing criteria such as improved pedestrian safety and access, improved transit speed and reliability, improved bike safety and mobility, improved vehicle safety and mobility, consistency with regional plans, and improved stormwater management. He summarized that the next steps include further analyzing the three study concepts, selecting a preferred concept, assessing the impacts, and developing a project cost estimate.

**Public Comment**

**Dave Lange, Shoreline,** suggested that the study should provide capacity per hour numbers for each of the scenarios that are being presented. A graph of the time versus hourly volume of observed usage would be a useful interpretive tool.

**Christine Southwick, Shoreline,** said that although it will be costly, she supports underground utilities because they take up less space. She referred to the Burke Gilman Trail in Lake Forest Park and cautioned that combining bicycles and people on the same pathway can be dangerous. It would be safer to have bicycles going bi-directional on one side and pedestrians on the other, and it would not require additional space. Another option is a 5-lane road with the bicyclists sharing the center lane. She pointed out that the 3-lane concept did not work well on 125th and questioned why the City is considering it as an option for 145th.

Ms. Southwick asked which part of the corridor design would be located in Seattle and if Seattle would be sharing the cost of the improvements. Mr. Seemann answered that no decisions have been made as to which parts of the corridor design would be located in Shoreline and Seattle, but representatives from the City of Seattle are part of the technical team and these questions will be addressed in more detail as the plan is refined. The four alternatives are preliminary and the team is seeking feedback from the public on the various elements contained in each one as they work towards a preferred alternative.

**Continued Staff and Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Maul agreed with Mr. Lange that information relative to the capacity of each of the designs would be helpful, and he asked if the study would also project the need for and impacts of the station. Mr. Seemann answered that the team will look at the projected volumes as the analysis moves forward. One of the philosophical questions looking forward is, does the City want to design a corridor that accommodates the needs of all modes of transportation both now and in the future or a corridor that gives people choices. For example, an alternative that dedicates the outer lanes to transit would not accommodate all of the future traffic demand in the future. There are tradeoffs associated with each scenario, given the corridor’s constraints.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked how the Commission would be involved in the corridor study going forward. Mr. Cohen answered that the City Council will make the ultimate decision on the preferred alternative. Although the Commission will not be involved in the final decision, the study will certainly play into their future conversations about land uses in the 145th Street Station Subarea.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she spent a lot of time in a large city that has significant traffic congestion, and bicycles had to dodge the traffic using the roads and sidewalks. She recently visited the City again and found that recently installed bicycle lanes down the center of the street worked very well. She said she supports a pedestrian/bicycle bridge going to the 145th Street Station, which would solve a broad number of problems. Another option would be to widen the existing bridge to provide pedestrian and bicycle access. Mr. Seemann responded that the City has asked the State to consider the future potential of the existing bridge. Currently, there are five lanes, and there is a potential for six lanes if the sidewalks are removed. While they are aware that the area around the new station will be very challenging, they must also focus on the best options for the entire corridor.

Commissioner Malek asked if there is some way to connect the 145th Street Corridor to the Community Renewal Area (CRA) at the intersection of 155th Street. Considering the anticipated density in the CRA and the lower parking requirements, it would seem relevant to connect these residents to the station. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that the Interurban Trail provides a connection from the CRA to the 145th Street Corridor, but not all the way to the station. Mr. Seemann agreed that it is important to consider how the 145th Street Corridor can serve the larger community. The corridor study is meant to be the beginning of the conversation and not the end. He noted that rapid ride bus service is available along Aurora Avenue North, and perhaps the corridor could be designed to strengthen the connections. They must also carefully consider the right balance between single-occupancy vehicles, transit and other modes.

Commissioner Mork asked if the current alternatives would have bicycle and pedestrian access either on the corridor or another route, or if there would there be two options for access. Mr. Seemann said he does not consider it an either/or concept. Citizens have indicated support for alternate bikeways that run parallel to the corridor, but they also want facilities along the corridor. In addition, many have expressed a need to better connect the entire area with bicycles and pedestrians, and not just along the corridor. Although Study Concept 2 would not accommodate bicycles directly along the corridor, Study Concepts 3 and 4 would ideally have three options for bicyclists (bikeways on both sides of 145th Street and an additional bikeway along 155th Street. Commissioner Mork said she supports the additional bicycle facilities and expressed her belief that people are willing to ride their bikes much further than ½ mile to access services.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas expressed her belief that the BAT lanes are absolutely essential, with the exception of the section just past Aurora Avenue North over to Greenwood Avenue. Although this stretch is very congested, perhaps a road diet would be more affective. Sound Transit recently published its wish list for ST3, which includes BAT lanes on 145th from SR522 to Aurora Avenue. If this project is included in a ballot measure in the future, there may be synergy and funding to make the improvements along the entire corridor. Placing BAT lanes down the center does not make sense since buses would not be able to pick up people waiting on 145th Street without requiring them to cross lanes of traffic. Speed and reliability are important for both transit and riders. While there is a dearth of transportation east/west, it is not easily accessible and 145th Street is intimidating.

