

City of Selah
Planning Commission Minutes
of
March 17, 2015

Selah Council Chambers
115 W. Naches Ave.
Selah, Washington 98942

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Quinnell at 5:34 p.m.

B. Roll Call:

Members Present:	Commissioners: Miller, Torkelson, and Quinnell.
Members Absent:	Commissioner Smith and Pendleton.
Staff Present:	Tom Durant, Consultant, Caprise Groo, Secretary
Guests:	None

C. Agenda Changes: None.

D. Communications:

- | | |
|-------------|------|
| 1. Oral: | None |
| 2. Written: | None |

E. Approval of minutes

1. December 16, 2014

Chairman Quinnell called for a motion to approve/disapprove the minutes.

Commissioner Miller motioned to approve the minutes with some small edits.

Commissioner Torkelson seconded the motion.

Chairman Quinnell called for a voice vote and the minutes were approved with a voice vote of 3-0.

F. Public Hearings

- | | |
|------------------|------|
| 1. Old Business: | None |
| 2. New Business: | None |

G. General Business

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1. Old Business: | None |
| 2. New Business: | |
| 1. | <u>Proposed Amendment to Title 10, Chapter 10.12:</u>
Repeal SMC 10.12.040 Designated two-family residential lots. |
| 2. | <u>Proposed Amendment to Title 10, Chapter 10.28, Table A-5:</u>
Amend the Table to remove two-family dwellings as a Class 1 use in the R-1 zone.
Repeal SMC 10.28.040(1) |

Chairman Quinnell turned the floor over to Mr. Durant.

Mr. Durant addressed the amendments to the staff report.

Mr. Worby asked if he could approach the podium. He stated his address as 200 Weems Way. He stated that he was the one who proposed the amendment. He questioned if Commissioner Torkelson needed to recuse himself due to his position before the Council. He declared that there were not enough Commissioners to recuse Mr. Torkelson. Mr. Worby requested that the meeting keep moving forward.

Commissioner Torkelson stated that he had talked to Mr. Noe and he did not need to recuse himself.

Mr. Durant went over the exhibits list (Attached.). He declared that he had amended the staff report and he listed each correction.

Corrected Staff Report:

**CITY OF SELAH PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT
March 17, 2015**

PROPOSAL: Wayne Worby has made a request to the Selah City Council to amend portions of SMC 10.12 and 10.28 to repeal certain provisions allowing duplexes in the One Family Residential (R-1) zoning district.

Under the requirements of SMC 10.40.020, amendments to text, standards or other provisions of Title 10 are initiated by the action of the legislative body or the planning commission. The proponent presented his request to the City Council who indicated that it should be considered by the Planning Commission.

Action on Code amendments is by the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission or Hearing Examiner (SMC 10.40.020(b)).

CURRENT CODE PROVISIONS: SMC 10.12.040 allows ten percent of the lots in a proposed land division of ten or more lots to be designated for future two-family dwellings (or duplexes). The Ordinance requires the reviewing authority, specifically the Hearing Examiner, to consider the lot locations and to carefully consider adjacent properties to ensure harmonious compatibility. These provisions indicate that designated two-family residential lots are not permitted outright, but that the reviewing body has the authority to deny them if requirements are not met. The specific standards required for two-family residential lots by SMC 10.12.040 are (emphasis is added):

1. They must be in a *proposed* land division of ten or more lots
2. Ten percent of the lots may be so designated.
3. The lots shall be clearly identified on the recorded subdivision providing public disclosure of such approval.
4. The minimum lot size is 9,000 square feet *or* the minimum lot size based on slope as specified in SMC 10.12.030 (the higher minimum lot sizes range from 10,000 square feet to five acres based on steepness of slope).
5. The requirement for the Hearing Examiner to consider adjacent properties to ensure harmonious compatibility.

SMC 10.28, Table 10.28A lists the land uses that are permitted by zoning district under the zoning ordinance and assigns a class of use based on the level of review required, Class 1 being permitted, Class 2 is administrative and Class 3 are conditional uses. Two family dwellings (duplex) is listed as a Class 1 use in the R-1 zone subject to footnote '1', which corresponds to SMC 10.28.040(l) and specifies that duplexes are only permitted on lots that have been designated per SMC 10.12.040 (i.e., approved lots in proposed land divisions). This provision repeats the requirement of careful consideration by the Hearing Examiner ensuring harmonious compatibility. However, this

presumably should have already been done, since the lots would have already been designated and the Hearing Examiner does not have jurisdiction over Class 1 uses.

