Fairfax Planning Commission Workshop
April 17, 2008
Fairfax Women's Club, 46 Park Road

CALL TO ORDER 7:30 pm

ROLL CALL

Board members present:

Shelby LaMotte
Terry Goyan
Alec Hoffmann
Pam Meigs
Peter Lacques
Brannon Ketcham
Shelley Hamilton

Staff present: Town Manager Rock (arrived 7:57 pm)
Ann Welsh, Planning Director
Linda Neal, Senior Planner
Amy Dunnigan, Minutes Clerk

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
M/S Hoffmann-Ketcham motioned to approve the agenda with removal of Public Hearing Item #4, Application # 08-17.
AYES: All (7)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
M/S Meigs-Lacques motioned to approve minutes from Planning Commission Meeting dated February 21, 2008 with the following changes:
Page 5, 88 Dominga, Staff started the report explaining that the applicants had removed **the roof deck, the screen wall and stairs voluntarily**.
4 down Commissioner Hamilton questioned clarification if Code allowed reconstruction of non-conforming structures.
Page 6, top of page: Final motion should also reflect **that the garage roof deck, the stairs and the screen wall be removed from the plans**.
Page 7, 5th sentence: Planning Director Welsh stated the Ordinance indirectly stated lofts were another story **because it had a floor**.
Page 7, 11th sentence (2nd to last paragraph): Town was going to contact Consultant Kennings to get a proposal **for design guidelines** for the CH District.
Page 7, 12th sentence: **Mixed Use Ordinance once approved by the Planning Commission and the Town Council would be sent to the State and Design Guidelines would be worked out by the Planning Commission in the interim while the State reviewed the Ordinance.**

Page 7, Last sentence of the last paragraph: The Commission should look at what was being proposed before the next meeting and decide what should be in the Ordinance as a requirement **(i.e. as Law)**.
Page 8, 1st paragraph: Commissioner Hamilton said pedestrian **could be addressed as it was being addressed in the area of Center Boulevard…**
Page 8, 6th paragraph: Change abbreviation of MUO to **MX Ordinance** in two areas within the paragraph.
AYES: All (7)

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
None.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

Commissioner Hamilton asked if there was an update on the cost basis for 50% remodel. Senior Planner Neal advised Staff had contacted a number of towns and had only heard from two and were still working on it. She advised Larkspur was actually using lower values than Fairfax.

Commissioner Hamilton asked what had been decided as far as moving to Action Minutes. Planning Director Welsh advised it was already in the Town Packet (Item #6) and that it would need to be approved by Town Council.

Commissioner Hamilton asked if the Commission would like to hear the Town Council's comments from the meeting the night prior and Chair Meigs advised to not hold up the Public, Commissioner Hamilton could comment at the end.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. 199 Scenic Road; Application # 08-15
Approved when agenda was approved.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

3. 17 Vista Way; Application # 08-16 (7:40 pm)
Commissioner Ketcham addressed Senior Planner Neal and asked how upslope and downslope were determined. Senior Planner Neal advised it was an upslope along the street front from left to right, but Commissioner Ketcham said it was the backside that gave it slope. Senior Planner Neal advised it was possibly downslope, but slope did not affect the application.

Applicant/owner, Martin Secker, 17 Vista Way, Fairfax: Advised it was a split-level house and initially thought about constructing a kitchen when he injured his leg and recognized the difficulty of a split level home. Mr. Secker advised he was forced to make a decision to either move or work to make the residence a single level. Mr. Secker

advised he enjoyed where he was living and hoped to remain there as it seemed natural to utilize the already existing structure and make needed improvements.

Commissioner Goyan questioned letters the applicants' neighbors had sent letters supporting the project. Mr. Secker confirmed that neighbors from the east, west and directly across the street all wrote letters supporting his project. Senior Planner Neal confirmed the same.

Chair Meigs closed the Application to Public (7:53 pm).

Commissioner Hoffmann said based on the width of the road and that parking was not an issue, he felt comfortable moving forward with the application. Since all neighbors supported the project and in light of second units being encouraged, Commissioner Hoffmann requested that the Commission allow Mr. Secker to plan for the future. Senior Planner Neal confirmed applicants paid half fees for the second unit amnesty and it was the first application under the Second Unit Amnesty Program. Commissioner Ketcham felt the project met the intent and was happy to see someone come up with a good use for it. Chair Meigs felt comfortable supporting the project as it was a modest change and was pleased to see the first Second Unit Amnesty Ordinance utilized.

