

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE
PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL SESSION
MINUTES
Milwaukie City Hall
10722 SE Main Street
THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2017
6:30 PM**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Greg Hemer, Chair
Adam Argo, Vice Chair
John Burns
Sherry Grau
Kim Travis

STAFF PRESENT

Denny Egner, Planning Director
Amy Koski, Economic Dev. Coordinator
Brett Kelper, Associate Planner
Alex Roller, Engineering Tech II

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Shannah Anderson

1.0 Call to Order – Procedural Matters*

Chair Hemer called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and read the conduct of meeting format into the record.

***Note:** The information presented constitutes summarized minutes only. The meeting video is available by clicking the Video link at <http://www.milwaukieoregon.gov/meetings>.*

2.0 Worksession Item

- 2.1 Summary: North Milwaukie Industrial Area Draft Framework Plan and Implementation Strategy Overview
Staff: Amy Koski

Amy Koski, Economic Development Coordinator, stated the update on the North Milwaukie Industrial Area (NMIA) Plan was to get feedback on key concepts and prepare for the upcoming public hearing. She noted the extensive public process used in developing the draft Framework Plan and Implementation Strategy over the last nine months.

Alex Dupey, MIG, presented the NMIA Draft Framework Plan (Plan) and Implementation Strategy overview via PowerPoint, and noted the Plan was intended to maintain and increase the area's employment potential for next 20 years even as changes occurred in technology, transportation, industry, etc.

Key comments and responses to Commissioner questions from staff and Mr. Dupey were as follows:

- The vision, goals, and objectives had already been vetted through a significant public process, which included the NMIA Advisory Committee, City Council, and a public meeting; some of the comments received had been incorporated.
- While incubator and smaller businesses were the new trend, larger lots with easy truck access were preferable for warehousing and distribution. Transitioning warehouses to flex space and housing smaller incubator spaces was the kind of low-cost adaptive reuse of the older and well-maintained buildings presently occurring in the NMIA. Businesses were also looking for walkable destinations, such as retail, restaurants, and transit that supported the area.
- The Plan would help address how to shift from the adaptive reuse of existing buildings to new construction in the near-term to reach the project vision to attract innovative and entrepreneurial businesses that would increase employment density, provide family wage jobs, and transition from a regional to world-class area.

- The NMIA was best suited for small-scale manufacturing. Heavy manufacturing required a lot of space and would locate elsewhere.
- The sewer treatment systems described in the Plan could be funded through a variety of funding mechanisms, including a local improvement district; however, further study was required.
- In the ecodistrict section, other green infrastructure options should be considered, like green streets and roofs, as well as riparian restoration rather than concepts like sewer mining, which was further out in terms of feasibility and application.

Discussion and comments regarding whether the Ecodistrict Framework made sense and was achievable in the NMIA's long-term vision included:

- A more tangible definition was needed of the achievements necessary to declare the area an ecodistrict. Strengthening the targets and linking the specific actions to implement would facilitate knowing an ecodistrict had been achieved.
- The climate action plan was yet undeveloped.
- The ecodistrict concept should be driven by businesses and not hamper businesses looking to relocate to the area. The ecodistrict could be a selling feature for the City of repurposing the existing buildings. Over-regulations could hamper the development and site changeover, but the City could take actions to help transition the area in concert with the vision of an ecodistrict.

Discussion and comments regarding the proposed zoning, the appropriate amount of commercial/retail square footage, and the minimum and maximum building heights was as follows:

- City Council established a policy direction to not add residential in the new NMIA Zone, but to preserve the existing industry and employment uses.
- The Business Industrial (BI) Zone in Milwaukie was a good example for the southern portion of the NMIA in terms of buildings size and a local retail and restaurant hub serving the employees.
- No feedback or concerns had been received about tall structures next to the highway. Solar access and other design standards would apply to building heights to avoid shading issues around Johnson Creek. Given Johnson Creek's reputation as a great amenity, it was important to pay particular attention to how development would interact with that environment.
- Public agencies owned a large portion and key areas of the NMIA. Those agencies were represented on the advisory committees along with property and business owners, residents, nonprofit organizations, and City staff.
- Manufacturers should be able to have retail space to sell their manufactured goods, but retail as a primary use should not be allowed.
- The ODOT building and large old tree in front were defining elements of the area. Including language to preserve, relocate, and repurpose the ODOT building was suggested. Opportunities to repurpose the buildings could infuse interest into the area in the short-term. ODOT was a willing partner on the advisory group and participated in conversations about what to do with the site, which ODOT now used only for vehicle storage

Ms. Koski announced the public open house on June 27 at 4:30 pm would be followed by the Planning Commission public hearing at 6:30 pm. The City Council public hearing was scheduled for July 18, 2017. Commissioners were asked to email any further comments or questions on transportation to staff.

