

MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

December 19, 2016

7:00 p.m.

Chair Gordon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Nibbelin, Campbell, Clifford, Cooper and Chair Gordon
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Vice Chair Nibbelin

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Asst. City Attorney Visick
Assoc. Planner Murdock
Asst. Planner O'Connor
Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Commissioner Cooper moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Nibbelin, Campbell, Clifford, Cooper and Chair Gordon
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: DECEMBER 5, 2016 Commissioner Clifford moved approval of minutes of December 5, 2016; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0-2**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford and Chair Gordon
Noes: None
Abstain: Commissioners Nibbelin and Cooper

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 9, 2017:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would not need a liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

CONSENT ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Consideration of Coastal Development Permits to Demolish Structures at 528 and 532 Esplanade Drive.

1a. CDP-378-16

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-378-16, filed by City of Pacifica to demolish a one-story, 910 square foot, single family residence at 528 Esplanade Drive, in Pacifica (APN 009-161-010). Recommended CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, Section 15301.

1b. CDP-377-16

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-377-16, filed by owners Tom and Melissa Wilson, to demolish a one-story, 910 square foot, single family residence at 532 Esplanade Drive, in Pacifica (APN 009-161-020). Recommended CEQA status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, Section 15301.

Asst. Planner Bonny O'Connor presented the staff report.

Melissa Wilson, owner, stated that they have owned 532 Esplanade since 2009, when it had stood vacant for a year, suffering the ravages of people invading and taking the copper pipes, etc. She stated that they took it down to the studs and just about restored the whole thing and then El Nino came. They intended to move the house, contracting with a company that lifted it up as they lost the back yard. The Planning Commission allowed them to get it away from bluff, but they were unable to find another property on which to move it. They thanked Pacifica and the Engineering Dept. as there was a tiny window to get applicants for the hazard mitigation grant. Three were asked to apply and they were supportive in helping with all the paperwork. She stated that they weren't sure if they were going to get the grant, but in the event that something happens and the house has to be demolished, or if they get the grant, they would take the house and land.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one who wished to comment on the item, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Cooper asked confirmation that there were two permit applications.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there were two different applications, one for each property, and they would take two motions.

Commissioner Clifford stated that this was a sad ending for that whole block. He stated that he worked on the house that was further away next to the RV camp. He did work on it for Beverly Axelrod and then they watched it fall into the ocean. He stated that now they are taking the last two houses and he sympathized with them.

Commissioner Baringer acknowledged that this was a difficult situation, and he was curious about the open-ended timing aspect for the demolition. He asked if there was an outside date when they would want to look at it if it hasn't occurred or are they going to wait until they have to do it because of Mother Nature.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the complicating factor to qualify for the grant funding was that the structure in peril needs to be present, and they can't ask for the grant funding after the fact. If they move forward with the demolition, they negate the possibility of getting the grant funding for the Wilsons and for the city's demolition work.

Commissioner Baringer then asked if the process was months or a year.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she would have the Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez, who is in charge of the grant program, respond.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez stated that the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) grant process takes approximately six months to a year because of the environmental review, and they were going through those stages now. He stated that it could be six months or a year, but after that it should be 90 days to go through demolition and escrow.

Commissioner Baringer concluded that they were talking about a year to process the grant and a 90-day period for demolition subsequent to that year of processing the grant.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez stated that FEMA has somewhat approved the grant, but it has to go through environmental before it is fully funded.

Commissioner Baringer wanted to know how long the house will be sitting there on blocks until it is removed.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez stated that they hope to start demolition in December 2017 at the latest.

Commissioner Baringer then asked why they don't put that in the condition of approval, adding that the house was there and the grant process was underway. They would just have an end date on it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the permit is valid for 12 months.

Commissioner Baringer thought the likelihood was that they may have to extend it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed that they may have to extend it. She stated that the City wanted to be prepared in the event of an emergency or if funding is dispersed sooner. Commissioner Baringer asked whether, if it was an emergency, they would still be eligible for the grant.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she did not know.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez understands the conditions indicate that there has to be a structure to go through the environmental review. He concluded that, if it was taken down before then, they would not be eligible.

Chair Gordon stated that he looked at the pictures and the structure looked perilously perched on the cliff. He thought it was a gamble. He thought the risk of making it through this winter and part of the next cycle was that there will be further erosion and the house could potentially tumble into the ocean.

Ms. Wilson asked if she could comment.

Chair Gordon questioned the procedures.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that they could reopen the hearing through a motion.

