

MINUTES
City of Newport Planning Commission
Regular Session
Newport City Hall Council Chambers
Monday, December 14, 2015

Commissioners Present: Jim Patrick, Rod Croteau, Lee Hardy, Bob Berman, and Mike Franklin.

Commissioners Absent: Gary East and Bill Branigan (*excused*).

City Staff Present: Community Development Director (CDD) Derrick Tokos, Building Official Joseph Lease, and Executive Assistant Wanda Haney.

A. **Roll Call.** Chair Patrick called the meeting to order in the City Hall Council Chambers at 7:02 p.m. On roll call, Hardy, Berman, Croteau, Patrick, and Franklin were present. East was absent, and Branigan was absent but excused.

B. **Approval of Minutes.**

1. Approval of the Planning Commission work session and regular meeting minutes of November 23, 2015.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Croteau, seconded by Commissioner Hardy, to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

C. **Citizen/Public Comment.** No public comments.

D. **Consent Calendar.** Nothing on the Consent Calendar.

E. **Action Items.**

1. **Outreach meeting for the City's assumption of the mechanical permitting program for properties within city limits.** Tokos noted that on October 1st the City filed with the Oregon Building Codes Division asking for the transfer of the mechanical program for properties within city limits. This is the only piece of permitting that the City doesn't have because we didn't have a Building Official qualified to do that work. Our current Building Official, Joseph Lease, who was present at this meeting, has those certifications. Tokos said he had included in the packets a cover memo and a link to where the materials are posted. He said this is a lengthy application process. The Building Codes Division is reviewing our request at this point. If they agree that this is appropriate, the transfer will be effective the start of the fiscal year, July 1st. The City has had conversations with the County. They elected not to comment. They want to work on the Intergovernmental Agreement on how we coordinate and how they can provide backup to us. Mechanical permitting is the smallest program in terms of permitting annual revenue. Tokos said why the City is looking at this is because it offers us the ability to bundle all permits. For instance someone who is building a single-family home can obtain all permits needed to do that home without having to coordinate with the City and the County. It allows us to be more efficient in that regard. We also can bundle inspections. There's a single point of jurisdictional contact for people. It increases the depth of mechanical permitting expertise in the county. We don't have a lot of depth between the county and cities in terms of building officials with these various licenses. The more depth we have and the more we can support each other, the better off we are. It puts us in a better position to serve our clientele. Tokos noted that as part of the process, the State wants us to do some outreach meetings. This is the first of a couple of which we are planning on doing. He thought the Planning Commission would be a good forum. A few of the Commissioners have some expertise on the construction side. This gives us a chance to make sure we get everything on minutes and are in a position to respond to folks if we can't answer their questions tonight.

Patrick opened up the meeting for public testimony on this action. Nobody was in attendance to testify on this matter. Tokos noted that we did send notices to the contractors and to the County; not just the mechanical contractors but also plumbing contractors who are licensed to do mechanical work. So they all received direct notice of this. Hardy said

we missed at least half of them based on that list in the packet. Tokos asked her to let us know because we will be doing another one of these.

Hardy asked if the Commissioners could ask questions, and Tokos confirmed that they certainly could. Hardy said Tokos' memo referred to using the mechanical for one- and two-family structures. She asked if that's the extent of it; excluding the larger multi-family or commercial structures. Lease said it would include pretty much the whole mechanical program. So it would include commercial as well. Hardy asked if an individual will be able to choose between the City and the County depending on scheduling restrictions that Lease may have as a single individual. Lease said they wouldn't be able to do that once the program is transferred. Tokos added that it doesn't work that way. That is basically what the Intergovernmental Agreement we're going to be updating with the County gets at; how we mutually support each other to ensure that we provide reasonably convenient inspection times. So if Lease is on vacation, a County individual would back him up; and if the county person is on vacation, Lease would back him up. That's the thought process. Hardy asked where the quality control as far as thoroughness of inspections would be. What standards do you have to meet as a public entity performing these inspections? Tokos said the Oregon State Building Codes Division is the one that does the licensing oversight of inspectors. Lease submitted for review to the Building Codes Division and received approval from them for him to do the mechanical plans review and the mechanical inspections. So they're satisfied that he understands mechanical code sufficiently and has enough on-the-ground experience to perform these types of inspections and reviews in the State of Oregon. He said if somebody were to take issue with Lease's work, it would be an appeal to the Oregon Building Codes Division. Hardy asked, not to his employer, the City. Tokos said they could certainly raise issue with the City. They can raise an issue with us; but if it comes to a dispute whether or not a code is being properly followed, that goes to the Building Codes Division.