Chair Hemer called for a brief recess and reconvened the meeting at approximately 7:46 pm.

3.0 Public Hearing

- 3.1 Summary: Rusk Rd Planned Development
Applicant/Owner: Brownstone Development, Inc. / Turning Point Church
Address: 13333 SE Rusk Rd
File: PD-2017-01
Staff: Brett Kolver

Chair Hemer reopened the public hearing and read the conduct of quasi-judicial hearing format into the record.

Vice Chair Argo declared a potential conflict of interest, noting two members of the applicant's team, Scott Emmens and Zachary Horowitz, were former coworkers. He has had no conversations with any applicant team member about the application.

Chair Hemer declared that when he worked at Milwaukie Lumber five years ago, he had worked with the late Ernie Green, who worked for Brownstone Development.

Vice Chair Argo and **Commissioner Grau** indicated they had reviewed the materials from the previous hearing and were prepared to participate.

Chair Hemer called for public testimony.

In Support

Edward Hacmac, 13033 SE Rusk Road, stated that although his property flooded twice in the last decade, he believed the culvert under the expressway would reduce the risk of the subject property flooding. Traffic was his biggest concern. The school district has a plan to eventually relocate the nearby bus barn, which should dramatically affect traffic. The district line for the two area high schools bisects the property and could cause increased traffic depending on which school system the site ends up feeding into. He suggested working with the church and using its property to help address traffic and wetlands issues. Some wetlands and oaks could be saved by relocating lots from the southwest portion of the site to the area near the community gardens and rearranging the turnaround at the end. Changes along Rusk Road could create an extra lane for turn lane at the Highway 224 intersection.

Eugene Zaharie (5273 SE Jackson St) was called forward to testify but was no longer present. **Mr. Egnor** later read aloud the comment that Mr. Zaharie had written on his sign-in slip.

In Opposition

The following people were called for public testimony, but they were no longer in attendance: Christina McCusker, Dan Sweet, John Christianson, Jean Dugan, Brad Whittington, and Mark Fitzsimmons.

Kirby Broderick, 6109 SE Eric St, suggested solutions to several issues, including flooding resulting from prior fill and development, as well as traffic and pedestrian safety. He questioned the foundation of the application, and contended the application was not an affordable housing solution but rather would offer housing at prices the market would bear.

Dominic Maze, 2705 SE 62nd Ave, Portland, noted he was a professional biologist familiar with the ecology and hydrology of this site. While building on the fill area was appropriate, the wetland and oak habitat on the site made most of the site inappropriate for housing. His professional opinion differed from the arborist's report in that he found no diseased Oregon white oaks on the site.

- He disagreed that retention ponds improved water quality, arguing there was a net loss of water quality at the site with the disturbance of the wetlands and their canopy. He urged the

Commission not to allow the variance for this housing development near this rare Oregon white oak woodland growing with ash trees.

- He believed the retention ponds would not be adequate to handle the extremely highwater table in the floodplain in the winter, given the amount of impervious surface proposed. In addition, the non-native plants slated for the retention ponds were not appropriate to the site and would require the use of herbicides in the retention ponds.

Wallace Brown, 5824 SE Kellogg Creek Dr, said there was significant risk for flooding with the addition of more impervious surface at the site, and he noted the back of his property at the corner of Kellogg Creek Dr and Rusk Rd flooded every year. He would like to see more risk mitigation. While Milwaukie should encourage growth, the community should also consider what risk they were encouraging in the future and whether this site plan was the best way to mitigate that risk.