Commissioner Cooper moved to reopen the hearing; seconded by Commissioner Baringer.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Nibbelin, Campbell,
Clifford, Cooper and Chair Gordon
Noes: None

Chair Gordon reopened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Wilson stated that they moved the house 20 feet forward to the sidewalk. She stated that the foundation is at the edge of the cliff now, and if the house was there, it would be in peril, but they bought the time and the foundation was a protection of the house as it was partially sitting on the foundation. She stated that they weren't going to have an El Nino this winter or next, and it was an extraordinary circumstance that brought the cliff down. She acknowledged that there will be wind and rain and sloughing off of the cliff, but nothing drastic to that point. She stated that, without anything drastic, they were sure it will last this winter and may go to next year unless an earthquake or something catastrophic happens.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that, if the Commission did not issue the Coastal Development Permit at this meeting and there was an exigent circumstance and the city or applicant needed to bring the buildings down, he would expect that it would qualify for an emergency coastal development permit, and this hearing offers them the opportunity to consider conditions they would impose on a permit as a Commission rather than being informed of an emergency coastal development permit being issued by the Planning Director after the fact. He felt that contemplating this now, even if it might not happen for a while, gives them a voice in the process.

Chair Gordon thought there was an irony that they have to delay so long to have an environmental review when the environmental review itself was posing a serious environmental hazard. He wondered if there was an argument that could expedite the process in those circumstances.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez stated that he did not know of any, but he was hopeful that, with a small footprint, the process will move rather quickly but he was given no guarantees.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that the grant administrators from the state have been out and toured the site with staff and they have had a visual of what we see.

Chair Gordon felt it was a Catch 22.

Commissioner Evans questioned, with the house not being attached, whether that would bring up any issues about the grant. He questioned that it was just theory that it had to be there.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez stated that FEMA and CalOES did not bring that up when they were out the previous month.

Commissioner Evans stated that they saw it on stilts.

Asst. Civil Engr. Marquez responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans gave his heartfelt sympathy to them because it was tough.

Vice Chair Nibbelin referred to 528 Esplanade, and stated that he thought that was closer to the bluff and that house has not been moved.

Weng; Pinkstone LLC, to extend the expiration date of permits for the construction of nine condominiums located at 1567 Beach Boulevard (APN 016-011-190).

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Nibbelin stated that he was curious about the amount of time that applicant has known about the city staff's position on this request for an extension.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the report was published December 16.

Assoc. Planner Murdock thought there was less than explicit communication of staff's intent to deny the request. Staff had expressed concern that went beyond most extension requests a week ago, and any understanding of the staff's position was probably less than a week from this date.

Commissioner Clifford asked whether, if they approve the denial, the applicant would still have the option of appealing their decision to City Council and their options would not be over with the denial.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the applicant has submitted a revised set of plans in the past five years or anything besides the permit extension request.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have been in plan check, and anything new would be limited to the building permit.

Commissioner Evans asked confirmation that this was initially approved in 2006.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that the city's final approval for the project was granted in 2007 and the Coastal Commission, due to the timeline of their appeal, finally appealed the Coastal Development Permit in 2008.

Commissioner Evans asked when the Planning Commission approved it, stating that he was seeing the 2006 date.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that was the case number assigned at the time of application which was submitted in 2006. He didn't have the date for the Planning Commission's approval.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the Planning Commission's staff report was dated October 2006.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he would be inclined to make a motion regarding the request for the extension. He believed that staff has done a good job laying out a rationale for denying the request to extend the expiration date of the site development permit, and he believes this would benefit if he were in the applicant's position for an opportunity to assess and provide feedback to the Commission. He felt, if it was going to go to the Planning Commission, it would be good with a full administrative record. He felt they didn't lose that much from affording the applicant a little bit of additional time to see if there was anything to add to the analysis. He would grant the request to continue this hearing.

Chair Gordon stated he would like to hear why the applicant wants a continuation on the request for an extension.

Asst. City Attorney Visick added that, because it was noticed as a public hearing, they do have to open the public comment period before they actually take action.

Chair Gordon thought a motion at this time was premature.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that you could put one on the table but you wouldn't want to take action until they have had a chance to take public comment.

Vice Chair Nibbelin thought that was what they should be looking at before they spend a lot of time building a significant record and spending a lot of time taking testimony. He thought the first question was whether they were inclined to continue the item.

Shaohong "Simon" Weng, applicant, stated that he was applying for a continuation for the hearing of the project. He stated that the staff report was posted the previous Friday at 1:00 p.m. on the city website. He stated that, with this being Monday, his engineers didn't have enough time to respond, which was why they applied for a continuation to have time to prepare responses to the comments in the staff report.