M/S Ketcham-Hoffmann moved to approve Application #08-16; 17 Vista Way with the findings and recommendations identified by Town Staff. .
AYES: All (7)

Chair Meigs advised that any member of the Public had 10 days to appeal the application and the application was available at Town Hall.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. M/S Hoffmann-Goyan motioned to approve item #2 on the Consent Calendar, Application # 08-15 as the Public was confused whether the project was approved under the Agenda.
AYES: All (7)

4. 110-114 Forrest Avenue; Application # 08-17 was removed from Agenda.

5. 37 Spruce Road; Application # 08-18
The application would go to DRB even though it is less than a 50% remodel due to being to the multiple family residence zone.

Commissioner Hoffmann asked if there was any historical significance to the residence. Neal advised the architect included historical photographs and that the home had been there for a long time. Senior Planner Neal advised Fairfax had nothing in place to preserve historical sites. Commissioner Ketcham asked about the slope requirement as he found it curious with the steep slopes and flat areas. The site sloped down to the creek and had a 35 foot height requirement. Senior Planner Neal advised it was the first home

she came across that had over 10% slope. Commissioner Ketcham felt more comfortable approving the project since the slope was very unusual as described by Senior Planner Neal. Chair Meigs inquired about the creek and the protection of the creek. Senior Planner Neal advised the applicants would have to comply with storm water discharge requirements and have to have silt protection plan during the building stage.

Applicant/Architect, Morgan Hall, 55 Bolinas Rd, Fairfax: Explained he would be adding on to existing kitchen at the 1st floor level and adding on to the master bedroom at the 2nd level. The home was the first home in the area at one point. They were working to remain consistent as possible to the period style of the home both inside and out. Mr. Hall did pull part of the 2nd floor back an additional 2 feet in order to create some interest in the design, but hoped that the addition will appear it had already been part of the residence. Chair Meigs questioned the red cedar shingles. Mr. Hall advised it was not in the fire zone, so there was no restriction on the side wall material and that the roof must still be a Class-A roof.

Chair Meigs closed the Application to Public.

Commissioner Ketcham asked Staff if the Town had plans since the property line was so near to the road. Senior Planner Neal advised that his would be a question for Public Works, but they were not present at the meeting. Senior Planner Neal advised changes like sidewalks were voluntary, but since the hydrant was being replaced if Public Works should anticipate a sidewalk.

ACTION: Senior Planner Neal advised Staff would notify Public Works of the potential property line/sidewalk issue.

Chair Meigs felt the improvement would be beautiful and that nothing lasts forever and saw the design as an upgrade. Commissioner Ketcham said respecting historical integrity stayed in line of applicants' changes. He had no problem with proposal and hoped Design Review Board also review from perspective of respecting historical integrity as he would hate to see the property changed too much. Senior Planner Neal advised that DRB was careful with those aspects and that DRB would see the night's minutes and she would also discuss it with the Board. Commissioner Lacques felt the project was appropriate scale and would be an aesthetic improvement and was a well thought out addition and supported the project. Commissioner Hoffmann supported the project and if it were not an existing building, he would have issues with the size of the building as from the backside it looked pretty imposing, but the structure was already existing and would add to the articulation of the building. Commissioner Hoffmann had no problems with the application. Commissioner LaMotte supported the project as it added living space and improved the lifestyle of those people living there. Respecting the creek and neighbors, it was really well thought out and appreciated all aspects of maintaining the footprint (as the previous application did as well and commended the applicants of both projects). Commissioner Goyan said the mass was impressive and was his main concern, but did see where the architect had tried to articulate it to make the project appear smaller and the project as it was done very well.

M/S Hamilton-LaMotte motioned to approve Application # 08-18 with the added finding that the proposal respected the historical integrity of the structure.
AYES: All (7)

Chair Meigs advised that any Public had 10 days to appeal the application and the application was available at Town Hall.

(8:18 pm- 5 minute break. Meeting resumed 8:27 pm)

DRAFT ORDINANCES

6. **Reviewed draft resolution revising Term for Chair and Vice Chair, allowing action minutes.** Planning Director Welsh prepared language that could be incorporated into the Municipal Code. She went through the existing Municipal Code and revised the existing Code for proposal in a Draft resolution for next Council Meeting for May 7, 2008.