Joseph Edge, Oak Grove Community Council (Clackamas CPO) Director, said the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) was currently working to implement the new regulations for cities participating in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance program by March 2018. Most of the houses constructed on the site would lie within the 500-year flood plain, which would see more frequent flood activity due to climate change. The Commission should consider how to mitigate the risk to life and property with creative developments that took into account the increased frequency of a 500-year flood. He agreed this was not a proposal for affordable housing; a development selling at market rates with the residents dependent on cars was not affordable housing for families. He encouraged the Commission to consider what outstanding amenities were being offered and to consider the impacts of allowing variances to create sites without buildable areas outside of the Habitat Conservation Areas (HCAs). He added that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was drafting new regulations for development in floodplains, including the 500-year floodplain.

John Ritchie, 7016 SE Savannah St, stated that he and his wife were longtime residents and were concerned about the proposed 92-unit development's impact on the quality of life in the area. While they were not against building homes, they did question whether 92 units were appropriate for this property. They supported previous comments about not impacting the environmentally-sensitive portion of the site. They were looking for a quality development to upgrade the quality of life in the area.

Beverly Curtis, 13182 SE Pennywood Ct, questioned how families could pay the costs of homeownership, including expensive flood insurance and homeowner association fees, if this was affordable housing. She questioned whether the number of children that would live in the development and their impact on the neighborhood schools had been estimated. She asked if the most current floodplain map was being used, and if there was an example of a similar development somewhere.

Mr. Egner read a comment from Eugene Zaharie, 5273 SE Jackson St, in support of the application stating, "92 is better than 80."

Additional Comments by staff:

Referencing PowerPoint slides, staff responded to comments and questions raised previously by the Commission, as well as by the applicant and public testimony, as follows:

- Although the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW) had provided information to staff via email explaining what "strategy habitat" meant, staff had not yet had time to review it. Copies of the email with the links were available.
- Staff was still researching Commissioner Burn's question about the Department of State Lands (DSL) and the history and legality of the fill.

- Any development on the site would trigger right-of-way improvements and affect the eight oaks in the public right-of-way. Flexibility for designing the right-of-way improvements to save the eight oaks was discussed.
- Staff described how the traffic impact study was used to determine what road improvements should be required. Staff had evaluated the movements at Rusk Rd and Hwy 224 and upheld the recommended condition of expanding the right-turn lane at the intersection.
 - Staff agreed with redoing the traffic counts on a regular school day, although they did not think a recount would change the result in terms of the development's traffic impact.
 - The standard methodology of a traffic impact study involves using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual, which sets trip generation counts by category of housing type. Housing type also determined system development charges, etc.
 - The undeveloped right-of-way on Rusk Rd is sufficient to widen and extend the turn lane without having to purchase property.
- Staff did not advocate filling in the floodplain, but would administer the rules in Milwaukie Municipal Code Title 18 Flood Hazards for evaluating a proposal to fill in the floodplain.
 - Staff was not sure how the new National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) floodplain requirements would affect the City when they were finally implemented. The Commission was encouraged to consider the floodplain alteration issues in the context of the Natural Resources review and the Code's intent to protect the natural resources. The standard was to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to the natural resources. There was also a requirement to build at least one foot above the base flood elevation.
 - When considering the density bonus, the Commission had broad discretion to identify the approach to the floodplain as something to consider in whether or not the development was outstanding.

• **Mr. Kelper** reviewed the five general approval criteria for a planned development that applied with or without a density bonus request. The third criterion regarding capacity of existing utilities could be used by the Commission to address traffic concerns, whether or not required improvements were triggered. The fourth and fifth criteria, along with the natural resource review, could provide discretion to consider factors such as floodplain impacts. Mr. Kelper added that requiring outstanding design and extraordinary amenities for the density bonus (beyond the maximum allowed 80 units) effectively functioned as a sixth criterion.

Mr. Kelper noted that the Commission's deliberation could include the Commissioners' own assessments and their evaluation. He reminded them that one question to consider was whether alternatives to the development had been sufficiently explored with regard to natural resources.

Staff responded to four points of concern raised by the applicant during their presentation:

- The prospect of adding a right-turn lane on Rusk Rd has already been addressed.
- Public access to the trail system could be considered as either a condition or an element of the proposal.
- North Clackamas Parks & Recreation District (NCPRD) indicated an interest and willingness to discuss how NCPRD might be involved with the open space, but they did not want to simply contract for maintenance of the area.
- A proposed condition of approval required that the FEMA maps, which also addressed flood insurance requirements, be revised before construction.
- Although the planned development approval expired after six months, the Code offered flexibility to use a phased timeline for the development plan and program.