Mrs. Weng added that, on this project, her husband worked hard and lost his job for 3 ½ years. All the people worked as a team and worked very hard. They were almost to the end, and the city denied permission to continue. They asked that they give him some time to solve the city's questions and let them finish the project.

Commissioner Cooper acknowledged that people go through hardships, but he mentioned that the permit was issued in 2008 and it has been nine years. He looked at the report and one of the concerns he has is the Building Code which has changed since they originally presented the project. He added that personal circumstances change as well as requirements within the city. He was inclined to continue the item but, regarding the granting of an extension, he asked how much longer were they anticipating responding to the city's questions. He asked how long they need, such as one week, or three weeks. He asked when they planned to respond to the city.

Mr. Weng stated that they already have a construction loan approved and the construction bond will be funded soon. He stated that they already have the subdivision agreement and easement agreement recorded in San Mateo County, and have a general contractor quote. He explained that, if they pay the bonds, they can get the final map recorded. He stated that they purchased the property in 2013. He clarified that 2008 permits were with the previous owner, as he purchased the property from the owner in 2013. He then stated that the architect passed away from a heart attack and everything stopped for several months. He stated that the design work continued after they found a new architect.

Commissioner Cooper stated that the staff report brings up quite a few different concerns. He asked if he was planning on responding in writing to these concerns.

Mr. Weng responded affirmatively, adding that the engineer already talked about it and he is working on that. He again stated that the report wasn't posted on the city's website until Friday and they need more time and will respond to the staff report.

Commissioner Baringer stated that, given the economy in 2008, he was more sympathetic to their lack of moving forward during that time period, but they were looking at 2017 and the economy is better. He stated that, if they were to agree to a continuance at this time, the staff has raised some issues concerning changes to codes, and from his perspective, he would like to see those changes incorporated into the new plans. He stated that he wasn't on the Commission when the

project was originally submitted and he would want to see what the project is before he would support it moving forward. He stated that he has no idea what it looks like, as all they are seeing is a request for an extension after a prolonged period of time with no activity, and many things have changed, such as building codes. He stated that, if the Commission votes for a continuance, he would still expect those issues to be dealt with and resolved to the Commission's satisfaction before he would support the project going forward. He stated that there are consequences to delays and the economy bought him 2-3 years, but the economy has come back and people would expect someone to move forward and take advantage of a robust economy. He would be willing to grant a continuance and support it to give the applicant more time to deal with these concerns which he would expect the applicant to deal with.

Commissioner Clifford asked staff, if they continue this, whether it would put a stop on the process for them, i.e., in waiting for the Commission's approval for a continuance, or can they go ahead and get their building permit and be able to proceed without coming back to the Commission. He stated that he was hearing that they were in the process of getting the building permit.

Asst. City Attorney Visick understood that the permits have now expired.

Commissioner Clifford assumed that they are already stopped on the process and they have to get an extension to have that process move forward. He stated that he was more comfortable with a continuance with that information, as he didn't want the project approval status as stood.

Asst. City Attorney Visick understood his concerns, adding that he understood that they applied for the extensions before the permits expired and the request has been pending as the permit has since expired. He confirmed that they could not get the permit now without getting the extension from the Commission.

Commissioner Cooper asked the applicant if he was prepared to respond to all the comments, as far as what the project looks like, and respond to all the concerns, etc., within a month's time.

Mrs. Weng asked him to repeat his question.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the questions within the packet, and he asked if they were willing to respond to those questions and also give the Commission an idea of what the project looks like so they aren't approving something they don't know.

Mr. Weng stated that they will respond to everything coming from the staff report.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing.

Craig Joyner, Pacifica, stated that he lives on Shoreview Avenue which is directly north of the subject property. He stated that, upon first hearing of a proposal on the lot, he thought it was a joke that there would be an underground parking lot that close to the ocean. He stated that he sees waves break on that property at every high tide. He was concerned about the effects to his property from digging down and disturbing the sub soil and how it might affect the stability of the soil on his property. He thought the project has been in planning for a long time, and he didn't know what could be done in a few weeks that couldn't have been done in a decade. He thought the project needs to be re-imagined and re-established with no underground parking. He also felt they needed new permits that respect the building codes and should go back to the Coastal Commission, given what we didn't know ten years ago about climate change. He also thought it should be scaled down, re-imagined and return with a contemporary plan.

