

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION MINUTES

December 8 , 2021
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Malakoutian, Vice Chair Ferris, Commissioners Bhargava, Brown, Goepple, Morisseau

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Moolgavkar

STAFF PRESENT: Thara Johnson, Emil King, Kate Nesse, Department of Community Development; Kristina Gallant, Nick Whipple, Trisna Tanus, Caleb Miller, Department of Development Services; Matt McFarland, City Attorney's Office

COUNCIL LIAISON: Councilmember Barksdale

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER
(6:33 p.m.)

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Chair Malakoutian who presided.

Chair Malakoutian stated that the meeting was being held remotely via zoom in order to comply with the Governor's emergency order concerning the Open Public Meetings Act, which prohibits in-person meetings.

2. ROLL CALL
(6:34 p.m.)

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Morisseau, who joined at 6:41 p.m., and Commissioner Moolgavkar who was excused.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
(6:34 p.m.)

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Brown. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Ferris and the motion carried unanimously.

4. REPORTS OF CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
(6:35 p.m.)

Councilmember Barksdale informed the Commissioners that the City Council acted to adopt the rezone application for the Safeguard site based on the Hearing Examiner's recommendation. The Council also adopted the Land Use Code amendment to establish a density bonus for affordable housing on public, non-profit or religious organization properties.

5. STAFF REPORTS
(6:36 p.m.)

A. Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Comprehensive Planning Manager Thara Johnson took a few minutes to review the Commission's schedule of upcoming meeting dates and agenda items.

Ms. Johnson reported that the City Council would continue to meet virtually for the next few months. No date has been set for when virtual meetings will end. All of the city's boards and directions will continue to meet virtually as well for the foreseeable future.

6. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
(6:40 p.m.)

Mr. Craig Spiegle spoke on behalf of the Lochleven Community Association regarding the proposed 115 100th Avenue NE Comprehensive Plan amendment before the Commission. He noted that it had been revealed earlier in the day that the applicant does not have legal standing, leaving the only action open to the city nullification of the application. The matter has been referred to the City Attorney's Office by the planning department and the community has requested an ethics and conflicts of interest review for all staff involved. The community wants to see the property in question developed but strongly objections to the application. The rezone would significantly impact the neighborhood and conflict with over 40 percent of the policies approved for the Northwest Bellevue neighborhood plan. The application could eliminate up to 23 residential units from the available housing stock, which also conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan. The rezone would increase existing building height from 30 to 45 feet, overshadowing adjacent properties, and insert commercial uses into a residential area. The rezone would be an unnecessary intrusion of the established transition buffer. The neighborhood opposes any discussion to potentially amend the application to expand the boundaries to include nearby similarly situated properties. In addition to the apparent lack of legal standing, the submission includes other material statements, including but not limited to the unfounded assertions that the rezone would provide a public benefit to the Grand Connection, and that the current zoning has impeded the development of the property. It is clear that approval would only benefit a single investor while providing no public benefit and negatively impacting the neighborhood. The property has an easement with the Bellevue Boys & Girls Club and is directly adjacent to Downtown Park and the play area. The safety of children and families needs to be prioritized. The property has been an eyesore and safety hazard for over five years. The planning department should flag the property as a public safety and health risk and seek expediting demolition. The application should be denied in its totality and efforts to restore the site to residential housing as soon as possible should be undertaken.

Mr. Scott Lampe spoke as board president of Bayside Place Condominiums located just to the south of the Chimney condominiums, the property up for discussion for a possible rezone. He supported the comments of the Lochleven Community Club. The property does not merit consideration for rezoning. The site should be maintained as residential as provided in the existing R-30 zoning. Available housing is a growing challenge in the city and as such an use of the property for any use other than residential will only exacerbate the problem. Traffic is another issue of growing importance in the area; both vehicular and pedestrian traffic has increase due to the completion of the inspiration playground at Downtown Park and the Meydenbauer Bay Park, and a full traffic study should be undertaken to ensure that adequate

capacity and safety exist, particularly on NE 1st Street which is appropriately designated as a low-volume residential street. Growing pedestrian traffic since the opening of the two park areas highlights the need for pedestrian safety as well as the need to minimize additional vehicular traffic. The recent update to the Northwest Bellevue subarea plan included no zoning changes, including for the area under consideration.