Mr. Seemann pointed out that the study breaks the corridor into three pieces: Aurora Avenue North to I-5, the freeway area, and I-5 to SR522. BAT lanes may be appropriate in the section between SR522 and the transit station to bring people in from the communities to the east and north. Based on comments from the community, the preferred alternative may very well be a combination of Study Concepts 3 and 4. While Study Concept 2 would provide underground power and some pedestrian benefits, it would be costly and still impact a number of parcels without getting a lot in return.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas commented that when streets are very wide (as per Study Concepts 3 and 4), it is difficult for people using strollers, wheelchairs, etc. to get all the way across. She suggested the City consider providing islands that allow people a place to stand midway across the street.

Chair Scully said he was glad to hear that an Interjurisdictional Technical Team (ITT) has been formed to provide input into the study because the City does not own the road. He asked if the ITT supports any or all of the study concepts, and what is their position as far as funding and ownership. Mr. Seemann said the City of Seattle has been participating in the ITT meetings, as well as other discussions with City staff. They are very supportive of the study to date. However, it is important to note that the proposed improvements would be made keeping the center line fixed, with improvements distributed equally on both sides of the roadway. That means property on both sides would be impacted. Another option would be to shift the alignment to one side or the other so that property acquisition is only required on one side. He emphasized that the City of Shoreline does not own any of the corridor, and a lot of cooperation will be required from both the City of Seattle and WSDOT. While funding and ownership are important questions that need to be addressed, the study is currently focused on identifying the right features for the corridor, how to treat non-motorized facilities, etc.

Chair Scully said he assumes that the wetland and steep slope issues that exist in a few locations will be addressed during the design phase. Mr. Seemann answered that both environmental property acquisition issues would be addressed as part of the design. In addition, he noted that many house are very close to the ROW and even a little widening could have an impact on these properties.

Mr. Seemann announced that the Citizen’s Advisory Task Force (CATF) is meeting on September 9th at 7:00 p.m. and the ITT will meet at 3:00 p.m. on the same day. The next public open house is scheduled for September 30th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

**STUDY ITEM: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – PART 3**

**Staff Presentation**

Mr. Szafran explained that the purpose of the presentation is to introduce Part 3 of the 2015 Development Code Amendments and discuss and answer the Commission’s questions. In addition, the Commission will discuss some revised amendments relative to how to approve Sound Transit’s development activities. He reviewed the purpose of code amendments and introduced the 17 staff-initiated code amendments (Attachment 1) and 1 privately-initiated code amendment (Attachment 3) as follows:

**Fee Waivers for Affordable Housing**

* SMC 20.30.100 gives the authority for the Director to waive permit fees based on King County’s affordability criteria.
* SMC 20.40.230 and 20.40.235 alerts the reader of the possibility of a permit fee waiver for affordable housing.

**Preparing for Sound Transit**

* SMC 20.20.034 provides a new definition for Multi-Modal Access Improvements, which are improvements that are not adjacent to a development project but mitigate impacts from that development.
* SMC 20.50.240 requires the availability of water and power at high-capacity transit centers. This provides infrastructure to accommodate mobile food carts and other activities in these public spaces.
* SMC 20.50.320 requires Sound Transit to comply with Shoreline’s tree regulations. Sound Transit will be clearing and grading a lot of trees and vegetation from the ROW and it is important to ensure that the City’s tree regulations apply to these activities.
* SMC 20.50.330 clarifies that trees abutting a development project will be evaluated and must comply with the requirements of SMC 20.50.330.
* SMC 20.50.350 clarifies that trees abutting a development project shall be managed, protected and replaced based on the City’s tree code regulations.
* SMC 20.50.360 specifies when trees need to be removed offsite and replaced in accordance with on-site standards. It increases the height of the replacement tree from 6 feet to 12 feet to mitigate off-site impacts.
* SMC 20.50.370 contains tree protection standards that will apply to on-site development and abutting properties. Currently, the City’s tree protection standards only apply to trees that are on site.