Steve Clark, Pacifica, stated that he lives on Paloma Avenue, south of the empty lot which was behind his property. He agreed with Mr. Joyner about the huge waves coming over the sea wall. He was concerned about the geological structure when excavating for a subterranean garage. He acknowledged that something will be developed on the property, but he would like it to be done properly with concern for the environment and changing conditions. He felt the report was very thorough and he agreed that these concerns should be taken seriously. He agreed with a redesign, taking all these issues into consideration with a possible alternative to subterranean parking.

Chair Gordon closed the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Weng stated that she understood what they said. She stated that the engineer will take care of all of them, and the city was concerned. They will work with this and she didn't think it will happen. She stated that her husband had a conversation with someone.

Mr. Weng stated that he had an ocean engineer expert and he has done a lot of work for this, and he didn't think there was a problem and it was safe. He stated that, in the public hearing, he will give them a satisfactory answer to all of the concerns.

Commissioner Evans stated that this was a ten-year old project and a lot has changed in those ten years. He was not in favor of extension of this, but he was willing to look at a continuance. He noted that the Coastal Commission extended their expiration date to March 7, 2017. He stated that he didn't have a problem going to that date, but only on a continuance as he was not in favor of the project as it is now. He wanted to see the changes brought out by staff to bring the project up to today's standards rather than previous standards.

Commissioner Cooper was in agreement with Commissioner Evans. He felt there was not enough information for him to make any decision. He felt staff did a wonderful job outlining the three important concerns and he didn't know how to address them as he didn't have the information or the applicant's response. He was not ready to make a motion regarding approval or denial of the permit, but was okay with extending this to get more information to make a decision.

Vice Chair Nibbelin stated that he shared the views that significant concerns have been raised, given the amount of time since the original granting of the permits. He also felt staff has done a good job of laying out those concerns. He felt the right thing was to afford a brief continuance to allow the applicant to have a reasonable opportunity to address the issues raised by staff so they have as full a record as possible.

Commissioner Clifford asked staff what date would be appropriate to continue this in terms of the work that staff will have to do, as well as giving the applicant an adequate amount of time to pull their responses together.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the first meeting in January was cancelled, and they wouldn't have had enough time for that date anyway. She stated that the second meeting in January was the 17th, but she would recommend the first meeting in February. She also requests that the Commission urge the applicant to provide his response by the first or second week in January to give staff time to respond. She stated that the first meeting in February was the 6th.

Commissioner Clifford also asked, if they don't extend the permit, what impact that has on the Coastal Commission, adding that, even if they approve it with changes to meet their concerns, he questioned what that does to the Coastal Commission approvals. He stated that they have approved what has already been approved.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, if the permits are not extended, the Coastal Commission's permit is moot. If they are extended with changes to the project, she would have to leave that to the Coastal Commission staff, adding that they will be in communication with them and they would indicate if they require a new permit.

Commissioner Campbell stated that, looking at the record of the project over the years, he felt there was enough to go along with a denial of the project at this point. He stated that, if they are going to entertain it in a month, he could go along with that, but he felt he could vote now to not extend it any further.

Chair Gordon stated that he was on the same page as Commissioner Campbell. He felt that the project as approved did not comply any longer with inclusionary housing requirements, etc. He didn't see what information can change the fact that the project does not comply with anything anymore. He was sympathetic with applicant's language issues as he understood English was not their first language and he thought they deserve to have someone who can speak English in a more fluent way so they can get their points across in a more comfortable way and he was in favor of a continuance just for that. He then asked staff, if they grant a motion to continue, whether the applicant has an option to come forward with a redesign that brings the project into compliance with all the things laid out. He asked, if that was allowed, whether it would be a material change that would put them in a Catch 22 issue. He asked if there was a way out for them.

Planning Director Wehrmeister felt it was possible. If they were going to recommend modifications to the project, they would analyze them and it was possible that the project would change so significantly that it needed to be reprocessed as a new project. She stated that they may be able to address all of the Building Code issues within the envelope of the building that was approved, adding that they would need to start over with plan check. She thought, if that were the only issue, it was not insurmountable and it would basically be the same project that the Commission saw in 2006. She reiterated that both things were possible, adding that she would not presume what would happen.

Chair Gordon understood her position. He stated that he was in favor of a motion to continue.

Commissioner Baringer asked staff, if they vote to continue, whether they would be able to see what the design was at the next hearing and asked if they would provide it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would provide it.

Commissioner Baringer concluded that they would have an opportunity to look at that as well as the other issues. He agreed that they may or may not be able to incorporate the changes in design requirements and inclusionary housing, etc. He stated that, at that point, they would have the opportunity to look at the total design and make a determination.