As it currently was written, the Commissioners would not have a chance to rotate into Chair if they served for 4 years, so revising it would create an opportunity. The Vice Chair was to create another position to fill as needed. Commissioner Lacques supported the chair position, but preferred detailed minutes and questioned whether the two issues should be voted on separately. Manager Rock advised the Commission could revise the Municipal Code, but it would have to be one vote to amend one portion of the Code even though they were separate issues.

Municipal Code § 2.28.120 CHAIRPERSON

Chair Meigs advised the vice chair position was in case of the absence of chair. Commissioner Hamilton added that if the chair ended the term early, the vice chair would not automatically assume the role of chair.

After discussion about whether the new language suggested to define the chairperson's roles under (B) The chairperson shall, the commission decided the language was unnecessary. Manager Rock advised it would take several Town Council meetings and that it would be late June at the earliest that the new proposals would be decided.

M/S Hamilton-LaMotte motioned to approve **Municipal Code § 2.28.120 CHAIRPERSON** revised as follows **Section A as stated in Staff Report: Planning Commissioners shall meet in regular session and elect a chairperson and vice chairperson. The elections shall be by a majority vote of the commission, to be held in December of each year. The term of service for these offices shall be one year, beginning in January of each year. No commissioner shall serve more than two (2) consecutive full terms as chairperson of the commission. Section (B) in the Staff Report was omitted and replaced by Section (C). Section (C) became (B): The chairperson shall preside at Planning Commission meetings. The vice chairperson**

shall preside in the absence of the chairperson. Should the chairperson and vice chairperson be absent from any meeting, members present shall elect a Chairperson Pro Tempore. Section (D) became (C): Should a mid-term vacancy occur in the Office of Chairperson, the vice chairperson shall preside in the office for the remainder of the term and a new vice chairperson shall be elected.
AYES: All (7)

ACTION: Planning Director Welsh would have the final product for the Municipal Code for the Commission on May 1, 2008. Chair Meigs agreed.

Municipal Code § 2.28.120 Action minutes
Commissioner LaMotte was comfortable with moving to action minutes.
Commissioner Goyan was not savvy with what led to the change, but feels if the rest of the committee felt it was the right thing to do, he was on board.
Commissioner Hoffmann advised it was important to have a detailed record of minutes, but with the technology the meetings were recorded verbatim. He suggested using language such as **"**Minutes and records shall be kept of the proceedings of the Planning Commission. An electronic recording of all Planning Commission meetings shall be kept. If the recording works, action minutes shall be sufficient. If the recording failed, then detailed minutes would be warranted for that particular meeting.**"** Commissioner Lacques felt the extra effort of retaining detailed minutes was important. He felt it was very useful recently and if things were appealed to the Town Council, the Council did not have the time to go through a CD and if anything was litigated, it was important to have a written record to have something to support the Commission's decision and the Council's decision. The Council did not take detailed minutes and projects sometimes returned and detailed minutes were good to remind the Commission of actions that had taken place on a particular property and for knowing what had been done for other projects.
Commissioner Lacques felt the Tree Ordinance was another example for a permit that had been applied for. He felt a digital recording was ultimately not that reliable. It was fallible and he had found detailed minutes useful when referring to past meetings.
Commissioner Ketcham said Town Council kept action minutes, Parks and Recreation was not required to keep minutes, Design Review Board kept detailed minutes and felt action minutes were important to only show the findings. Commissioner Ketcham felt the detailed record was kept with the recording. If something was really important, it was something that said "the opinion" so what was being said was articulated rather than reading through minutes to find what everyone thought. Commissioner Ketcham felt defining minutes should not be put in the Code, but "that an electronic minutes version was available and should be reviewed if there are any questions." Commissioner Hamilton advocated strongly for action minutes as they remind us of actions taken and findings should reflect the outcomes of discussions. She believed action minutes should serve as a table of contents and to have a time for where in the recording you would want to find an issue. Commissioner Hamilton's rationale for going to action minutes was that there were challenges with detailed minutes not actually portraying what was said and felt there was more liabilities for that reason and to refer to the digital recording as true documentation. If there were legal issues that would come up, the digital recording would be reviewed. Commissioner Hamilton's suggestion for language in the Code was as

stated in the following motion (9:07 pm). Chair Meigs felt she could live with action minutes after hearing what was said as she had been in a few Planning Commission meetings where detailed minutes were needed. Her only concern was because the Town had had electronics fail in the past, but not since using back-up recorders. Without the recording, there would be potential legal problems.