**Transitional Encampments**

* SMC 20.40.120 changes the name “tent city” to “transitional encampments.”
* SMC 20.40.535 adds criterion for background checks when a transitional encampment locates in Shoreline.

**Development Updates**

* SMC 20.30.380 raises the thresholds for short plats in the Mixed Use Residential Zones from 4 to 9. State law allows jurisdictions to raise the thresholds to nine and still have it be an administratively-approved process.
* A City-initiated amendment to SMC 20.50.020 alerts property owners that a ROW dedication may reduce density potential. Alternatively, a privately-initiated amendment would allow a property owner to calculate lot size prior to ROW or drainage dedication.
* SMC 20.60.140 changes the word “or” to “and.”

Director Markle referred to a memorandum dated September 3rd, which outlines proposed revisions to the Sound Transit Amendments. She explained that the City Attorney has voiced concern that development agreements may not be the right process for permitting light rail facilities. There will be a mixture of zones along the light rail corridor; and as per State Law, development agreements are not designed to accommodate deviations or variances from the underlying zoning regulations. Because a light rail facility/system is considered an essential public facility, it is appropriate for the City to allow for deviations or variances from underlying zoning to accommodate the use. The City Attorney is now recommending the City use the process identified in the Comprehensive Plan for siting essential public facilities as a special use permit process, instead.

Director Markle further explained that the City Attorney has raised concern about processing the light rail facility/system projects as legislative actions. As per the current code, a special use permit is a quasi-judicial action, and a development agreement is approved legislatively. Legislative items go before the Planning Commission and then to the City Council, and communication outside of the meeting about the subject matter is allowed. With a quasi-judicial action, this communication would be considered ex-parte and would not be allowed. One of the reasons for selecting the development agreement process for station projects is to allow the ability for commissions and councils to speak openly and often about the designs of the station. A special use permit would go directly to the Hearing Examiner, and would not be presented to the Planning Commission or City Council. If the Commission agrees with the concept of using the special use permit versus the development agreement, they could keep the decision with the Hearing Examiner. Another option is to have it be a quasi-judicial process that goes to the Commission and Council for a recommendation and decision rather than to the Hearing Examiner. She said there are also some concerns relative to the appeal authority. The appeal authority for a legislative decision goes to the Growth Management Hearings Board as opposed to Superior Court. She advised that no changes have been proposed to Table 20.30.080, but she wanted to point out the concerns and potential options.

Director Markle referred to SMC 20.30.330, which outlines the special use permit (SUP) process, noting that the purpose section (A), as written, fits well with what the City is trying to accomplish with light rail facilities. Section B contains decision criterion that applies to all special uses, and no changes have been proposed. Section C is new language that outlines decision criterion that only applies to light rail facilities/systems. As proposed:

* **Criteria C.1** requires that the proposed development use innovative, aesthetic, energy efficient and environmentally sustainable architecture and site design. This language was added to the development agreement process with transit projects in mind, but it is also appropriate for other types of development agreements.
* **Criteria C.2** also comes from the existing development agreement criteria. While it is repetitive of the generic criteria in Section B, it is appropriate to be very specific to ensure that certain transportation improvements are made in conjunction with the light rail station and facilities.
* **Criteria C.3** has to do with other utilities and public services and is specific for a reason.
* **Criteria C.4** comes from the existing development agreement criteria, as well, and has to do with architectural design. The criteria are envisioned to let the City have some influence on the design of the structures. Even if the special use permit process is not be legislative, the City Council just approved a process for design review of the station, garages and facilities that is completely open to public participation. As adopted, the City Council will give a formal recommendation on design to Sound Transit.

Director Markle referred to Section D of SMC 20.30.330, which outlines the additional submittal requirements for light rail transit facilities/systems. As proposed Sound Transit would be required to provide additional studies to address anticipated issues, concerns, and needs to be identified and mitigated. The additional studies include a construction management plan, parking management plan, multi-modal access plan, neighborhood traffic plan, and transportation impact analysis.

Director Markle advised that the language in SMC 20.40.050 was moved from its previous location at the request of the City Attorney. Most of the facilities associated with the station will be located in WSDOT ROW, which is unzoned and it is completely unclear what regulations apply. The proposed language in Section C requires that a special district be created that defines the regulations that apply. Staff anticipates it will not be easy to define the boundaries of the special district. The idea is to capture not only the ROW, but properties to be acquired by Sound Transit for the purposes of the light rail facilities. The language proposed for this section is very similar to the language provided in the Staff Report. However, Section C.3 was amended to make it clear that the special use permit process outlined in this section could not be used to alter a critical area. Lastly, she noted that Section D.1 was amended to make it clear that for properties that are zoned or designated as a special district, the regulations pertaining to that zone or district would apply. “Light rail transit facility/system” was also added to the Use Table 20.40.140 as a special use in all zones.