- Some suggested revisions to the findings and conditions in light of the natural resource report provided by ESA were as follows:
 - A condition to allow the City to look at the site again after the FEMA map corrections, to more accurately capture the HCAs (especially with respect to the oak trees) and correct the City's natural resource administrative map for the site.
 - A condition to preserve prior restoration plantings on the site where practicable.
 - A condition to take measurements along the bottom of the proposed slope to confirm the actual disturbances resulting from the physical construction.
 - A condition for a weed control and mitigation plan.
- Staff would need additional supporting material and time to evaluate the alternative revised site plan. The applicant could choose to extend the 180-day land use clock, if needed.
- Staff recommended the Commission continue the hearing and provide direction to staff and the applicant about changes the Commissioners would like to see. Staff highlighted several questions for the Commission to consider in light of the revised plan during deliberations.

Mr. Egner confirmed that the Commission could use the findings presented by staff to approve the original plan. However, staff believed the Commission would prefer the revised plan or a different plan over the original plan.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Chair Hemer called for the applicant's rebuttal.

Serah Breakstone, Senior Planner, DOWL, noted Mr. Kelter's comment about the flexibility regarding the half-street improvements on Kellogg Creek Dr that would allow saving the oak trees and stated that the applicant was willing to work with Engineering to figure out how to save more of the trees.

Scott Emmens, Senior Civil Engineer/Project Manager, DOWL, discussed the stormwater facilities. While the City preferred not to detain water on the site, the wetlands impact triggered a SLOPES V requirement for stormwater detention on the site. The applicant had followed the latest guidelines for retention ponds. With respect to the retention pond size, the team's predevelopment conditions were modeled after the 100% forested area found by Lewis & Clark. The water quality facilities were designed to detain the maximum pre- versus post-development conditions.

- He described how a worst-case-scenario methodology was applied to the site to draw the 70-ft flood stage elevation across the entire site, even though part of the site had a FEMA flood stage elevation of 66 ft. He believed the proposed mitigation more than compensated for the floodplain impact and created 600 cubic yards more of available storage on the site than what was there previously.
- He confirmed that the proposed mitigation would not improve the floodplain upstream or downstream, but only on the site itself.

John Van Staveren, Wetland Scientist, Pacific Habitat Services, 9540 SW Commerce Circle, Wilsonville, said he understood the concerns of the Watershed Council regarding the natural resources in this area. He reviewed the process his team went through in conducting the natural resource studies, including a wetland delineation approved by DSL, a plan presented at the neighborhood meeting, and an onsite meeting with the Army Corps of Engineers and DSL to review the plan. In accordance with the directive to avoid, minimize, and mitigate, the applicant's team minimized the wetland impact to .07 acres of impact on the wetland extremities, down from half an acre of impact. He added:

- It appeared that all of the oaks would be saved through redesign. As part of the required HCA mitigation, the applicant would need to complete the unfinished restoration of the riparian area and habitat.

- The criteria to treat stormwater came from the NMFS determination that Coho salmon were adversely affected by stormwater entering essential salmon habitat, such as Mt. Scott Creek, and there were treatment and detention requirements to mitigate the effect, which exceeded the requirements of local jurisdictions in Oregon. NMFS was currently reviewing the stormwater treatment plan for this site.
- He acknowledged that the endangered and at-risk species listed in the letter from ODFW were found in the area and creeks. The letter was general and appropriate in reflecting the ODFW's charge to protect habitat, but it did not go into detail about any physical impacts or mitigation related to the project.
- With regard to Mr. Maze's testimony about potential damage to the oaks from nearby development activities, he suggested asking the team's professional arborist for her opinion on the risk level involved.
- He confirmed that the rare plant found at the site and at Crater Lake would not be directly impacted nor was it a protected species. However, its level of protection did merit investigation.