Commissioner Evans agreed with the Catch 22 issue. He thought that, to get the design and plan where the Commission and staff are comfortable, it was a different plan. He thought, at that point, it was not a plan that the Coastal Commission has approved. He didn't see any step other than denying the extension and starting all over again. He stated that he wanted to give the applicants a fair chance to comply with what they are requesting them to do which requires time. He thought, if they want their plans by the beginning of January, approximately two weeks away, it was tough. He didn't mind the continuance, but he cannot go forward with the extension.

Commissioner Clifford agreed with Commissioner Evans. He was also having trouble with extending the project unless there are major changes done and then they get into it being a new

project. He thought they might be able to comply with the Municipal Code issues, but thought the disintegrating sea wall in front of the property was a different ball of wax. He stated that he was on the Commission when this was approved, and the project the Commission approved went to City Council and changes were made there, and then went to the Coastal Commission and became a different project from what the Commission had approved, mentioning some specifics, which the Coastal Commission took out and then approved the project. He mentioned that City Council has said the sea wall has to be replaced and he wasn't sure what the applicant can do to make a difference with the property in front of them and changes to the conditions around them. He was willing to give them a continuance to tell them what they might be able to do, adding that he was presently leaning toward the denial of the extension.

Chair Gordon asked if there was an issue of them prejudging.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that he didn't think that was the case, based on listening to what the Commissioners were saying. He didn't think they were prejudging the outcome of what will happen when it comes back in a continued hearing, if they choose to do that. He thought it was valuable to the applicant that they were letting him know their instincts now, based on what was in the report. He added that he hasn't heard anyone expressing any indication of how they will vote with additional information in front of them.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was ready to make a motion, but he wanted to be clear that January 10, 2017 was the deadline that the Planning Director would want to receive their response, and with that caveat, moved that the Planning Commission continue this item until February 6, 2017; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-1**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Nibbelin, Clifford,
Cooper and Chair Gordon
Noes: Commissioner Campbell

Chair Gordon stated that they should consult with the Planning Director on how to proceed next.

Ms. Weng thanked them, and she wanted them to have more time to review the case. She added that their engineer said, because of the holidays, they weren't ready and some were on vacation. She stated that this helps them to have more chance to review.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Cooper stated that he attended a fun City Council meeting last Monday regarding the Palmetto discussion for the four condominium units, wanting the four bungalows, but were pushed into a corner, and they agreed with Commission except one negative vote by the Mayor and they upheld the Commission's reasoning.

Commissioner Clifford wished everyone a Happy Holiday as they won't see each other until after the holidays are over. He then asked staff regarding the reappointment cycle. He stated that they are doing one thing, but he pointed out that the by-laws state that they do things at the end of December and he would like to see the by-laws up to date. He added that he mentioned it when he was reappointed. He reiterated that the by-laws stated that they do things at the last meeting in December but they have changed it to March or April

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the by-laws say it is the end of the year and the Council's resolution on reorganization says April and the by-laws do need to be adjusted.

Commissioner Clifford agreed that they need to come together, adding that it should be fairly simple to change the by-laws to conform to the resolution.

Commissioner Evans also wished everyone Happy Holidays, and to be safe through New Year's.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister reiterated that the meeting on January 2 was cancelled. The January 17 meeting will be on Tuesday due to the holiday. She stated that they have a handout on how to sign in and use MinuteTraq and they were hoping to be on schedule to have the agendas through the MinuteTraq program which was exactly how Council agendas work, and it was much easier for the public to scroll through and find the documents that they are looking for. She wasn't going to walk them through it, but they are there and they are pretty intuitive. She asked them to let her know if they have questions but, if anyone still wants to have the agenda analog, they can still deliver it to them.

Commissioner Cooper asked if analog means on paper.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively. She then stated that they were working out a few things, but 7-Eleven at Hickey and Gateway was going to have their grand opening. She then wished them Happy Holidays.

Chair Gordon asked if the plan was to go paperless for the staff reports and plans.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that was the idea.

Chair Gordon asked what the timeline was for that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they were hoping to start on the 17th of January.

Commissioner Clifford asked if they were going to be getting laptops like Council has or do they have to supply their own.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have to supply their own. She stated that the benefit was that, not only was it green, but it was a huge benefit to the public in transparency. She stated that it was difficult to scroll through the PDFs on line. If you are commuting without a laptop, they will still print them out if they would like them. She reiterated that the major benefit was that people will be able to find things easier.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Cooper moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:08 p.m.; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Nibbelin, Campbell,
Clifford, Cooper and Chair Gordon
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina

Planning Commission Minutes
December 19, 2016
Page 13 of 13

Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister