

**GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
MAY 13, 2003 MINUTES
7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.**

The regularly scheduled Planning Commission hearing was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Roland Cole. The public hearing was held in the City Hall Auditorium. The Mesa County Planning Commission was present for a joint hearing of item GPA-2003-018.

In attendance, representing the City Planning Commission, were Roland Cole (Vice-Chairman), John Evans, John Redifer, William Putnam, Bill Pitts, Richard Blosser and Travis Cox (2nd Alternate). Dr. Paul Dibble was absent.

In attendance for the Growth Plan item only, representing the County Planning Commission, were David Caldwell (Chairman), Craig Meis, Mike Gardener, and Mark Bonella.

In attendance, representing the City's Community Development Department, were Bob Blanchard (Community Development Director), Kathy Portner (Planning Manager), Pat Cecil (Development Services Supervisor), Lisa Cox (Senior Planner) and Ronnie Edwards (Associate Planner).

In attendance for the Growth Plan item only, representing the County Planning Department, were Kurt Larsen (Planning Director) and Michael Warren (Senior Planner).

Also present were John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney) and Rick Dorris (Development Engineer).

Terri Troutner was present to record the minutes.

There were approximately 21 interested citizens present during the course of the hearing.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes from the April 7, 2003 Planning Commission public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Evans) "Mr. Chairman, I would move for approval of the minutes of the April 7 meeting."

Commissioner Pitts seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 6-0, with Commissioner Blosser abstaining.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS, PRESENTATIONS AND/OR VISITORS

Present for consideration of the Growth Plan amendment rehearing, and introduced to the public, were members of the Mesa County Planning Commission.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Offered for placement on the Consent Agenda were items PP-2003-023 (Preliminary Final Plan--Fruitvale Estates); PP-2003-010 (Preliminary Plan--Grand Meadows South Subdivision); PP-2003-043 (Preliminary Plan--Iles Subdivision); PP-2003-016 (Preliminary Plan--Summit Meadows West); FPP-2002-159 (Final Plat/Plan--Independence Ranch Filing #'s 10 and 11); and CUP-2003-040 (Conditional Use Permit--Artic Cooling and Heating). At citizen request, items PP-2003-023 and PP-2003-043 were pulled from Consent and placed on the Full Hearing agenda.

Vice-Chairman Cole read into the record a letter received from the petitioner of item PP-2003-023. The petitioner agreed to erect a privacy fence as a condition of approval.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I would move for consideration that we approve item 2, 4, 5 and 6 [PP-2003-010, PP-2003-016, FPP-2002-159 and CUP-2003-040] of the Consent Agenda."

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

IV. FULL HEARING

GPA-2003-018 GROWTH PLAN AMENDMENT--REHEARING OF ITEM #25, APPLETON RESIDENTIAL AREA, 2002 UPDATE TO THE GROWTH PLAN

A rehearing of discussion item #25 on the proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map of the Growth Plan Update. Discussion item #25 is a request to increase the residential density designation of the property in the Appleton area bounded by 24 Road, 23 1/2 Road, H Road and the I-70 frontage road, from Estate (2 to 5 acres per unit) to Residential Low (1/2 to 2 acres per unit).

Petitioners: Dick and Alan Pennington

Location: Area bounded by 24 Road, 23 1/2 Road, H Road and the I-70 frontage road

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Kathy Portner reviewed the request and referenced the 1998 Joint City/County Resolution [copies distributed] regarding extension of sanitary sewer service to the Appleton Elementary School, the Fellowship Church and vicinity. Ms. Portner noted that "vicinity" pertained to the area proposed for the Residential Low land use designation. The resolution stated that the sewer system was capable of serving that portion of the Appleton service area provided that the overall residential density did not exceed 0.42 unit/acre up to a maximum of 174.5 EQUs (appx. 2-acre lots). Because there were already a number of parcels in the area less than 2 acres in size, the remaining parcels could not all develop as 2-acre lots without exceeding sewer capacity. Ms. Portner said that a great deal of community concern had been expressed over extending sewer to the school and church. Residents had felt it would serve to promote urban sprawl. To help mitigate concerns, both the Council and Board had agreed to limit the time and area served by the sewer extension. The resolution stated that "Revision of the Appleton service area boundary shall not be considered prior to 2010 and only then upon the completion of a review of the *North Central Valley Plan* and only if the findings of said review so direct." Ms. Portner said that provision was primarily to avoid concerns expressed about urban sprawl.