The two-family residential lots allowed by SMC 10.12.040 would also be subject to the requirements for land divisions of SMC 10.50. One notable standard is SMC 10.50.041(e)(6)(C), which requires a minimum lot size increased by ten percent on corner lots. This would presumably be in addition to the larger minimum lot size required for two-family residential lots and would increase it to 9,900 square feet or more where the larger lot sizes required for slopes apply.

REQUEST SPECIFICS: The specific requests for Code Amendment made by the proponent are the repeal of SMC 10.12.040, deletion of the provision of SMC 10.28.040 that permit duplexes in the R-1 zone and any other Code provision that would allow duplexes in the R-1 zone. The request makes a number of arguments based on the Growth Management Act, intent of the zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan policies. It also raises issues concerning the amount of rental housing in the community.

BACKGROUND & HISTORY: The provisions of SMC 10.12.040 and 10.28 that are proposed for amendment were adopted in 2004 under Ordinance 1634. They were amended to their current form on January 13, 2015 by Ordinance 1958, the purpose of which was to make a connection between the two-family lot provision of SMC 10.12.040 and Table 5-A and the regulatory notes of SMC 10.28.040.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: A Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) (971.42.14-07) was issued on March 11, 2015. It was issued without a comment period under WAC 197-11-340(2)(a) because there are no agencies with jurisdiction.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN & ZONING ORDINANCE: The purpose of the One-Family Residential (R-1) zone is to provide for single-family residential development where urban governmental services are currently available or will be extended to facilitate development. Specific intent statements include providing for an orderly, phased transition from vacant or partially developed to single-family residential development, facilitate coordinated and collaborative public infrastructure investment, require individual lot connection to municipal water and sewer systems, require development to meet the City's minimum urban development standards, and ensure that R-1 land uses and land division will facilitate urban development and the extension of utilities (SMC 10.12.010).

The R-1 zoning district corresponds to the Low Density Residential designation from the Comprehensive Plan which provides for densities of up to 5 dwelling units per gross acre. Clustering of dwelling units within the permitted density range is encouraged. The comprehensive plan also includes the following statement with regard to the LDR designation:

"The predominate use will be low density residential; however, it is the intent and desire of the City of Selah that its low density neighborhoods develop with a mix of housing types including single-family, duplexes, townhouses and multi-family dwellings. The mix of housing types will be limited by the maximum permissible density and zoning standards will regulate development to assure compatibility" (City of Selah Urban Growth Area Comprehensive Plan, p. 34).

Comprehensive Plan Policies relevant to this issue, and including the policies in the request made for this amendment are as follows:

Objective LUGM 3: Encourage economic growth while maintaining quality development and controlling the cost of public improvements in Selah's UGA.

Policy LUGM 3.2: Direct development to areas where infrastructure (water, sewer, and streets) is either present, can easily be extended, or is planned to be extended.

Goal: Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

Objective HSG 1: Maintain and upgrade the character of existing residential neighborhoods.

Policy HSG 1.1: Discourage rezoning which would allow incremental conversion of existing single-family dwellings to duplexes or multi-family dwellings.

Policy HSG 1.2: Encourage new single-family development throughout existing single-family neighborhoods as redevelopment and infill construction at appropriate densities.

Objective HSG 2: Encourage new residential development to approximate existing residential densities and housing mix levels.

Policy HSG 2.1: Encourage the combined net density of all residential development to remain at present levels. Exceptions to this policy should be permitted where the developer can demonstrate that the quality of the project design, construction and amenities warrants a different housing density.

Policy HSG 2.2: Ensure codes and ordinances promote and allow for a compatible mix of housing types in residential areas.

Objective HSG 3: Minimize the negative impacts of medium and high-density residential projects on adjacent low-density residential areas, but encourage mixed use/density projects.

Objective HSG 4: Encourage new residential construction to be compatible with existing residential development.

Policy HSG 4.1: Encourage developers to use private covenants and deed restrictions which specify architectural, maintenance and landscaping standards within their development.