Mr. Dane Jorgensen spoke on behalf of Wineman Investment, applicant for the proposed rezone action. He said the company has several active rezones within a few blocks of the site, and also has its offices within a block of the property. He said the company is buying the property from a foreign investor who has not taken the time to manage the property properly. Sale of the property is set to close on December 17, and there are no contingencies based on rezoning the site. It has been found that several persons are encamped within the building and measures have been taken to have those persons removed for trespassing, which has made the place safer. The vision for the property is to have quality housing units for families, and to align it with the Grand Connection and Downtown Park. The proposed rezone would allow for having a small restaurant or bakery to serve the local neighborhood and people going to and from the park.

Mr. Mark Walters indicated that he also serves as a member of the Lochleven Community Association board. He voiced his support for the previous speakers opposed to the rezone of the Chimney property. The application includes a couple of insincere items, including allowing a hotel and a commercial use. It would appear the applicant is looking to horse trade, denying the hotel and commercial use but allowing the additional height. Allowing a 45-foot building on the site will create a sun block for the adjacent properties. The property is not even close to the corridor planned to be used for the Grand Connection which runs along 102nd Avenue NE from the park to Main Street. A small café or restaurant on the site would change the community quite a bit. Small-scale commercial properties are appropriately situated along Old Main Street and 102nd Avenue NE and 103th Avenue NE. The Commission should act to recommend denial of the application. He commended Mr. Jorgensen for his efforts to clean up the property.

Ms. Khaiersta English, a mother of three children in Bellevue public schools and an active member of the parent community, and a small business owner in the city, voiced concerns about the management and preservation of significant trees in the neighborhoods. Millions of square feet of office space is being built in Downtown Bellevue for Amazon and other projects, the result of which is a huge demand for housing. The Enatai neighborhood is seeing older homes being torn down and replaced with new and larger homes, and in the process a number of significant trees have been removed. Trees provide a great deal of value and unique dimensions for neighborhoods. They reduce heating and cooling costs. Redevelopment may require the planting of new trees to replace those removed, but it will take decades for them to reach maturity. Bellevue has one of the most permissive tree management policies in the region. A significant tree is defined as being eight inches in diameter and developers are allowed to remove up to five significant trees without a permit. Other municipalities define a significant tree as being six inches in diameter and they require a permit to remove one or two trees. The Commission should direct members of the public to the right resources or persons to talk to about updating the city's codes to get more protections in place ahead of all the new development.

Ms. Johnson said the only written communication received was from Craig Spiegle highlighting his concerns and relating to staff the fact that the applicant of record has not closed on the Chimney property and as such is not the current owner.

7. PUBLIC HEARING

(7:02 p.m.)

A. Land Use Code Amendment (LUCA) to Address Clean-up Changes in the Land Use Code

A motion to open the public hearing was made by Commissioner Goepple. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

Senior planner Kristina Gallant stated that following the public hearing staff would seek from the Commission a recommendation that the Council approve the proposed Land Use Code amendment. She said the proposed amendment involves a routine general cleanup involving changes to improve clarity, assure internal consistency, and to correct citations. None of the changes are substantive and none of them change policy or application.

Ms. Gallant called attention to the inclusion of a new amendment added after the Commission's previous study session. She explained that the code amendment addressing home occupancy limits which was recently approved triggered the need to make a small tweak to the B&B occupancy limits. B&B uses require a home occupation permit, but the criteria for the permit has limits on the number of people onsite during the day that conflict with the updated B&B limits. Language is proposed to be added that defers to the specific code section covering B&B uses.

A graphic currently in the Downtown section of the code is intended to depict some standards for parking garages. The code text calls for an area 20 feet from the façade of the parking garage on both the first and second floors to be habitable for commercial activity. The current graphic, however, only shows the space requirement on the first floor. The draft image previously shared with the Commission extended the visual reference to include the second floor, but it generated some confusion with respect to the arrows and what the highlighted space meant. Accordingly, the image was updated to clarify that both the first and second floors are referenced by the graphic.