Ms. Portner said that she had conferred with Mr. Shaver and that the staff recommendation was that any approval by the Planning Commissions would be contingent upon the agreement of both the City Council and Board of County Commissioners to amend the original 1998 resolution. Referencing a letter to the Penningtons from City Utility Engineer Trent Prall [copies distributed], Ms. Portner said that Mr. Prall wrote that if higher densities were approved for the subject area, an engineering study would be required on downstream infrastructure and recent development within the basin to ensure that there was adequate capacity. While capacity may have adequate collection and interceptor systems for the additional development, the Railhead lift station may not have adequate capacity and may require upgrading. The letter further emphasized that capacity was based on an "overall" density of .5 unit/acre. Thus, if additional density were approved in the subject area, it would likely mean a reduction in sewer service to another part of the service area.

According to Ms. Portner the Penningtons are contending that higher densities are warranted as a result of the sewer line's presence in the area; however, that argument had been anticipated and had been one of the primary concerns expressed by those involved in the initial service area plan. A review of existing parcel sizes in the area revealed that out of 31 parcels zoned for residential use, 18 were less than 2 acres in size. All of the smaller parcels had been created prior to 1992, and all of them had existed at the time the 1998 North Central Valley Plan had been completed. The Estate land use classification provided for density transition in the

subject area, which staff felt was appropriate. Having determined that the request did not meet the criteria outlined in Code section 2.5.C., denial was recommended based on the conclusions and findings outlined in the May 13, 2003 staff report.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Blosser asked for clarification of the fifth paragraph in Mr. Prall's letter regarding "overall" density. Ms. Portner clarified her understanding.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Mike Joyce, representing the petitioners, offered a Powerpoint presentation, which included the following slides: 1) amendment requested; 2) why amendment requested; 3) staff review; 4) reasons amendment requested; 5) findings of fact/recommendations; and 6) aerial photo of the site. Hard copies of the presentation and a copy of Utility Engineer Trent Prall's letter were distributed and made part of the record. The major points contained in the presentation included the petitioner's belief that substantial growth was occurring in the subject area and that the North Central Valley Area Plan had not been updated over the last five years to reflect current trends; that the extension of the sewer line to the subject area was consistent with the 1998 Joint City/County Resolution which stated that sewer service would be provided to not only the church and school, but also the "vicinity"; that based on his interpretation of Mr. Prall's letter, expansion of sewer service could occur subject to lift station upgrades; that there was an inadequate supply of suitably designated land available in the area for the proposed land use; and that of the 31 parcels in the area zoned for residential use, 18 (58%) were less than 2 acres in size. Thus, the request would be compatible with surrounding densities.

Dick Pennington, co-petitioner, came forward and said that a sewer line T intersection was located at the end of the flag portion of his property off 23 1/2 Road. This junction, he said, would be the perfect point from which to extend sewer to his property and other properties directly east of 23 1/2 Road. Upgrades to the lift station and extension of the sewer line would be cost-prohibitive to a single property owner, and there was no way to recoup costs with the current low densities. However, higher densities (at least one-acre lots) and cost-sharing among a number of the area's property owners was a feasible alternative. Mr. Pennington noted that most of the current area's properties were on septic; however, because they were located within the joint urban planning area, the only way they could get sewer was to develop their properties and annex into the City. If the City denied the current request, property owners would be required to comply with a mandate that they could not individually afford. Reading from an excerpt of the 1998 Persigo Agreement, Mr. Pennington said that the Agreement encouraged residents to connect to sewer instead of waiting for their septic systems to fail. He added that the Mesa County Health Department would confirm that the area was poor for leach fields, especially given the area's high water table.