ISSUES:

Definitions: The terms Multifamily Dwelling and Two-Family Dwelling (or Duplex) are defined by the Zoning Ordinance (Appendix A to Chapters 10.02 through 10.48). Although not specifically defined in the Comprehensive Plan, the terms are used in a way that clearly distinguishes them, both in the text and in the tables, primarily in the Land Use Element. It is clear that with respect to the plan policies and zoning ordinance requirements it is not intended that duplexes be included in the term multi-family dwellings.

Density: The Comprehensive Plan requires density to be limited to that allowed in the Low Density Residential plan designation. This is also referenced in the intent statement that encourages a mix of housing types. Table 1 evaluates the consistency of the existing code requirements to this density standard. Based on 10% of the lots being designated duplex lots with the minimum allowed lot size of 9,000 square feet and the remainder of the lots at the 8,000 square foot minimum lot size, Table 1 shows that the maximum level of development allowed under the existing code standards is consistently at a gross residential density of 4.7 dwelling units per acre. This is less than the maximum density of five units per acre.

Table 1: Maximum Gross Density of Subdivision Under SMC 10.12.040

Acreage	Net Acreage	Number of Duplex Lots (9,000 sf)	Number of SFR Lots (8,000 sf)	Total Dwelling Units	Gross Density (dwelling units per acre)
10	8	4	39	47	4.7
20	16	8	78	94	4.7
25	20	10	97	117	4.7
30	24	12	116	140	4.7
50	40	21	194	236	4.7

Notes:

1. Net acreage assumes 20% of land area dedicated to right-of-way, or 80% available for development
2. Duplex lots: 10% of total lots in the subdivision with no rounding.
3. Number of SFR Lots is the net acreage divided by 8,000 after taking out the 9,000 sf duplex lots
4. Gross Density: Total dwelling units divided by Acreage

Compatibility: An evaluation of compatibility begins with existing zoning ordinance standards. The 9,000 square foot minimum lot size is fairly high. On corner lots, that may have more visibility, the minimum lot size goes up to almost 10,000 square feet. Other jurisdictions in the area considered by staff, that allow duplexes in the R-1 or equivalent zone, had minimum lot sizes between 7,200 and 8,000 square feet. In R-2 zones, minimum lot sizes can go down to 7,000 square feet. Setback requirements from the Selah Code should be sufficient to provide room for off-street parking and the parking standard of 4 off-street spaces (2 per unit) is consistent with typical parking requirements. The lot coverage standard for the R-1 zone is substantially less than that in the R-2 zone, which along with the larger minimum lot size, should prevent over-building the lot.

It is harder to evaluate architectural features such as building materials through plat approval. However, developers could be encouraged to present covenants that demonstrate minimum standards and consistency with single-family construction.

Analysis of Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan: The standards of SMC 10.12.040 and 10.28 as they currently exist are consistent with the intent statement from the Comprehensive Plan for the Low Density Residential land use designation to develop low density neighborhoods with a mix of housing types that include duplexes. The higher standards for two-family residential lots and the authority of the reviewing official to approve or deny based on compatibility is consistent with the policy of zoning standards to regulate development.

Objective LUGM 3 and Policy LUGM 3.2: While not inconsistent with the policy of directing development to areas where water, sewer and streets are present or can be extended, these standards don't really promote them and are not necessary for those policies to be met.

Objective HSG 1: The standards seem to be consistent with the goal of encouraging the availability of affordable housing and they do promote a variety of residential densities and housing types. The requirement and authority given to reviewing official to determine that the two-family lots are compatible with the neighborhood along with the higher standards for duplexes in the R-1 zone is supported by Objective HSG 1 to maintain and preserve the character of existing neighborhoods.

Policies HSG 1.1 and 1.2: There is no rezoning involved nor do the standards allow the conversion of existing single-family dwellings or redevelopment of existing single-family development. They are specifically limited to new lots. While designating two-family residential lots is not new single-family development, it doesn't discourage it. Ninety percent of the lots in a new plat under these provisions must be for single-family dwellings.