Franklin asked if the cost of permit would be the same. Lease said we have yet to adopt mechanical fees, but we're anticipating we're going to adopt the County fees. Tokos added that we are going to adopt fees in a manner that is consistent with the County. One place where it may differ is that it doesn't appear that the County has updated their fees in a very long time. So we will check to make sure we are charging fees that are in line with State rules. If their fees were inconsistent with a particular State provision, we would adjust there. Otherwise, we will try to stay consistent with theirs.

Croteau asked then at this point if the Building Codes Division approves the transfer; it's done. Tokos said yes, then it's a done deal. We would expect to do the intergovernmental agreement probably in February because we will need to get that agreement updated with the County in time for both of our respective jurisdictions to do budget work.

Berman asked why the intention to administer the program for a minimum of four years. Does that imply another look in four years to see how well the integrated program is working? Patrick said he believes that came from the State. The State's the backup if all of a sudden this gets dropped. Tokos said they want to make sure jurisdictions have the capacity to do this type of work. He said it's not as big a deal for this type of request because typically they're trying to make a program assumption on a whole package. This is an odd situation where we already do everything but mechanical. So the State doesn't really have any concerns. They know we know how to do it. We've been doing it for years with electrical, plumbing, and structural. Mechanical is another piece; but in terms of its administration, it's very similar in terms of how you handle the money, how you do permit intake. That's all very similar; it's just the expertise in terms of the mechanical plan review and permitting, which Lease happens to have and our prior building official didn't.

Franklin said so this would be just this one inspector instead of as in the past a mechanical inspector having to be called out separately from the County. Lease is going to be the one guy that comes out and inspects everything? That was confirmed. Franklin said that actually is going to save a lot of time, and the others agreed.

2. Initiate amendments to Public Facilities Element of the Newport Comprehensive Plan to establish policies for forming LIDs. Tokos noted that the Commission has looked at the Comp Plan policies a couple of times so he thought it would be reasonable for the Commission to initiate the amendments at this point in time. What that would allow him to do is send the notice to the State that we're initiating some work on this. We can then hold the public hearing in a couple of months. He said what's ultimately adopted doesn't have to look like what you initiate right now. But until the Commission initiates the amendments, he can't send that notice; and once he sends that notice, it's another 35 days until we're holding our first hearing.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Berman, seconded by Commissioner Franklin, to initiate the process of making amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to cover the subject of Local Improvement Districts. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

F. Public Hearings. Patrick opened the public hearing portion of the meeting at 7:15 p.m. by reading the statement of rights and relevance. He asked the Commissioners for declarations of conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, bias, or site visits. Croteau and Berman declared site visits. Patrick called for objections to any member of the Planning Commission or the Commission as a whole hearing this matter; and none were heard.

1. File No. 2-NCU-15. A request for approval of a Nonconforming Use Permit submitted by Philip Zlatnik of Northwest Natural (Mary Fierros Bower, authorized representative) for the replacement of a nonconforming office use with a new 3,893 square-foot office in the W-1 zone.

Patrick opened the hearing for File No. 2-NCU-15 at 7:16 p.m. by reading the summary of the file from the agenda. He called for the staff report. Tokos noted that before the Commission tonight was an application filed by Northwest Natural for a new control building, or office, at the LNG plant property at 1702 SE Bay Boulevard. In their packets, the Commissioners had the staff report along with the applicant's submittals, which were attachments to that report. He noted also that he had the full case record, should the Commission have any questions about any of the other materials. Tokos explained that if a use was permitted under older rules and after it was originally permitted and constructed the land use rules changed such that it's no longer permissible, that's a nonconforming use under our code. NMC Chapter 14.32 sets out the requirements for making modifications to nonconforming uses. It does require a land use proceeding, which in this case has to go to the Planning Commission since it's nonresidential in nature. The NW Natural LNG facility, which is well documented in the applicant's submittals, was established in the 70s. That was prior to the adoption of the current water-dependent zoning, which would not allow utility facilities of this nature since they are by their nature not dependent upon property or access to the water. Tokos noted that the applicant did a good job of documenting when the plant was built. And they also provided information in the packet documenting the various maintenance and upgrades that were done to the facility since it was originally constructed in the late 70s. It opened in 1977, as indicated in the report. Tokos said that he believes there is sufficient information in the packet for the Planning Commission to find first that this is a nonconforming use that was lawfully established at a time when the water-dependent zoning didn't apply, and that zoning was later applied rendering it nonconforming. And that it has been maintained in good condition since it was originally opened in the late 70s. Turning from there, you then look at what are the criteria that you need to evaluate this application against given that it is a nonconforming use and this is a proposed change to that nonconforming use. He said that those standards are set out in the staff report. They speak to such things as character and history of development of the surrounding area; the comparable degree of noise, vibration, dust, odor, fumes, glare, or smoke; the adequacy of infrastructure to accommodate the use; the comparative numbers and kinds of vehicular trips to the site; the comparative amount and nature of outside storage, loading, and parking; the comparative visual appearance; the comparative hours of operation; the comparative effect on solar access and privacy; and any other factors that impact the character or needs of the neighborhood. Tokos noted that the staff report includes findings on these. The applicant provided narrative explaining how they believe each of these standards have been met. Tokos said that he believes each of these standards have been met and has outlined the reasons in the staff report. He noted that this is an industrial area. The properties to the north and to the west are either heavy industrially developed, such as the International Terminal, or are likely to develop in an industrial or water-dependent nature in the future. We've had some discussions about the possibility of a log yard coming out here; and that's still in the works and would happen north of this property. This is a relatively isolated facility. Traffic to those industrial properties or other water-dependent properties doesn't rely upon crossing this property because they orient to Bay Boulevard. The nature of the use here is a control building. It's an office. It's not expanding the size of the tank. It's not an increase of a volatile material here, which may increase the potential of a larger blast zone or anything of that nature. We are talking about a control building; an office use. Tokos thinks as you go through the criteria, regarding the comparative degree of noise, it's not going to generate any more noise than what is out there now. Infrastructure's adequate to support this use. It doesn't have a very significant demand on existing services. As he pointed out, you don't have sewer service there at this point in time; and sewer service is more than 250 feet away, so they don't have to connect to city sewer. They are addressing their parking needs. The plans show they are providing parking for their facility; paved parking. They're addressing accessibility issues. Regarding comparative visual appearance, they provided exterior elevations showing how they are using architectural elements that are consistent with what's out there now. They are taking measures to protect their own staff in terms of berm and blast barrier that they've built into the design. Hours of operation will be the same. Solar access and privacy really aren't

an issue when you're talking about a property such as this that's much larger in size and somewhat isolated. He said there weren't any other factors per se that appear to be relevant to this. Tokos said he believes the Commission has everything they need to find that this application satisfies the standards for approval of a Nonconforming Use Permit; and he has provided a final order and draft findings to that effect if the Commission agrees.

Franklin asked if they aren't on septic out there, and Tokos said that he believes so. Franklin asked if they will tie into the new area when sewer's brought out into that area; or is sewer being brought out there? Tokos said not anytime soon. Sewer would be done as part of the McLean Point Urban Renewal Plan. At that point we would be putting a pump station out there along Bay Boulevard and would extend sewer down there. It certainly would be something they would probably want to think about; but they're not obligated to. If they have a fully-functioning septic system that's working and meets their needs, then they're fine. If we had sewer within 250 feet and they had to replace that septic system, then they would have to connect at that point in time.

Croteau asked if he understands that this is NW Natural property; and Tokos confirmed that. Croteau asked if Tokos could clarify the ownership lease arrangement and the role of the Port in all of this. Tokos said with respect to this request the Port doesn't really have a role. This is NW Natural property. The only connection is the Port did do some mitigation work related to the NOAA facility. So they provided some constituent access to the bay and did some improvements in that regard. But there's no formal agreement that allows the public to cross NW Natural's property to access the estuary. The improvements the Port put down there are nice, but there is no formal tie to NW Natural in that regard.

Proponents: The applicant, Philip Zlatnik, on behalf of Northwest Natural, 220 NW 2nd Avenue, Portland, OR 97209, came forward to testify. Zlatnik said he thinks this is a terrific idea. The plant is thirty-eight years old, and the building is in need of improvement. They will build a purpose-built control building off to the side. He thinks this is a very good idea.

Berman said he noticed on their plans that that building is about as far away from everything else as possible. He asked why they chose that location. Zlatnik said it's further away and allows a separation between the processing equipment and the processing building where the operators will be housed to actually operate the plant. Berman asked if that's a safety issue. Zlatnik said it's basically up wind of processing. There is going to be a level of safety because it's further away. That's also why the berm is there. Berman noted that on a personal level, he's started walking all the way around even though there's a small no trespassing sign one direction, but you don't see one going the other way. He asked if that's something that they plan to allow. Zlatnik thinks they have to study the impacts related to that. Berman said that it's fabulous for the dogs, and literally hundreds of people use it on a regular basis. Zlatnik said he knows it's very popular; but there is potential for access issues coming down the road. There are a lot of things involved with that; especially if the log yard gets developed. He thinks they will have to look at access. Safety has to be a primary concern, and that has to be balanced with public access. Berman said the public really appreciates the ability to be able to walk there, and the new benches are nice.

Croteau said that he notices the building has an occupancy of nine, but only seven parking spaces. Zlatnik said they're actually increasing it to fifteen, which are not reflected on those plans, plus one ADA-accessible van space.

Franklin asked what happens to the existing processing building. Zlatnik said it's going to stay right there. The existing control building will become purpose-built, it will remain purposeful for the NCC control gear. They are going to move the controllers out of that building and into the new control building, and the electrical gear will stay in that building. Franklin asked if the current septic system is able to handle the old needs and the new needs. Zlatnik said there's no increase in personnel on site. They're just simply moving operations over to this new building.

There were no other proponents present to testify.

Opponents or Interested Parties: There were no opponents or interested parties present to testify.

Patrick closed the hearing at 7:29 p.m. for Commission deliberation. Hardy said she had no problem with the request. Berman echoed that. Croteau said it's a straight shot; no problem. Franklin said that he mentioned the septic issue a couple of times, and the only reason he said that is because of the proximity to the bay down there. He noted that when a septic tank is figured out for a home, it goes off the number of rooms and potential occupants. Building this

new structure, even though you're saying there's going to be the same number of operators on site, you could potentially have more people there. He asked the age of the existing septic system. Is that being considered in this? Is that something the City should look at? Tokos noted that the septic systems are actually handled by the County Sanitarian. They are pretty rare in the city limits these days since we have sewer to most areas. Any change to the system would be evaluated by the Sanitarian. Berman asked if it would be reasonable to attach a condition to the permit that says when sewer become available within 250 feet that there will be hookups made and septic be phased out. Tokos didn't think that's something we want to stipulate on this because the service isn't within 250 feet right now. We have Comprehensive Plan policy and city code that apply to that. When we do have service within 250 feet, if there is some issue with the functionality of that system, we have existing municipal code language that would compel the connection at that point in time. Continuing deliberation, Patrick noted that he also agrees that it meets the criteria. As far as the septic field, they have so much ground out there that if they couldn't find another spot to put a septic field, he'd be amazed. He has no problem with the request. Franklin said the building looks great by the way.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Croteau, seconded by Commissioner Franklin, to approve File No. 2-NCU-15. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Croteau, seconded by Commission Franklin, to adopt the final order as presented for File No. 2-NCU-15. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

2. File No. 1-VAR-15. A request for approval of a Type III Variance submitted by Jayanti & Saroj Patel (Motel 6) (Dennis Bartoldus, authorized representative) to allow a wall sign on the north side of the motel to be placed at a height of 43 feet and a wall sign to be placed at a height of 38 feet on the south side of the building. The applicant is further requesting a variance to allow a total of five signs; four of which would be wall signs, and the fifth a freestanding sign. *(Please note that at the request of the applicant's representative, this hearing will be opened and continued to January 11, 2016.)*

Patrick opened the public hearing for File No. 1-VAR-15 at 7:32 p.m., noting that the applicant has requested a continuance.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Croteau, seconded by Commissioner Berman, to continue the hearing for File No. 1-VAR-15 to January 11, 2016. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote. Croteau noted that at that time, he would hope to see a pretty good set of data on this one. He said it looks like a real request of quite the variance. He wants to see a complete record on this one.

G. New Business. No new business to discuss.

H. Unfinished Business.

1. Ordinance regarding business license endorsement for recreational marijuana facilities. Tokos noted that the City Council did adopt the changes to the business license code, and they did elect to adopt it with the provision that retail recreational marijuana facilities will have to be at least a thousand feet from child care facilities; and it's those child care facilities that are documented on official City maps. The reason that was done was because, unlike schools, child care facilities pop up from time to time, and we're not always aware of those changes. So we wanted to set ourselves up so we don't put ourselves in a position where we're set up to fail because we allow a retail facility to go in not knowing there was a child care facility within a thousand feet. We agreed to make sure the child care facilities map will be updated annually, and we will use that map for purposes of identifying whether or not a retail marijuana facility is within a thousand feet of a child care facility. Franklin asked if that's existing child care facilities; it's not the other way around. So if a recreational dispensary goes in, a child care facility can then open up around the corner from them. Tokos said absolutely. A child care facility could open up next to an existing retail marijuana facility, and what that means is the existing marijuana facility would be good to go as long as they maintain their existing license; but they would not be able to sell to a new retail facility. He noted that's how the State rules work, too, for schools. If a new public school opens up next to a retail marijuana facility, under the State's rules that existing operator is fine; but they couldn't sell the business to a new operator. Franklin said, so if someone gets their license taken away, that location is no longer valid. Croteau asked how day care facilities are tracked; State licensing? Tokos said there's the State Office of Child Care that does license certain types of child care; it's the larger ones. Hardy said it's the number of children you have in the day care that generates the need for licensing. Franklin said even if you have

in-home daycare facility, you have to have a license from the City; it doesn't matter about the number of children. Hardy said from the City; but the State doesn't care. Tokos said that he thought it was three or less; there's a threshold. It's something like that; you don't have to bother with any State licensing if it's like three kids other than your own. Berman asked to Tokos' knowledge if any of the existing medical marijuana dispensaries are within a thousand feet of a daycare. Tokos said that two of the four are within a thousand feet. Under the provisions of this rule, they are being treated as retail marijuana already. All four are operating in that capacity under Health Authority rules, so they are fine as long as they want to stay there. Berman asked, so they wouldn't get shut down; and Tokos confirmed they wouldn't. Tokos noted that all of those existing facilities could convert over to retail facilities under OLCC rules should they choose to. It's just those two are locked into their current ownership; another person couldn't come in there. Those are all lease arrangements anyway. He doesn't believe any of those own their particular building. They're all leasing. Patrick asked if that won't affect them if they decide to improve their building or if they decide to expand. Tokos said as long as they maintain their current license, they're fine. So, if they wanted to expand or improve or make changes to improve their business, that's fine.

I. Director Comments.

1. Debrief of the December 7th City Council work session on affordable and workforce housing. Tokos noted that the City Council is going to be meeting in early January to think about where it wants to go on affordable housing. It's going to take a look at its existing agreement with the Lincoln Community Land Trust. Patrick said he recalls this meeting. It's where he volunteered the Planning Commission. Tokos said the Council recognizes that it really didn't put together a process for identifying property it might want to make available for workforce housing above and beyond the agreement it made with Habitat. He said the bottom line is that the Planning Commission will likely have a role early next year to help map out some additional tangible steps that the City can take to further affordable housing issues. He said there's some consternation by some of the Council members that the Land Trust was putting together a proposal for a piece of property next to Don Davis Park that the City owned; although a proposal hadn't been formally made to the City. Then he thinks there's some concern about how much, if any, additional City property should even be made available or whether the City should be pushing other avenues for getting affordable housing. Tokos said we've talked repeatedly, and the Council knows, that there are a range of different strategies the City needs to pursue; no single strategy is sufficient. He thinks there's going to be some further discussion, certainly at the City Council level, about what all the City should be doing on the affordable housing front.

Croteau asked what the origin was of the proposal that never got completed with the facility around Don Davis Park. Tokos said the Commissioners may recall that the City Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Lincoln County and Lincoln City to fund the administrative costs of the Land Trust. Newport, Lincoln City, and Lincoln County all put in \$30 thousand a year. Another part of that agreement was that all of the parties would, without making a commitment to specific property, make every effort within the law to provide property and/or revolving loans for the purpose of expanding workforce housing in our respective communities. The Land Trust took that to mean they're going to have an opportunity to look at the City's properties. Proud Ground, who is managing the Land Trust's program, is a much larger land trust out of the Portland Metro area and has a much larger staff to draw from. They assessed all of the properties that the City has in our inventory that are suitable for residential development. Likewise, they've looked at properties in Lincoln City and are starting to look at foreclosed properties in the County. From that assessment, it was determined by the Land Trust's Board based on Proud Ground's work that the most viable property was this one next to Don Davis Park because the property is zoned for high density residential development and all services are available to the property. Unlike Habitat the Trust is not a developer. So the Trust decided to see if they couldn't get a public/private partnership. They wanted to see what a public/private partnership might look like where a developer comes in, builds a certain number of units, gets to take a small percentage of those and make available at market, and all of the others get reserved for affordable or workforce housing. To that end, the Trust put out an RFP; and a couple of developers responded. No commitments were made that the property was ever going to be made available. In hindsight, the RFP that Proud Ground put together wasn't as clear as possible about that, although it was made clear to the developers. Diane Lind with Proud Ground made that clear to the Council. Somebody in the community got hold of the RFP and said there's some backroom deal being done by the City when that was not the case. That's how it got up to a work session, and the Council said they didn't know; and they really didn't know because nobody made a proposal to them. On the flip side, they hadn't mapped out a process. They know they made the commitment, but they never made a process for how to identify properties. Maybe they wouldn't have thought this was a good property had they set out a process. Tokos said it came up awkwardly.