Mr. Pennington noted the existence of five new churches within a one-mile radius of his property. He said that he asked Two Rivers Realty to conduct a study of properties bounded by G Road, I Road, 22 Road and 25 Road to determine how many higher density properties were available for sale (1/2 to 2 acres); Mr Pennington stated that only four properties were for sale.

Mr. Pennington referenced Mr. Prall's letter, which he felt suggested that the only concern was over the capability of the lift station, not the size of the actual sewer line. He realized that a study would be required and that improvements to the lift station would be necessary and he stated that he was willing to participate in those costs.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Meis asked Mr. Pennington to note the location of his property, which was shown on an available aerial photo.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

Brian Baldwin (796 24 Road, Grand Junction) expressed support for the request.

Francis Hayes (2351 H Road, Grand Junction) pointed out a drainage ditch along the south side of her property. If and when area septic systems failed, she said, it would result in a health hazard.

AGAINST:

Dave Zollner (2545 Canyon Way, Grand Junction) felt that approval of the request would result in densities not compatible with the surrounding area and not consistent with the Appleton Area Plan. Without the Estate land use classification, he said, the area would have no transition. I-70 was supposed to serve as the logical boundary for higher densities, and no significant demographic changes had occurred in the area to warrant the higher density encroachment north of I-70. Approval of the request, he said, would result in future development requests for higher densities.

Dan Miller (2363 H Road, Grand Junction) said that traffic from the Fellowship of Excitement Church had already significantly impacted the area. He'd attended the North Central Valley Plan area meetings and recalled conversations and concerns regarding the encroachment of higher densities into the area. He said the request, if approved, would be detrimental to the area.

Joe Crocker (806 24 Road, Grand Junction) agreed with the points brought up by Mr. Zollner and Mr. Miller. He too had attended the North Central Valley Plan meetings and said that there had been a lot of discussion about keeping densities in the area low. When the sewer line was extended to both the church and school, it represented a compromise to the original Plan; however, the City and County both agreed that to allay citizen concerns and give residents some sense of stability, no additional changes in the sewer service boundary would even be considered until 2010 (Joint City/County Resolution MCM98-51/22-98, page 4, paragraph 14). Mr. Crocker said that he and other neighbors had formed an improvements district and paid approximately \$7,500 each to extend sewer to their properties. Mr. Crocker said that the Penningtons and other neighbors should consider doing the same. That could potentially provide sewer service to existing properties without requiring higher densities to pay for it. The character of the area, he continued, had not changed since 1998, and density increases were not consistent with the surrounding area. He urged denial of the request.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mike Joyce reiterated that higher densities were warranted for the area and that one-acre lots made sense.

QUESTIONS

Chairman Caldwell wondered why a Growth Plan amendment had been sought. He asked why hadn't the petitioners just submitted a development plan for review? Mr. Joyce replied that other area property owners had expressed interest in developing their properties; a Growth Plan amendment affected a larger area.

Commissioner Meis asked at what density is sewer service feasible? Mr. Joyce said that 1 to 1 1/2 acre lots would be the break-even point; sewerage 2-acre lots was more expensive due to the lengths of lot frontages.

Chairman Caldwell asked if there were any land use classifications available between the Estate and Residential Low? Mr. Joyce responded that there are not. Chairman Caldwell remarked that even if the Growth Plan Amendment were approved, it didn't guarantee approval of a rezone request.

Commissioner Pitts asked staff if they knew where the sewer line branched to serve the school and church. Ms. Portner was unsure of the exact location but surmised that the junction was located somewhere along H Road. Referencing the aerial photo, Mr. Pennington provided a more detailed explanation of where he believes existing sewer lines are located.

Commissioner Cox asked if the City would be responsible for upgrades to the lift station. Ms. Portner said that costs would fall to the developer triggering the need for such improvements.

Commissioner Cox asked if septic systems would be permitted in the City if development of 2-acre lots occurred. Ms. Portner said that any development in the joint urban planning area would trigger annexation into the City and hook-up to City sewer would be required. She said that a developer could request a waiver from that requirement but the decision would rest with the City Council.

Commissioner Pitts asked for clarification on the improvements district mentioned by Mr. Crocker. Ms. Portner thought that the majority of property owners in the area along H Road were included in the district and had paid their fees. Commissioner Pitts asked if the City would require sewer hook-up either in the event of annexation or failure of a septic system. Ms. Portner reiterated that if development triggered annexation, hook-up to the sewer line would be required for new development unless a waiver was granted by the City Council. In the event of septic system failure, a property owner would only be required to hook up to sewer if the property was within 400 feet of an existing sewer line. When asked if property owners could still band together to form an improvements district for the purpose of extending sewer service, Ms. Portner said that that was certainly an option.

Commissioner Bonella asked if the Penningtons would be subject to annexation should they develop their properties? Ms. Portner replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Bonella asked for clarification on the density reference made in Mr. Prall's letter. Ms. Portner said that sewer capacity was based on more than just line size or pumping capability. It was also based upon what the treatment plant could handle. The capacity of the City's treatment plan, she said, was based on density calculations of the entire service area. She noted that these and other comments were also included in Mr. Prall's letter to the Penningtons.

Chairman Cole asked if Planning Commission approval of the Growth Plan amendment would be subject to the City and County's agreement to amend their initial resolution. Mr. Shaver replied affirmatively. He noted the paragraphs in the resolution and in Mr. Prall's letter that supported Ms. Portner's comments and referenced the Resolution's Exhibit A, which delineated the locations of approved sewer trunk extensions.

Commissioner Redifer asked when the next North Central Valley Area Plan update would be undertaken. Ms. Portner said that area plans were usually updated every five years, with this being the fifth year. She noted that most of the area's parcels are within County jurisdiction. Kurt Larsen said that it was likely that review of the North Central Valley Plan would begin within the next four or five months. He commented that with regard to treatment plant capacity, any sewer study undertaken would show that if service were provided to increased densities in one area, it may require taking away service from somewhere else.

Commissioner Meis asked whether it would be the City or County that considered any actual development proposal brought forth by the Penningtons. Mr. Larsen said that because the property is within the urban planning boundary, the request would be forwarded to the City for its review and consideration. The County Planning Commission would not hear it at all.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Putnam remembered the discussion that had ensued over extending the sewer line to the Appleton Elementary School. He noted that there had been a lot of opposition from surrounding residents at the time, which had prompted both the City Council and Board of County Commissioners to restrict any further expansion until at least 2010. He said their intent had been clear and residents had accepted the restriction in good faith. He felt that the resolution should be upheld, and he expressed support for staff's findings and recommendations.

Commissioner Blosser agreed, noting that I-70 did serve as a barrier against expansion. There hadn't been much change to the area north of I-70, he said, and approval of the amendment request would override and undermine the intent of the 1998 Resolution.

Commissioner Cox also agreed, although he felt that I-70 had failed to provide a barrier against expansion given that two exceptions had already been made. He felt that the area was properly classified as Estate but sympathized with the Penningtons' difficulty in bringing extensive infrastructure to the area's larger lots.

Commissioner Pitts concurred and felt that the Estate density classification was appropriate and should remain unchanged.

Chairman Cole agreed that approval of the Growth Plan amendment request would be tantamount to going against the word that City Council members and the Board of County Commissioners had given to residents of the area in 1998. The Resolution, he said, should remain intact until at least 2010.

Commissioner Bonella disagreed. He said that the County's support for higher densities is always contingent upon there being adequate services available in the area. In this case, a sewer line was located nearby and the City required hook-up anyway upon annexation. He didn't see that there was any appreciable transition in the area since typically transition zones buffered varying uses (e.g., a higher density residential zone to buffer a commercial use and a lower density residential zone). The uses in the subject area, he maintained, went directly from commercial to rural. Upon annexation, the City will not only require property owners to hook up to sewer, it will require higher-end improvements such as curb, gutter and sidewalk. To require those things in a rural area without the benefit of subdivision to help pay for those improvements was unfair to property owners. It effectively prevented them from developing their properties. He doubted that the level of growth occurring in the area had been foreseen five years prior, at the time the North Central Valley Area Plan and Joint City/County Resolution had been drafted. He expressed support for the request.

Commissioner Gardener felt his position to be somewhere in the middle. He was concerned about higher densities overburdening the sewer treatment plant and felt too that any amendment to the original 1998 Resolution would be doing a disservice to the residents who had been a part of that earlier discussion.

Commissioner Meis felt that using a Growth Plan Amendment to address the needs of one or two parcels was inappropriate. He also agreed that requiring curb, gutter and sidewalk in a rural area was also inappropriate and felt that any annexation of properties in that area would be a struggle.

Chairman Caldwell concurred with Commissioner Meis's comments.

Commissioner Bonella reiterated that denial of the current request would "hamstring" area property owners and prevent them from developing their properties.

MOTION: (Commissioner Meis) "Mr. Chairman, with regard to GPA-2003-061/2003-025-TXT1, a Growth Plan Amendment rehearing of item #25 of the Appleton residential area, 2002 update to the Growth Plan, I would make a motion that we accept staff's recommendation of denial on the grounds that it doesn't meet the provisions as specified by the staff."

Commissioner Gardener seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 3-1, with Commissioner Bonella opposing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Blosser) "Mr. Chairman, on item GPA-2003-018/2003-025-TXT1, Growth Plan Amendment, a rehearing of item #25, Appleton residential area, 2002 update to the Growth Plan, I move that we approve the request to increase the residential density designation of the Appleton area to Residential Low (1/2 to 2 acres/unit)."

Commissioner Cox seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion failed by a unanimous vote of 0-7.

The Joint City/County Planning Commission portion of the public hearing was adjourned at 8:45 p.m. and a brief recess was called. The City Planning Commission public hearing reconvened at 8:52 p.m.

PP-2003-043 PRELIMINARY PLAN--ILES SUBDIVISION

A request for Preliminary Plan approval to develop 23 single-family lots on 5.76 acres in an RMF-5 (Residential Multi-Family, 5 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioner: John Iles

Location: 3080 D 1/2 Road

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Monte Stroup, representing the petitioner, said that those who had originally asked that the item be pulled from Consent Agenda had mistakenly believed the item to be part of the Dakota West Subdivision proposal. They were directed to the engineer of that subdivision for resolution of their issue(s).

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

There was no presentation by City staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Anna Elliott (no address given) said that her issue pertained to irrigation water delivery. She noted the location of an irrigation lateral north of her property. All three developing subdivisions in the area, she said, needed to get together to ensure uninterrupted irrigation water delivery to existing area residents. Already one irrigation ditch had been destroyed. She also wanted to know if privacy fencing would be installed along her property line.

Mr. Shaver explained that water and fencing issues are not generally considered in detail during the Preliminary Plan stage. He suggested Ms. Elliott talk with staff prior to Final Plan review. To planning commissioners he said that they could either choose to hear the Final Plan or let the item proceed through administrative review.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I would move that topic PP-2003-043 be removed from the Full Hearing [and moved] to the Consent Agenda."

Commissioner Cox seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

PP-2003-023 PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAN--FRUITVALE ESTATES

A request for approval of the Preliminary Plan to develop 14 single-family lots on 3.95 acres in an RSF-4 (Residential Single-Family, 4 units/acre) zone district.

Petitioner: Disraeli Development, Inc., Merritt Sixby

Location: Hoover Drive and E 1/4 Road

This item was opened for public comment because only one citizen was present and it was felt that the item may be a candidate for late placement on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Dave Austin (no address given), representing the Clifton Fire Protection District, said that he had not received a review agency packet and so he did not have a chance to review the request. He asked that the item be postponed until the next public hearing to give him an opportunity to review and comment. This was not the first time, he said, that proposals had gone before the Planning Commission without Clifton Fire having seen a review packet.

Mr. Cecil said that the Clifton Fire Department was included on the list of review agencies. All review agencies were sent the same information at the same time. Non-response had always been understood to mean that there were no issues or concerns. In addition, the City Clerk always notified review agencies a second time whenever a development triggered annexation.