Objective HSG 2 and Policy HSG 2.1: Comparing the net residential density of the 90% of single-family lots in a given subdivision with the net density of the entire subdivision including the maximum number of allowable two-family lots, using the same assumptions in Table 1 above for determining gross density, it is determined that the net density of the single family lots would be 5.4 units per acre. Including the two-family lots, it is 5.9 units per acre. It would seem that this approximates the density that would be allowed in a new subdivision without the two-family lots. With regard to existing neighborhoods outside of the new plat, it may or it may not approximate the existing densities and housing levels depending on the neighborhoods being considered.

Policy HSG 2.2: The code standards as they exist are consistent with this policy in that they allow for a mix of housing types in residential areas. Assuming that the higher standards and the authority of the reviewing official to evaluate compatibility are effective, they would be consistent with the requirement that the mix of housing types be compatible.

Objective HSG 3: The code standards are consistent with encouraging mixed use/density projects. Otherwise, this objective does not apply because as shown above, they do not permit medium or high-density residential projects, as those terms are defined by the Comprehensive Plan.

Objective HSG 4 and Policy HSG 4.1: Consistency with this objective and policy depends on the effectiveness of evaluating the compatibility of the two-family residential lots with existing residential development. The fact that they require that evaluation, and give the reviewing official the authority to deny the application based on compatibility should be considered to promote consistency with these policies. The higher standards being imposed on two-family residential lots as described above are also consistent. Encouraging developers to use private covenants and deed restriction with specific architectural, maintenance and landscaping standards and to include them in the evaluation would also be consistent.

STAFF ANALYSIS: Based on this evaluation, the existing code requirements are generally consistent with the comprehensive plan, especially based on the intent statement for the Low Density Residential plan designation that encourages a mix of housing types and also based on the determination that when combined with other existing zoning and subdivision standards, these standard don't result in the maximum allowable density being exceeded. If there is any uncertainty it is in how effective the standards are in ensuring the compatibility of two-family lots with existing residential neighborhoods.

It is also important to point out that although duplexes are shown to be a Class 1 (permitted) use in the R-1 zone, they are actually quite restricted. They are only allowed in proposed land divisions that must meet minimums in terms of size and number of units. The preliminary plat review process is the equivalent of a Class 3 review in terms of notice, review process and the discretion given to approve or deny. Other jurisdictions that allow duplexes in R-1 zones or their equivalent typically allow them on any lot, whether new or existing and often without specified limitation of the number of lots.

RECOMMENDATION: Leave the current code provisions as they are without change. The fact that they were just recently adopted with the new requirement for compatibility analysis is also a factor in this recommendation. If the Planning Commission or City Council feel that changes are appropriate, they should be to provide more specificity in how compatibility is to be reviewed and/or including the review criteria from the Zoning Ordinance for Class 2 or 3 land uses.

Chairman Quinnell asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Miller stated that he did not understand why duplexes needed to be eliminated when there were checks and balances regulating them. He stated that there were places that duplexes seemed to fit nicely.

Chairman Quinnell asked if a person outside of the City of Selah could make changes to the City of Selah Code.

Mr. Durant declared that the ordinance stated that the Planning Commission or the City Council must initiate the amendment process and his understanding was that the City Council wanted it to go to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Torkelson stated that Mr. Worby went to the City Council and asked if he could make the proposal.

Mr. Worby agreed.

Discussion ensued about the process that took place.

Commissioner Miller asked if there was a difference between a duplex and a mother-in-law apartment.

A discussion ensued and the final conclusion was that the connection code needed to be looked at to answer that question.

Chairman Quinnell opened the floor for the discussion of the text amendment.

Mr. Worby approached the podium and stated his address as 200 Weems Way. He handed out a typed statement which was marked Exhibit 6. (Attached) Mr. Worby proceeded to outline why R-2 units should not be in R-1 developments. He referenced the Growth Management act and asked if there was a directive demanding R-2 housing in R-1 Zoning.

Mr. Durant stated that to his knowledge there was no directive.

Discussion continued to a variety of issues from the growth management act to Cluster housing to Covenants and owner occupied dwellings, rentals and affordable housing.

Mr. Worby continued to refer to Exhibit 6 (Page one, red writing). Mr. Worby asked what a duplex was considered, one unit or two. He gave an example of two acres with ten lots and one of those lots being a duplex and creating 11 addresses. Mr. Worby wanted a conversation started to discuss the wording of the text amendment.

Commissioner Miller stated that it all comes back to units per acre.