The LUCA involves a Process IV legislative action. The study session with the Commission was conducted in October, and a courtesy public hearing was held with the East Bellevue Community Council on November 2. The EBCC voiced no concerns at the time specific to the LUCA. After the Commission's recommendation is forwarded to the Council, there will be one study session held with the Council after which the Council will take action. After that a public hearing will be held by the East Bellevue Community Council and that body will take action.

There were no members of the public wishing to speak during the public hearing.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Vice Chair Ferris. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Goepple said the cleanup amendments were all in order. He applauded the staff for working to make the Land Use Code more user friendly.

Commissioner Brown echoed those comments and said the efforts of staff will make it easier to work and engage with the city

A motion to recommend to the City Council adoption of the clean-up Land Use Code amendment, 21-118294-AD, was made by Commissioner Morisseau. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Land Use Code Amendment (LUCA) to Address Supportive and Emergency Housing (7 :14 p.m.)

Consulting attorney Trisna Tanus reminded the Commissioners that the state legislature approved HB 1220 earlier in the year and it became effective July 25. The bill requires cities to allow permanent supportive and transitional housing in all land use districts where residential dwellings or hotels are allowed, and to allow emergency housing and emergency shelter in all land use districts where hotels are allowed. The city adopted an Interim Official Control (IOC) as Ordinance No. 6585 to bring the Land Use Code into compliance. Once the proposed LUCA is adopted, it will replace the IOC.

Ms. Tanus explained that the LUCA topics are divided into three areas: housing uses definitions, land use tables, and supportive housing requirements. She said permanent supportive housing is housing with on- or off-site supportive services intended to keep people housed permanently. Transitional housing is similar in that it has on- or off-site services supportive services available, but the intent is to transition people into independent housing. Emergency housing is intended to address basic housing needs, including shelter, water, food and hygiene; it can be either short- or long-term. Emergency shelter is only short-term and is designed to provide shelter during the daytime, in the form of day centers, or overnight. The current LUC does not provide for or regulate supportive housing, but it does address emergency shelter. The intent is to establish supportive housing as a use while maintaining the regulatory framework for emergency shelter.

Senior Planner Caleb Miller said the housing uses definitions are divided into two categories with the main distinction being the length of stay. Supportive housing is proposed to be added as a new use. As drafted, the definition includes permanent supportive and transitional housing, as well as non-transient emergency housing, meaning the duration of stay is 30 days or longer. The homeless services uses category includes transient emergency housing, with stays of less than 30 days, and emergency shelter with stays typically 24 hours or less.

The land use tables in the LUC govern the various types of uses allowed in the various districts. Supportive housing is proposed to be inserted into the tables as its own specified use and permitted in all districts where residential and hotel/motel uses are currently allowed as required under state law. A note will be included directing readers to a new section, LUC 20.20.845, detailing the specific requirements for supportive housing. For non-residential districts, supportive housing will generally be permitted in the districts where hotels/motels are allowed, and no changes to the requirements are anticipated. In residential districts, supportive housing will be subject to all density and dimensional standards for those districts.

Most land use districts where hotels and motels are allowed currently permit homeless services uses as a conditional use. There are, however, a few districts where the staff are proposing to insert homeless services uses as a conditional use, specifically Neighborhood Mixed Use, Office/Limited Business – Open Space, and Evergreen Highlands D. A standard footnote will be included to point readers to the homeless services uses requirements.

Mr. Miller said the last set of proposed amendments seek to establish a new section to house the supportive housing requirements. Certain exemptions are needed to facilitate the establishment of lower-intensity supportive housing uses that have less day-to-day activity occurring onsite. The exemptions include facilities providing services onsite as a subordinate use, which the code

defines as involving less than 25 percent of the floor area, and where the services are only available to residents of the facility. An exemption would also apply to facilities with no onsite services; any staff residing at the facility permanent would not be considered as an onsite service. Also exempt would be facilities that require confidentiality due to the population served. The recommended language points to the Washington State Address Confidentiality Program which shields victims of crimes and violence. Facilities serving such populations would be exempt from any registration or noticing requirements.