A brief discussion ensued over whether to continue the item to the next public hearing.

MOTION: (Commissioner Pitts) "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we continue this item to the next meeting."

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion.

Mr. Cecil said that the next regularly scheduled May meeting had been cancelled. If continued, the item would not be heard until June 10.

Merritt Sixby, the petitioner, objected to the delay. He said that he had followed all the City's requirements and should not be penalized for one review agency not having received its packet. He offered to discuss the request with Mr. Austin after the meeting, if that would help. Mr. Sixby asked that the item be moved forward. In response, Mr. Austin said that he felt he should be given time to review the request and comment prior to consideration by the planning commission.

Commissioner Redifer expressed discomfort in moving the request to the Consent Agenda without having first heard from Clifton Fire.

A vote was called and the motion failed by a vote of 2-4. The decision was made to open the item for a full hearing.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Jeff Mays, representing the petitioner, reviewed the request and availed himself for questions.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Blosser asked Mr. Mays if he or the petitioner had received any comments from either the Grand Junction Fire Department or Clifton Fire regarding street widths, hydrants, etc. Mr. Mays responded negatively. Typical comments expected would have been regarding hydrant quantity or their placement. The proposed cul-de-sac had been designed according to City standards.

Commissioner Cox asked Mr. Mays if he knew how far it was from Orchard Avenue to the center of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Mays said that it was between 500-600 feet. He said that hydrants would be placed at the junction of Orchard Avenue and Hoover Court and at the entrance to the cul-de-sac.

STAFF'S PRESENTATION

Pat Cecil offered a Powerpoint presentation containing the following slides: 1) site location map; 2) aerial photo; 3) Future Land Use map; 4) existing City and County zoning map; and 5) the Preliminary Plan. A stub street to the west from Hoover Court was noted. Comments had been received from the water district regarding placement of fire hydrants. The Grand Junction Fire Department had reviewed the request and submitted comments. A detention area was proposed for the rear of the property. One letter had been received from Carl and Charlotte Freytag (3079 E 1/2 Road, Grand Junction), who asked for fencing along their property line. The petitioner had agreed to provide the requested fencing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

FOR:

There were no comments for the request.

AGAINST:

Dave Austin (no address given), representing Clifton Fire Protection District, again asked for postponement of the request pending his review.

QUESTIONS

Commissioner Cox asked if a signature from Clifton Fire District staff would be required on the Final Plat. Mr. Shaver responded "no," adding that review agency comments were advisory.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Mays said that during Final review, the Clifton Fire District would have a chance to review and comment on the proposal. He noted that Clifton Water had requested moving a fire hydrant, but to remain compliant with fire codes and requirements, the hydrant had to remain where proposed. Mr. Mays said he understood that Clifton Fire District's comments must be considered prior to Final approval.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner Redifer acknowledged ongoing concerns expressed by the Clifton Fire District regarding its limited resources and new development. While there appeared to be nothing wrong with the proposal, Commissioner Redifer said that there are bigger issues involving the District that must be addressed and soon. He appreciated the District's staff taking the time to be present at public hearings but its issues would be best addressed in another forum.

MOTION: (Commissioner Redifer) "I would move that we approve this project."

Commissioner Blosser didn't feel that Clifton Fire was present to oppose the project; rather, to point out continued non-receipt of review agency packets and to express interest in reviewing all development requests proposed within its service area.

Commissioner Blosser seconded the motion.

Chairman Cole asked staff to do what they could to ensure that review agency packets were sent to and received by the Clifton Fire District. Mr. Blanchard said that if the District's name was included on a mailing list, a packet was sent out. He was unsure why they weren't being received. He said that staff would make sure the District was notified during Final review.

A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7-0.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Blanchard said that Chairman Dibble had requested a meeting with City Council members to discuss a number of issues. Attempts are being made to schedule that meeting and more information would be forthcoming. When Commissioner Cox asked if there were any plans to revise the landscaping portion of the Code, Mr. Blanchard said that revision efforts would at least commence this year.

With no further business to discuss, the public hearing was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.