Chris Brehmer, Principal Engineer/Licensed Traffic Engineer, Kittelson & Associates, reviewed the items in his memorandum responding to public testimony and distributed to the Commission. Although Kittelson received concurrence from review agencies that the trip rates used were appropriate, the traffic impacts of using single-family detached trip rates had been evaluated, and the trips generated were still within the agency performance standards. He addressed additional questions from the Commission as follows:

- Although the first traffic study was not done during a school day, the counts had been adjusted based on a similar study nearby and had yielded results that he was confident represented the conditions at Rusk Rd. In his professional opinion, he did not see a problem meeting the City's or any agencies' standards.
- Although ODOT prioritized traffic flow on highways with regard to traffic light rotation, when existing conditions changed due to growth in background and regional traffic, rotation times may increase to accommodate the greater demand on the side street.
- If a condition was made to expand the right-turn lane, he requested that flexibility be provided with the turn lane design; if the right-of-way was insufficient for the design, private developers could not exercise eminent domain to obtain additional property to complete a required improvement.

Ms. Breakstone observed that "affordable housing" had many different meanings, definitions, and connotations. The proposed housing was intended to be affordable at the market rate for working households with moderate incomes. She read a statement from the April 4th memo from Johnson Economics in support of the intended cost-sensitive starter family market that would value the local amenities and proximity to employment and commercial services. She noted the many values on the site--from floodplain storage, wetlands, white oaks, and the stream--to its development potential. The proposed revised site plan allowed the developer to maximize the development potential of the property while protecting the white oaks and minimizing the impacts to the natural area.

The applicant's team addressed additional questions from the Commission as follows:

- The church was not part of the development area or the 13.9 acres of the site plan.
- Currently, the improvements shown on the site plan along Rusk Road were limited to closing off the existing driveway in the southeast corner of the site. There was no room for a bike lane southbound on Rusk Rd from Hwy 224. The bike/ped trail connecting to the cul-de-sac went through the site and on to Kellogg Creek Dr. Since the right-of-way along the church frontage on the western side of Rusk extended only six inches behind the existing sidewalk, any church frontage improvements would be up to the church.

- The developer would accept a condition to allow public use of the soft surface trail and the bike/ped connection, per the developer's original intention.
- The applicant had not drafted language for a condition about granting the western open space to NCPRD.

Randy Myers, Brownstone Homes, 20475 S Fernview, West Linn, OR, confirmed that Brownstone would welcome continued discussion with NCPRD about taking over the open space. However, a public easement across the entire property could be an issue with regard to illegal camping. The condition also depended on how many units they were allowed, due to the break point involved. If 92 units were approved, he would sell the land to NCPRD for \$1. The developer disagreed with reducing the plan to 88 units, as the project functioned on volume of sales rather than individual sales and removing units escalated the costs per unit. He added:

- The preference was for NCPRD and the Watershed Council to manage the open space; however, the applicant was agreeable to the homeowner's association (HOA) providing funds to the Watershed Council to maintain the tract.
- He noted there was a certain window of time in which they could develop the site because of fill issues, adding they could not move fill in October.

Chair Hemer asked Mr. Runyard whether the Watershed Council would be willing to take money from the developer to maintain the creek.

Chris Runyard, responded he did not know, as that would be a discussion item for the Board. He agreed NCPRD was probably the best agency to deal with a contiguous wetland and oak forest.

Commissioner Burns asked if Mr. Runyard would be willing to accept the density bonus in exchange for guaranteed protection of the rest of the site by NCPRD according to the revised plan. **Mr. Runyard** replied no, he was not prepared to negotiate away what little old growth oak trees and wetlands were left in this area that had already been compromised.

Chair Hemer confirmed the applicant had no further rebuttal and closed the public testimony portion of the hearing.

Planning Commission Deliberation

Chair Hemer suggested continuing the hearing to allow the applicant to conduct a new traffic study on a school day and for staff to draft new conditions and findings to support the revised plan, including one accessway and a right-of-way alignment that did not remove any oaks. The Commission would also further review the information presented tonight. He believed the original traffic study was flawed because it did not count the actual traffic on Rusk Rd.

Commissioner Burns concurred, stating it would be wrong to move forward without another traffic study. He cited the amount and unanimity of the public testimony about how bad the traffic really was versus the professional traffic engineers' credible testimony.

Mr. Egner confirmed that the inclusion of new information would require the Commission to reopen the hearing for the applicant and public comment, but the testimony could be limited to the new information of the traffic study, the conditions, and the revised findings only.

Chair Hemer noted that the main issues raised during public testimony were flooding, traffic, density, and environmental impacts. He did not know if the revised plan changed the flooding issue and noted the Commission needed to consider whether there was enough public benefit for the 92-unit density.