M/S Hoffmann-Goyan motioned to amend Municipal **Code § 2.28.110** records of proceedings to read: **Action minutes and records shall be kept of the proceedings of the Planning Commission so long as an electronic recording of the meeting is available. If such a recording is not available, detailed minutes shall be kept.** Commissioner Ketcham recommended findings that action minutes should include the findings and the actions of the Planning Commission and there should be a dissenting opinion, that those opinions/findings would be articulated in the minutes. Commissioner Hoffmann added the action minutes should also include the point on the tape so that item can be referenced.
AYES: (6)
OPPOSED: (1) Commissioner Lacques

ACTION: Staff would bring back new Draft Amendments to Chapter 2.28 of the Municipal Code for the Commission's workshop on May 1, 2008.

(9:15 pm)
7. **Continued discussion/consideration of the Draft Mixed Use Overlay Zone.**
Commissioner Hamilton provided a quick summary of the Town Council meeting from the previous night: A few of the agenda items were the Housing Element, affordable housing and MX Ordinance that was needed to get the Housing Element certified. Town Council was very concerned about not having a certified Housing Element. Town Council wanted Planning Commission to give them the Commission's best effort to date and Town's legal council said Planning Commission cannot send a draft with holes in it and it was the Commission's legal responsibility to send them a completed version. There was an impression that Town Council would have to revisit all issues, so they requested the Commission pass on everything to them, so the Public would get involved with the planning. The Town Council understood making things doable within Fairfax, but to document decisions and make the MX Ordinance achievable and trust that the Town Council would do the right thing. There was also a discussion about creating a redevelopment agency.

Chair Meigs felt the MX Ordinance should go directly to Council. Chair Meigs' fear was that by the time it reached Council, they would have to begin again since the state was constantly changing their rules and regulations and that a decision had to be made by the Commission. Commissioner Hamilton said the Planning Commission had to make a decision because the Town Council made a strong recommendation to the Planning Commission to complete work on the MX Ordinance by May 21, 2008. Chair Meigs requested any Town Council meeting that had any issue with the Planning Commission that she/chairperson be made aware.

Only two meetings were left prior to the Council's May 21, 2008 deadline. Planning Director Welsh and Senior Planner Neal felt there would be a lot of applications at the May Meeting and Chair Meigs questioned whether a special meeting was needed.

Commissioner Ketcham felt that the sub-committee and the drafts had helped tremendously and he felt the commission was close to having the draft finished. The commissioners agreed to stay late and vote on the outstanding issues with the MX Ordinance knowing that if the commission was not unanimous on everything, it would most likely be revised at a future time by the Council. The commission did not want to hold up progress and potential for the Town. (9:38 pm)

Landcaping:
Commissioner Hamilton felt a supplemental document summarizing the table and the findings and the basis for each topic category and articulating alternate options and descending opinions would be beneficial to Town Council.

Commissioner Ketcham felt 15% needed to be in the ordinance since that defined the footprint, but what was in it needed to be in design. The Commission decided to suggest 15% of the ground surface be landscaped and to let the Town do the analysis. Commissioner Ketcham proposed a minimum shall be permeable and designed in accordance with approved landscaping. Commissioner LaMotte advised landscaping was different for every application and that vegetation needed to be implied.

M/S Ketcham-Hoffmann motioned to change the language in the MX Ordinance on Page 5 (D) as follows: **A minimum of 15% of the ground surface within the lot area (exclusive of rights-of-way) shall be permeable including planted and usable outdoor space in accordance with an approved landscape plan, subject to Design Review.**
AYES: All (7)

Affordable housing %:
Affordable Housing incentives were discussed in the prior workshop, but nothing was decided. Planning Director Welsh said the first draft and second draft of the ordinance were sent to her contact with state to get feedback and she advised that the percentage of affordable housing was not decided.