Patrick said he was watching the work session go round and round and finally just said why not give it to the Planning Commission as a task because we've been dealing with this stuff. There needs to be some criteria for identifying properties. Croteau said the RFP was premature. Patrick said he didn't think it was bad intentions on either side. But it's one of those things where there's no communications either way. All of a sudden it showed up. Tokos said that he absolutely thinks a process should be mapped out for that purpose; and he thinks that's where things fell apart. He also thinks you can't talk about a public/private partnership in too fluffy of terms; you actually do have to map it out, what it would look like. That does take some engagement. If at some point the City does get to a position it's looking at that kind of stuff again, it needs to put some thought to it because you can't just have a conversation conceptually about something like that. You actually need to try to pen out what it looks like. Otherwise, you can't have a really intelligent conversation. People start running around saying you're giving property away to a developer. Nobody's giving anything away to anybody. That sounds terrible. But what if it's a developer gets four units, and the community gets a dozen units of workforce housing out of it? That sounds a little bit better. If it doesn't make sense on a certain property, you have to be able to map it out to a point where you'll be able to say it doesn't make sense, let's not even take this to the public. Patrick said he was of the opinion that you need some rules. We need to lay out a process and put some guidelines on it.

The other comment Patrick wanted to make was that most of the people in or around Nye Beach are of the opinion that piece of property was being reserved as a parking lot. Tokos said, that isn't the case by the way. He looked back through the records and can't find anything. Patrick thought it had been mentioned in meetings, but no action was ever taken on it. Tokos said to be honest, if parking lot was pushed, he doesn't know that that would have broad community support either because there were a number of folks who said they would like it for sculptures or green space. Patrick said there's a bunch of competing interests for that piece of property. He said it wouldn't have been the one he would have picked to run with workforce housing. He said it makes sense if you're sitting in Portland. Tokos said frankly it may very well be that the City doesn't have any additional properties in its inventory at this time that are suitable. Patrick said he's not certain that it does. Tokos said frankly that's the only piece of property that's actually fully serviced. He thinks there needs to be a legitimate conversation about what to do with it because it's a very valuable piece of property. If it's going to be park land, that's another consideration. It's fully serviced; it has all utilities available to it, it has good public access; and prior plans did not reserve it as a park. Prior plans even when they did all the streetscape improvements showed it as being developed. But maybe that's changed, and maybe that's not where community sentiment is. That's fair. Patrick said that's where we set up the conversation; we figure out what kind of process we want to have and how we get to make decisions about these things. He said we kind of fell into the Habitat thing. He was for it, but we just kind of did it. That's really not the way we should be doing these things. We should put some sideboards on it and figure out how we get to that point. Croteau said it's important enough to have a good plan.

2. Advisory Committee vacancies. Tokos said we still only have one application for the Advisory Committee. He asked the Commissioners if they knew of anybody who might be interested to please encourage them to apply. That's why he hasn't brought this back because we have two vacancies and only one applicant right now. He said to put some thought to folks that they think might be a really good fit for that. Croteau wondered if we keep active applicant files from prior appointments to this position. Is it something we can do to contact those people? Let them know there's an opening and their application can still be alive. Tokos said we'll take a look at it. His fear is that most of those people we had in prior applications actually were appointed. Berman said there were a bunch of people that applied for Planning Commission. Tokos said that's definitely something we could take a look at. That's a good point. This advisory position is a common stepping stone to the Commission. Croteau thought there are people out there who might still be willing; but if they were not appointed the first time around, they may be hesitant to try again. A positive action might be bringing them forward.

3. No more Planning Commission meetings this year. Tokos noted that we don't have a meeting on December 28th. The next meeting will be January 11th. There will be some organizational things on that docket as is typical for the first of the year.

J. Adjournment. Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wanda Haney

Wanda Haney
Executive Assistant