Mr. Worby asked how many square feet.

Commissioner Miller and Mr. Durant stated that a duplex was two units.

Commissioner Torkelson stated that it was counted as one unit with the connection code.

Mr. Worby replied that a duplex is two living units. He stated that a home owner occupied units are better taken care of than renter occupied homes.

Mr. Miller asked if covenants could be used to resolve that issue.

Mr. Worby proceeded to tell a story about Alaska and covenanted owner occupied developments compared to non-owner occupied developments. Mr. Worby stated that he wanted to know if there was any other place that allowed duplexes in the R-1 zone

Mr. Durant replied that Yakima allows duplexes in r-1 zones.

Mr. Worby wanted to know what the process was for that to happen. What was the criterion for a duplex in and R-1 zone?

Mr. Durant stated that it would go thru the class 2 review processes to get approval.

Mr. Worby wanted to know if there was a city that would allow a single duplex to build in and R-1 with out rezoning the land.

Mr. Durant stated that City of Yakima allowed that.

Mr. Worby asked what it took for Yakima to refuse the applicant.

Mr. Torkelson stated that there are minimal standards that are embedded in the Yakima's system.

Mr. Worby proceeded to state that he had requested language be provided that could be discussed.

Mr. Durant stated that he called Mr. Worby to inform him the duplexes are not a given for a development. He continued to state that the provision of harmonious compatibility, gave the hearing examiner leeway to deny the request.

Mr. Worby and Mr. Durant discuss Harmoniums Compatibility. Mr. Worby proceeded to argue his point. He also stated that he had not seen an occasion where a duplex would be appropriate. He then asked Commissioner Torkelson where he had placed the duplexes in his Development.

Commissioner Torkelson (Eagle Ridge) answered that the majority of the Duplexes were on the main arterial because that is where they work best. It is what made sense with the surrounding property.

Mr. Worby proceeded to question Commissioner Torkelson about the Eagle Ridge Development.

Commissioner Torkelson stated that he had two things to address - He stated that Lisa Smith added that comment to the text. It gave the Hearing Examiner a little wiggle room, then the comment that Dennis made about a developer fouling his own nest. The point is that the Developer wouldn't. Each development has different circumstances and there are many circumstances where a duplex could help the community. Examples: Elderly parents, or handicapped child who needs a little help but also needs to feel independent. Commissioner Torkelson stated that not all situations are negative and there was a time and place for everything.

Mr. Worby responded with the statement that he felt that too many times the community interest and or benefit was shuffled back down the line because we have not defined what is appropriate. A developer cannot stay in business without making a profit.

Commissioner Miller stated sparsely placed duplexes could be good for the community. He stated that he had 4 persons between the ages of 83-90 that he would love to have living next to him but he is unable to arrange it at this time.

Mr. Miller suggested that a covenant for owner occupied would be reasonable.

Mr. Worby stated that a covenant would be measurable and make sense, but to just 10% doesn't

Commissioner Miller replied that no contractor would build a new development and build second class duplexes. The duplexes would be the same style, level and quality of the other homes with covenants in place

Mr. Worby replied that he would have thought so until six months ago when a planned development was proposed near his home.

Commissioner Torkelson asked what would have happened if the developer had presented his ideas with clear detail and given you a clear picture of how the development would look.

Mr. Worby started describing a development that was proposed behind his property.

Chairman Quinnell stated that he had seen a development that had duplexes on one side and single family homes on the other. It was located at 88th and Tieton. It was called Cotton Wood Grove. It was a perfect example of how common walls, zero lot lines, single family, and duplexes can work together. If the garages had not been connected no one would know they were duplexes. He stated that that neighborhood sold out fast and the property values had increased

Mr. Worby asked Chairman Quinnell what made that development happen.

Chairman Quinnell stated that he had not participated in that development.

Mr. Worby replied that a directive that controls the quality of the outcome is what he wanted, not a 10% designation for duplexes.

Chairman Quinnell responded that had the developer provided all the information the first time the outcome may have been different. He stated that Cotton Wood Grove was a good example of how they marriage up.

Mr. Worby presented Exhibit 7 and read through it for the Commissioners. (Attached)

Discussion ensued between Mr. Worby and Commissioner Torkelson about the correlation of rentals and poverty, impact funds for schools and homeownership.