Commissioner Hoffmann reminded one idea was a density or story bonus for adding some percentage of affordable housing. It was tied to a height variance. The Planning Commission would look favorably upon that if the project included a percentage of affordable housing. Commissioner Hoffmann advocated an actual number. Commissioner Ketcham suggested if a project had a higher level of affordability, the building(s) could have a certain number of stories. If they did that with the height, they'd have to do it with density. The densities were always maximum densities and it created a definitive incentive, but both height and density would have to be addressed. Commissioner Hamilton said to come up with a table would be a good idea for Green Building, but it could not be part of the ordinance unless it was made part of the code. Commissioner

Goyan agreed with Commissioner Hamilton and that 20% might be more workable for a developer and questioned why the percentage was the problem. It would most likely be returned to Planning Commission again and incentives could be included at that time. (10:07 pm) Commissioner Lacques felt the Town should move towards a higher affordable housing ratio whether it was 30-40% rather than putting in incentives. Commissioner LaMotte took the chart of the Housing Element and different sites and did some math and since Fairfax was very small, to put a high percentage of affordable housing, it would kill the project. Fairfax was not San Rafael or San Francisco and 20% is high for some of the places with smaller lots. Commissioner LaMotte supported 20% because it was achievable and felt a higher percentage would only come back to the Commission and she also did not want to see big, three-story buildings. Commissioner Hoffmann asked if the Overlay Zone would govern the zone. Planning Director Welsh said an applicant could still come in for commercial and that residential was allowed on second units. Commissioner Hoffmann said on the small lots, only 2-3 affordable units would be allowed and asked if the Planning Commission wanted it to make it 20% so even a small property would have to have a minimum of one affordable unit or would a small property pay in-lieu fees to not have an affordable unit. (10:12 pm) He would be more amenable to lowering the percentage. Chair Meigs thought 20% was reasonable and fair if the Planning Commission really wanted affordable housing. She knew Fairfax very well and maybe it was progressive, but she felt something had to be let go in order to move forward. Incentives could go to design aspects and Planning Commission could make a basic statement. Commissioner Ketcham confirmed 28.5 feet commercial 2-story and residential 3-story depending on lot slope. Commissioner Ketcham saw 20% as not incentivized and anything else talked about was to try to get that level of affordability higher as long as it was not a giveaway to the Town's character. There would be a level of incentive if a developer could meet 25% affordability. A developer could be given a third story if there was a good control on height. Start at 20% unincentivized and allowing a third story and a couple of foot increase could get a lot more density and more percentage of affordability in those zones. Commissioner Ketcham had mixed feelings about mandating one affordable unit per site since that would mean 50% for small lots. Commissioner Hamilton heard from the meeting with the affordable housing consultants that there was no other community that goes higher than 20% and that 20% was actually considered aggressive. 5-10% was aggressive in many towns and was comfortable with 20% for Fairfax. If the commission was voting on 40% or higher she would want it documented that the development would require incentives, but had not tested it. She felt it best to stick with what the Planning Commission had and tell Town Council that the Commission would like to see higher percentages and here are recommendations (i.e. in-lieu fees, story bonuses, height bonuses) and do their best to try to draft something. She had issue with one unit, but was fine with leaving it at the time. Commissioner Lacques asked why the Town should let any developer build any housing that was not affordable and said to be careful with incentives that would not work in Fairfax as there would not be enough properties to include in-lieu fees. Fairfax was small with small parcels of land and in term of incentives, he felt in-lieu fees would not work in such a small community as there would not be enough small properties to contribute to in-lie fees. Chair Meigs said she liked Commissioner Hamilton's idea, but was concerned about sending something to Council that did not have more of a consensus of the Commission. She felt

the majority of the Commission was backing down to 20% affordability with a back up of increasing based on incentives. Chair Meigs was concerned with incentives and would have to agree generically to send it to Council even though it sounded open, but to move ahead, could they come to a conclusion on the percentage.