**Public Comment**

**Dave Lang, Shoreline,** suggested that the City reopen the transit impact fee ordinance and eliminate the fee for a work force of up to 15 people in the first 15 affordable housing units per lot. The City should also consider removing the transit impact fees around the stations and major transit corridors, as well as allowing a reduction in the parking requirement for affordable housing to match what is happening in King County. He also suggested that traffic impact fees should be used to direct development to where the City can handle it and discourage development where it cannot. He noted that the proposed amendments talk about pavement and impervious ground cover, and he suggested it would be appropriate to also address water treatment and collection standards. If Shoreline continues to lose trees, wouldn’t clean water be a good addition?

**Continued Staff and Commission Discussion**

Chair Scully asked if transportation impact fees for affordable housing would be a separate agenda item that will be discussed at a future meeting. Director Marklesaid there is already a waiver for affordable housing and transportation impact fees in the ordinance. Chair Scully said he also heard through the grapevine that the City Council was considering revisions to the ordinance and the Commission might be asked to comment on it. Director Marklesaid she has not heard that the affordable housing piece would be revisited and it is not part of the proposed amendments.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that parking and microhousing are hot-button issues, and it appears that the proposed amendments are intended to patch rather than fully address the problems. She voiced concern that the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on a large number of code amendments without having adequate time to digest the information. Chair Scully reviewed that the Commission has had study sessions for each part of the Development Code amendments. Although the Commission was asked to provide direction when each of the three parts were presented to them, no public hearing has been held. The Commission is not being asked to make a recommendation at this time, as a public hearing on all of the amendments is scheduled for a later date.

Chair Scully voiced concern that making station area development a quasi-judicial action would significantly limit the public’s ability to provide input. A quasi-judicial hearing is similar to a court case. Even if a quasi-judicial proposal comes before the Commission and City Council for a recommendation and final approval, the public’s ability to participate in the process would be limited and no discussion outside of the public hearing would be allowed. The look and feel of the station is going to be of significant importance to the community in which it is located, and he would like the process to remain legislative. He asked if the Comprehensive Plan could be amended to make any property owned by Sound Transit its own land use designation and zone. Mr. Szafran commented that this could be a problem given that much of the land that will be used for the station is located within the WSDOT ROW. Chair Scully asked if the City could zone the WSDOT ROW, and Director Markle agreed that is possible. However, she reminded the Commission that the Comprehensive Plan can only be amended once a year, and the amendment would not be docketed until next year. The City is trying to get all of the important regulations in place before Sound Transit completes its 30% design, which is scheduled for the 1st or 2nd quarter of 2016. Mr. Szafran added that it is important to have the right regulations in place when the permits start trickling in in the near future. The Commission had a discussion about whether or not the City Council could amend the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket to include the amendment proposed by Chair Scully. Director Markle agreed to seek legal counsel as to whether or not the City Council could add new amendments after the deadline has expired and the docket has been set.

Chair Scully commented that the draft amendments encapsulate a lot of what the City heard in the public comments about preserving trees and making sure the station fits in with the neighborhood as much as possible. However, he is concerned that excluding the public from the process going forward could result in justifiable backlash if it doesn’t look and feel like everyone thought it would.

Mr. Szafran referred to the conflicting amendments for SMC 20.50.020. He recalled that the city-initiated amendment would alert property owners that ROW dedication may reduce density potential, and the privately-initiated amendment would calculate lot size prior to the ROW dedication. Calculating lot size prior to the ROW dedication would require that the City allow substandard lot sizes so that no development potential is lost. It was noted that both amendments would be presented at the public hearing and staff would make a recommendation for the Commission’s consideration.

Again, Chair Scully voiced opposition to making light rail station projects quasi-judicial actions rather than legislative. The remainder of the Commissioners concurred. Director Markle agreed to ask the City Attorney to provide more information to support the recommendation that quasi-judicial is the best approach. She also agreed to explore other ideas such as a special use permit that is legislative or a completely different permit process for light rail station development.

Mr. Szafran announced that a public hearing on the complete set of Development Code amendments is scheduled for October 1st.

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Director Markle did not have any items to report.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no reports or announcements.

**AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING**

Chair Scully announced that a public hearing on the Critical Areas Ordinance Update is scheduled for September 17th.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Keith Scully Lisa Basher

Chair, Planning Commission Clerk, Planning Commission