Non-exempt facilities would be subject to registration requirements. The registration form would be submitted to the Department of Development Services and would include some basic information, such as contact and pertinent operating information. An enhanced noticing requirement is proposed for the uses that would include some of the information detailed in the registration form as well as contact information. The enhanced notice would be sent out to all property owners within 500 feet. The notices would not include an avenue for appealing the establishment of the facility.

Mr. Miller said there are some requirements proposed that would apply to all supportive housing uses, including the exempted uses. In order to promote habitability of the facilities, supportive housing facilities are recommended to include either a kitchen in each room or a common kitchen within the facility. The kitchen does not necessarily need to be intended for use by the residents if the operator believes the best approach would be for the meals to be made and provided to the residents. The other proposed amendments would apply specifically to facilities in single family land use districts and they are intended to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods. A limit of five rooms is proposed for residents of the facility, though there would be no occupancy limits beyond the five rooms. Any onsite staff rooms would not count toward the five rooms. Any onsite services would be available only to residents of the facility. Any alterations to a single family structure would be required to maintain the distinctive residential character.

Mr. Miller said the proposed LUCA involved three modes of public outreach, including all required Process IV requirements for noticing and public hearing. Many of the changes made to the proposed LUCA were done in response to dialog with services providers and supportive housing operators, and with city staff familiar with the operation of such uses. The dialog will continue so long as the code language is being developed. Finally, a LUCA webpage was created detailed the proposed amendments, providing staff contact information, and an overview of the schedule and progression.

Mr. Miller sought from the Commission a recommendation to schedule the public hearing for a future date. He said following the Commission process, the issue will be moved to the City Council and EBCC processes for finalization. Staff anticipates the process will be completed in the first quarter of 2022.

(7:30 p.m.)

Commissioner Bhargava asked how the occupancy limit was established, and how the onsite staff exclusion aligns with the occupancy limit. He suggested that the occupancy limit should include onsite staff. Mr. Miller clarified that the limit applies to the number of rooms used for clients, not the number of people, which under state law cannot be limited. With regard to the maximum number of rooms, the limit is based primarily on how other residential uses are regulated. Both rooming houses and boarding houses have maximums of four and two respectively. The exemption for onsite staff was carved out to avoid discouraging staff from

residing onsite. The research done by the Department of Community Development found that having some onsite supervision or services tends to lead to better outcomes. Commissioner Bhargava commented that a facility with five onsite staff would likely have an increased number of occupied rooms. Mr. Miller allowed that the staff had not considered.

Ms. Tanus added that staff spoke with their counterparts in other departments to try and understand the operating model for facilities located in single family neighborhoods. She said for the most part such facilities operate just like single family homes. The intent was to allow that to take place and to be exempt from any additional requirements, balanced with size limits to avoid becoming multifamily residential facilities.

With regard to the registration requirement, Vice Chair Ferris said she assumed operators may change over time and asked if there would be a requirement for keeping the information updated. Mr. Miller said as drafted the code language does not call for keeping the information up to date. He said the suggestion was a good one and could be added in. Vice Chair Ferris also said she assumed the reference to the number of rooms occupied actually was in reference to bedrooms. Mr. Miller said that was correct.

Commissioner Goeppele said kudos were due the staff for creating a nomenclature that fits well with the RCW and makes sense under the Land Use Code. He said the supportive housing requirements as outlined make sense and will help to bolster the distinction between the supportive housing type of uses versus homeless services uses.

Commissioner Morisseau asked if the occupancy limits are an attempt to address total capacity of homes, and asked if it would make more sense to limit the number of people rather than the number of rooms. Mr. Miller reminded her that under recent state law jurisdictions are not allowed to limit the number of persons in residential uses. The limit on the number of bedrooms occupied fully recognizes that there may be one person or a number of persons in each bedroom.

Ms. Tanus added that agencies such as Congregations for the Homeless owns and utilizes many single family homes for supportive housing. The intent was to allow such uses to continue while also seeking to ensure neighborhood compatibility. It was thought that limiting the number of occupied bedrooms to five would accomplish that goal.