Mr. Worby implied the community would rather have single family homes and not rental property. He stated that the community needed long term homeowners and not short term renters.

Commissioner Torkelson and Commissioner Miller stated that the community needed both Renter and homeowners.

Discussion ensued

Commissioner Miller declared that he saw no reason to eliminate this option unless different language was developed to address the issue.

Commissioner Torkelson asked where a municipality draws the line at telling people what they can and can't do with their land.

Mr. Worby stated that it is done all the time through building codes, municipal code and standards.

Discussion ensued

Mr. Miller commended Mr. Worby's spirit.

Mr. Durant assigned numbers to the exhibits.

Chairman Quinnell thanked Mr. Worby for coming. He asked if anyone else wanted to speak.

Mr. Durant wanted to clear up some mistakes. Minimal lot size placed constraints on the number of lots. The other point is that 10 lots or more is a substantial piece of land. Then 10% can be designated duplexes and a duplex is counted as two units. Refer to staff report table one for density. Mr. Durant also clarified that not all duplexes are rentals and vice versa. Mr. Durant reiterated the duplexes are restricted in that they only apply to new developments and they have to be designated from the beginning of the Planned Development. Whereas other counties allow duplexes to be place in old and new properties. He stated that compared to other districts it is not a free ride.

Chairman Quinnell asked if there were any more comments.

Commissioner Torkelson replied that they should vote tonight and move this forward.

Chairman Quinnell stated that he saw nothing wrong with duplexes when developed correctly.

Commissioner Miller stated that Mr. Worby was worried about the consistency of the language.

Chairman Quinnell asked if that language was already there.

Commissioner Torkelson stated that it was contradictory because in a nice neighborhood why billed a cheap duplex.

Commissioner Miller replied that there are a lot of what if's here and anything can happen.

Mr. Worby requested that the commissioners delay their vote and go to the code to find a reason to deny a development.

Discussion ensued on the legality, restrictions, language and standards.

Chairman Quinnell proposed that the commission vote on it tonight and send it to council

Commissioner Torkelson moved to accept the Staff Recommendation.

CITY OF SELAH PLANNING COMMISSION FINDINGS AND DECISION

THIS MATTER, having come on for public hearing before the City of Selah Planning Commission on March 17, 2015. The Commission is considering zoning ordinance text amendments to Selah Municipal Code Title 10 (zoning ordinance) Chapter 10.12.040, Chapter 10.28 A-5 and Chapter 10.28.040 Regulatory Note (1).

The Members of the Commission present were Quinnell, Miller and Torkelson.

Legal notification pursuant to Selah Municipal Code was given on the 6th of March 2015. All persons present were given the opportunity to speak for or against the proposed text amendments.

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

1. The proposed zoning ordinance text amendments will not further the goals and their underlying policies of the 2005 City of Selah Urban Growth Area Comprehensive Plan to avoid compatible land uses, preserve natural resources and protect against flooding and drainage problems. The goals and underlying policies to promote orderly growth, avoid incompatible land uses and maintain and improve air and water quality were determined to be not applicable.
2. The Planning commission does not find changes in circumstances which justify the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments.
3. The Planning Commission does not find that there is a demonstrated and/or recognized need to amend Chapter 10.12.040, Chapter 10.28, Table 5-A and Chapter 10.28.040 Regulatory Notes.
4. The public testimony that was offered was in favor of the proposed text amendments.
5. The Planning Commission finds that environmental review has been completed on the proposal and further finds that such environmental review was adequate.
6. The Planning Commission determines the findings of the staff report to be controlling in its deliberations on the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments.

DECISION

The Planning Commission, based upon the aforementioned findings and controlling factors, finds that the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments are not in furtherance of the public health, safety and general welfare of the peoples; therefore the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments should be DENIED and additional amendatory language not added to Chapter 10.12.040.

Motion to DENY by: Torkelson Seconded by: Miller

Vote: 3-0 in favor of the motion

Reports/Announcements

1. Chairman- None

2. Commissioners- None
3. Staff- None

I. Adjournment

Commissioner Torkelson motioned to adjourn the meeting, Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. Chairman Quinnell adjourned the meeting at 7:33 pm with a voice vote of 3-0.



Chairman