Planning Director Welsh commented that she listened to the recording before today's meeting and read "Section §17.097.050(C) (1) and drafted language she felt captured the spirit of what the Commission was trying to say (10:28 pm). Commissioner Lacques liked that the incentives for height (not to exceed 35 feet) were very clear. He still felt higher than 20% was a good idea, but he would support something along what Planning Director Welsh stated as a clear incentive for building another floor. Commissioner Hamilton agreed with the incentives for height as the Fair-Anselm site was the most likely site for a third. In recommendations for Town Council, the most likely site for incentives such as height (saying here was the menu of incentives Planning Commission's discussed) and let Town Council determine it. Commissioner Goyan agreed with Commissioner Hamilton. Town Council was going to have to handle it regardless of what the Commission provided. Commissioner Goyan said it would take days and days if the Commission tried to narrow down incentives. Commissioner Hoffmann said in general he would agree, however, he was getting the feeling that everyone agreed that a height incentive made sense, 20% could be a minimum and maybe throwing in 40% if the developer met affordable housing and Town Council could always change it. He suggested to proceed if everyone agreed. Add actual height limit, but 35 feet addendum to Planning Director Welsh's language drafted. Commissioner Ketcham felt it was also important to make a statement this is important and this is a way to accomplish it. Town Council was going to debate the percentage and if it was not in there, they may not debate the percentage at all. Giving Town Council a benchmark was a place to start and it would be a strong point. Commissioner Hamilton thought section (C) (1) should say a minimum of 20% shall be affordable and section (2) should say if 40% was achieved, then the developer would get three stories with total height not to exceed 35 feet. Commissioner Hamilton liked the rationale.

Chair Meigs said there were other incentives out there, but she could vote for the previous statement. Commissioner Lacques reminded it was something that everyone could agree on. Chair Meigs said it was just for the largest site in Town (Fair Anselm, both sides of Center Boulevard) and that the Town could work on incentives. Commissioner Ketcham asked what the ramifications were to say item (1) or having them as two separate sections. He felt it was stronger incentive as one section.

M/S Hamilton-Hoffmann motioned to amend Section §17.097.050 (C) on affordable housing to read as follows:
(C) Affordable housing
(1) A minimum of 20% of the residential units shall be affordable.
(2) If a minimum 40% affordable units are to be built in the "Fair-Anselm/Albertson's" site, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 002-131-12, 002-131-13, 002-131-09, 002-131-07, 002-131-14 and 002-131-15, a height bonus of a third story not to exceed 35 feet shall be granted".

(3:11 on recording)
(3) Inclusionary units shall generally have the same ratio of unit sizes as market rate units.
(4) There shall be a minimum of one affordable unit per **Mixed-Use Project**.

AYES: (5)
Opposed (2) Commissioner Goyan, Chair Meigs

§17.097.060 FINDINGS

Commissioner Ketcham asked if in order to grant a variance, would a developer have to meet A though I. Chair Meigs confirmed all would have to be met. Commissioner Hamilton asked if there were any other findings that were not listed. Senior Planner Neal said the first four findings were found everywhere throughout the Code. E-I were not standard, but additional on top of all others. Commissioner Ketcham said he read through the findings and could live with them, but they had talked about incentivizing, but felt the findings were very difficult. Commissioner Hoffmann said he would hope that the Planning Commission would see all projects getting application through the MX Ordinance. (10:54 pm) The Planning Commission would need findings to approve the project and then a subsection to approve the variances. Senior Planner Neal advised the way the CH Zone was set up and thought the intent was to give someone a level of confidence by right. Commissioner Hoffmann said clarifications for Findings for Granting a Variance in the MX Ordinance was needed for a heading. Commissioner Hamilton said that if A-D were stated everywhere throughout the code (cross reference Variance section), then only the last four items (E-I) would be needed.

M/S Lacques-Hamilton motioned to adopt language for §17.097.060 findings for variance in the MX Overlay Zone: Neither the Planning Commission nor Town Council on appeal shall grant a variance, unless it concludes, **in addition to the findings required by 17.028.070, that all of the following findings apply. (Incorporate findings E-I and re-letter A-E).**
AYES: All (7)

M/S Hoffmann-Lacques motioned to propose new language for §17.097.070 CONDITIONS (F) **"The proposed project shall be designed to conserve energy and natural resources and incorporate green building and design principals."**
AYES: All (7)

M/S Hamilton-Goyan motioned to remove Conditions (B) under §17.097.070 CONDITIONS (Page 6).
AYES: All (7)

Planning Director's Report.

ACTION: Chair Meigs said the sub-committee would go through the Matrix for the next draft with notes from meeting before it was returned to Planning Commission for the next workshop. At the next workshop, present the final and at least the first draft of the notes of the supplemental recommendations to the Town Council.

ACTION: Planning Director Welsh would notify Consultant Kennings and provide a draft to him. Ask if Consultant Kennings needed to do the edit. Email Consultant Kennings, Chair Meigs and Commissioner Hamilton the draft.

M/S Hoffmann-Meigs motioned to adjourn meeting 11:18 pm.
AYES: All (7)

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Dunnigan
Minutes Clerk