Chair Malakoutian agreed with the rationale for limiting overall intensity. To do otherwise would be to invite incompatibility in single family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Brown questioned why the limit was five bedrooms and not six, noting that there are neighborhoods in the city that have homes that have six or more bedrooms. She said it was her understanding that the purpose of the legislation is to remove any artificial barriers to having supportive housing and emergency housing in the community, in part to address the housing crisis. Ms. Tanus said the state legislature's action was intended to require cities like Bellevue to site supportive housing in districts that allow residential uses. There is a distinction made between supportive housing/transitional housing and emergency shelter in terms of the districts in which the uses are permitted. The proposed limits are intended to allow supportive housing in all districts that allow residential housing and at the same levels of intensity.

Commissioner Brown asked how much more supportive housing would be needed to meet the growing demand once the proposed LUCA is adopted. She asked if there is enough supportive housing in the community currently. Mr. Miller said he did not have that data in hand but added that under the same bill that is triggering the proposed LUCA there are new requirements for

how cities approach their comprehensive plans, particularly in regard to their housing elements. The state Department of Commerce will be providing cities with a projected level of need for supportive housing and emergency housing uses.

Commissioner Brown noted her appreciation for requiring kitchens. She asked if there are restrictions about supportive housing providing community based meals. Mr. Miller said there are no restrictions and the language in the proposed LUCA is quite flexible. It is really up to the providers.

Commissioner Morisseau asked if during the public engagement process there was any feedback from providers about the proposed LUCA accomplishing the desired outcome. Mr. Miller said the language is not written to serve as an incentive, rather it simply creates new regulatory language for supportive housing. The intent is to provide clarity with regard to how the use will be regulated. No incentives for the creation of supportive housing uses are being proposed. Feedback from providers has been that the proposed approach is a fairly light touch. The regulations have been set up to avoid being a major barrier to the siting of supportive housing facilities.

Commissioner Morisseau asked if the stakeholders who indicated the approach offers a light touch offered any additional feedback as to how it could be a stronger touch. Mr. Miller said focus in talking with providers was on whether or not the proposed approach would disrupt existing operations or prevent additional uses from being permitted. Their input was incorporated into the draft language.

Councilmember Barksdale asked if the city currently regulates the number of bedrooms in single family homes. Ms. Tanus said the city does not regulate the number of bedrooms but does regulate lot coverage, building height, bulk and scale and setbacks of the structures. Mr. Miller clarified that while the proposed LUCA limits to five the number of rooms that can be used by the residents of facilities, it does not preclude someone from renting a home with more than five bedrooms for use as a supportive housing facility.

Commissioner Goeppele asked whether or not the proposed LUCA might open the door to siting new homeless services uses even with the requirement for a conditional use permit. Mr. Miller said the city already has in place a framework for homeless services uses. The main change under the proposed LUCA is to allow the use in all zones where hotels/motels are allowed. No change are proposed to the permitting requirements for the use.

Commissioner Bhargava asked if feedback was received about the noticing provisions, particularly in regard to noticing being misinterpreted as seeking permission to operate. Mr. Miller reminded him that at the first study session it was recommended that there should be a community meeting prior to siting a supportive housing use. Through talks with providers and city staff, it was realized that that approach would not result in any changes to the facilities and would not necessarily have any specific end goal. The proposed noticing requirement is intended to get information out to the community without a community meeting.

Commissioner Bhargava asked if residents of the city will understand that the noticing requirement is not associated with the granting of permission to site and operate a supportive housing use. Mr. Miller said there are a number of situations in which noticing may be triggered. If a supportive housing facility were to be required to obtain a conditional use permit, the required notice would have to be distributed to the surrounding property owners who would then be given the opportunity to provide comments, and the opportunity to appeal. If a supportive

housing facility that is not exempt from the requirements were to move into an existing house, it would only be required to register with the city and the city would provide notice to surrounding property owners. He agreed that the language of the notices should be clear about being for information purposes only. He also agreed that mailed notices go to the immediate neighbors, while a sign posted on the property would be seen by anyone passing by. The sign option could be considered.

Commissioner Morisseau voiced the opinion that the limit of five bedrooms is somewhat subjective and not backed by any strong data. She asked if there are other areas of the code that establish requirements that single family homes must meet. She suggested that so long as all single family home and occupation requirements are met, any number of rooms should be allowed to be occupied.