Commissioner Grau suggested that the Commissioners discuss what they defined as 'exceptional' and the criteria for meeting that standard in light of the requirement that the project provide sufficient public benefit to merit the density bonus.

Mr. Egner confirmed that the revised plan required a variance to the number of lots served by one access. If the Commission rejected the variance request, the applicant would have to put in a second accessway, which could possibly reduce the density.

The Commission was in consensus that the revised plan was better than the original proposed plan and that the site was available for homebuilding. The Commission also consented to go through the process again with the revised plan and questions related to the planned development zone then instead of now.

Discussion by the Commission continued with these key comments:

Commissioner Grau asked if any other Commission member wanted to hear from the arborist besides herself.

- Staff was asked to have an arborist corroborate the information from the environmental scientist regarding the ecological effects described.
- A straw poll was conducted regarding the requested 92 units. Commissioner Burns believed he could approve the 92 units. Commissioner Grau and Vice Chair Argo were unsure, and Commissioner Travis was not sold on 92 units.
 - The Commission needed to understand the intensity of use introduced on the site and the related aspects. Although the traffic engineers were confident another traffic study would confirm the project still met the intersection thresholds, the level of service designation did not address pedestrian safety.
 - The 92 units were leverage to achieve other benefits in the site plan, such as further minimizing the wetland impacts, protecting all the oaks, turning the wetlands over to NCPRD for protection indefinitely, and providing safer passage for kids. Achieving those objectives with 80 units was preferable, but 92 units was acceptable in order to achieve those benefits.
 - The arborist's professional opinion about the oaks along the edge of the development near the slope was needed before determining whether 92 units would be acceptable.
 - The amount of excavation required or how the bank would look were both unknowns, and there were an infinite number of possibilities. The Commission had already seen two alternate proposals with different amounts of cut and fill and different amounts of oaks preserved or removed.
- With regard to the findings, the arborist's opinion was of more consequence than the applicant doing another traffic study.
- The Commission agreed that saving and protecting the oaks was a criterion for exceptional design. The arborist's opinion really mattered because the Commission needed to know that the oaks would be saved now and would live for another 10 years.

Chair Hemer suggested using the revised plan with the accessway variance and the right-of-way change that saved the most oaks. He did not believe the 92 units should be an issue if the arborist's testimony was what would sway the Commission.

Mr. Egner said staff would work with the applicant to get all the background information they needed to bring back a set of findings and conditions, plus a new arborist report and a new traffic study.

The Commission requested the following information from staff:

- Confirm that sufficient right-of-way existed to widen the right-turn lane on Rusk Rd and that there were no other issues involving the right-of-way.

- Talk with NCPRD, draft a finding to turn the open space over to them and determine what things NCPRD would want to list as conditions.
- Confirm that the school district would be moving the bus barn in a couple of years.
- Provide the square footage of the fill proposed under the revised plan.
- Determine what was being built on the existing fill versus new fill, and research any potential liability or history regarding the illicit fill.

It was moved by Commissioner Grau and seconded by Vice Chair Argo to continue the public hearing for PD-2017-01 for 13333 SE Rusk Rd to a date certain of June 27, 2017. The motion passed unanimously.

4.0 Planning Department Other Business/Updates – None

5.0 Planning Commission Committee Updates and Discussion Items – None

6.0 Forecast for Future Meetings:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| June 13, 2017 | 1. Public Hearing: PD-2017-002 13333 SE Rusk Rd- <i>continued tentative</i> |
| | 2. Public Hearing: DEV-2017-006/VR-2017-002 29 th Ave Triplex |
| | 3. Public Hearing: S-2017-002 4217 SE Railroad Ave |
| | 4. Public Hearing: VR-2017-004 11630 SE 27 th Ave ADU |
| June 27, 2017 | 1. Public Hearing: S-2017-002 4217 SE Railroad Ave- <i>continued tentative</i> |
| | 2. Public Hearing: WG-2017-002 Eagle and 21 st Avenue |
| | 3. Public Hearing: NMIA Framework Plan and Implementation Strategy |
| | 4. Worksession: Vision/Comprehensive Plan Update |

Chair Hemer confirmed the Commission would not have the worksession scheduled on June 27th and that the Rusk Rd public hearing would be addressed first on June 27th.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Martin, Administrative Specialist II



Greg Hemer, Chair