There was consensus to direct staff to schedule a public hearing on the proposed LUCA.

B. 2022 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments (8:09 p.m.)

Dr. Kate Nesse explained that the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process has two steps, beginning with threshold review during which the Commission looks at the geographic scope of each proposed amendment, including the issue of expanding the scope to neighboring similarly situated properties, and then evaluates whether they should be included on the staff CPA work plan. Final review is the where each proposed amendment is evaluated on their merits.

Dr. Nesse said two privately initiated Comprehensive Plan amendments were submitted, but one was subsequently withdrawn. The remaining amendment centers on the former Chimney Condominiums property at 115 100th Avenue NE in the Northwest Bellevue subarea. The amendment proposes changing the land use designation from Multifamily-High to Neighborhood Mixed Use. The subject property is across the street from Downtown Park and is surrounded by Downtown land uses, Office, Multifamily-High, Single Family-High, Multifamily-High and Multifamily-Medium.

Notice of the proposed amendment was published in the weekly permit bulletin and two signs were erected on the property. Both negative and positive comments have been received about the proposed amendment. The negative comments have focused on building height, possible use as a hotel, and first floor retail uses. The positive comments have also been about retail on the first floor, the possibility of including additional residential units, and getting the property back into use following a fire in 2016 since which the building has been vacant.

Dr. Nesse said the threshold review process would kick off in March 2022 with geographic scoping and a public hearing after which the Commission will make a recommendation to the Council. The final review step will occur near the end of the year.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Morisseau, Dr. Nesse confirmed that there are no NMU land uses located adjacent to the property in the Northwest Bellevue subarea.

Commissioner Morisseau asked how drastic a change the request is from the adjacent designations. Dr. Nesse said staff has yet to conduct the analysis work that will be part of threshold review.

Commissioner Brown commented that the area kitty corner from the subject property is pretty

commercial. Dr. Nesse confirmed that. Across the street in the Downtown proper there is a lot of mixed use. The property is, however, located in the Northwest Bellevue subarea where there are no mixed use designated properties.

Commissioner Goepple commented that the written communications received to date show that the Lochleven community has done a fairly extensive analysis to support their position that the proposal does not fit within the threshold review design criteria. He asked if the Commission would be seeing the applicant's submission and any associated analysis. Dr. Nesse said staff would make the application available to the Commission.

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
(8:21) p.m.

A. October 27, 2021

A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Vice Chair Ferris. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Morisseau and the motion carried unanimously.

11. CONTINUED ORAL COMMUNICATION
(8:22 p.m.)

9. OTHER BUSINESS
(8:23 p.m.)

Commissioner Morisseau asked when the Commission would circle back to the issues raised during the retreat, including the suggestions made by Ms. McFarlane and the comments made by the Commissioners regarding the meeting minutes.

Chair Malakoutian stressed that the comments made by Ms. McFarlane about the meeting minutes represented her position.

Ms. Johnson said staff checked in briefly with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to the meeting about how to move forward with addressing the issues raised during the retreat. She said the intent is to return to the Commission in January or February with a discussion of some of the feedback offered during the retreat. That will give the Commission the opportunity to dive into some of the comments and recommendations in more detail. She said staff would also check in with the City Attorney's Office about some of the recommendations made by Ms. McFarlane regarding the meeting minutes.

Assistant City Attorney Matt McFarland added that some of Ms. McFarlane's recommendations, although very well taken, will need to be run by the City Clerk's Office to make sure they do not run afoul of larger city policy. He reminded the Commissioners that when the Commission acted to amend its bylaws, there were a number of elements that were meant to be uniform across all the city's boards and commissions. The City Clerk's Office will be asked to weigh in on what is to be applied uniformly and what the Commission has the authority to diverge from.

12. EXECUTIVE SESSION – None
(8:30 p.m.)

13. ADJOURNMENT
(8:30 p.m.)

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Goepple. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Malakoutian adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.



1/14/2022

Thara Johnson
Staff to the Planning Commission

Date



1/14/2022

Mohammad Malakoutian
Chair of the Planning Commission

Date