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**COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL PRESENT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Commission Members:**  David Lindley  Tom Stevenson  Ross Henry | **Staff Present:**  Erika Castro Guzman, City Associate Planner  Patrick Munyan, City Administrator  Ken Woodrich, City Attorney |

**CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL**

Planning Commissioner Chairman David Lindley called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

**MINUTES OF RECORD**

1. **Minutes of September 25, 2019**

Moved by Ross Henry. Seconded by Tom Stevenson.

Motion to approve minutes of September 25, 2019. CARRIED 3 – 0.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. **Comprehensive Plan Update: Parks and Recreation**

WSP Planning Consultant Scott Keillor reviewed the Comprehensive Plan Element for Park and Recreation, including its background, future facilities, and goals and policies.

Planning Consultants and Commissions agreed on the following items to be updated:

* Shorten the Parks and Recreation Vision Statement to provide focus.
* Remove references to Northwestern Lake.
* Address how the city will specifically support the White Salmon Valley Metropolitan Pool District.
* Keep the city’s park district concept in the policy but be specific.
* Revise the bike path direction of travel on N Dock Grade Rd or re-route through Bingen/HWY 141.
* Connect White Salmon’s downtown to the proposed Riverfront Park, potentially with a walking trail or steps.
* Be vague with future facilities and park plans, especially regarding the Riverfront Park, as the property is not owned by the city and layout may be subject to change with a new bridge.
* Remove the proposed youth recreational center associated with the pool and construction of a new pool on the city’s behalf.
* Insert that the City would like to partner with other entities that are providing public park-like activities, specifically with the White Salmon Valley School District.
* Reword any comment where the city is asserting itself as an administrator, where the land is not owned, to a partnership.
* Summarize the attributes and create a narrative of existing conditions for each city park, which may be expanded to the surrounding area.
* Reestablish White Salmon’s connection to the Columbia River.

It was acknowledged that Parks and Recreation funding comes from the City’s general fund; additional funding may come from the State’s recreation and conservation office through grants. The city does not have a parks department; therefore, consideration may be given to creating a city park’s district in the interest of better funding sources.

Commissioners agreed to email further comments within 10 days. The next comprehensive plan update meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 2020.

**Public Comments**

***Eric Sanford, 163/173 N Main Ave, White Salmon WA***

Eric Sanford pointed out there is a 500-foot cliff, a state highway, railroad, and the in-lieu site as significant barriers to making the proposed riverfront park a part of White Salmon. Although he applauds the idea, he thinks time, effort and money could be much better spent. He said he likes Hood River’s waterfront park for its walkability to and from downtown but states that there are many barriers to preclude a realistic riverfront park for White Salmon.

***Archer Mayo, 1264 NW Heidi Ln, White Salmon WA***

Archer Mayo stated that he, as well as Commissioner Henry, uses the waterfront routinely. He said he hopes the riverfront park idea is not going to go anywhere, because as an experienced swimmer, he thinks it is brutal water conditions in the proposed park area. Mayo said the joy of the park, versus the hassle, is unreasonable and suggests the use of the Port of Klickitat’s park instead. He added that the water at the park property has tested clean and describes the area calm at the 15-feet deep; and envisions there could be a diving board, ADA access and have police patrol. Mayo recommended taking the responsibility off the city to create a riverfront park and partner in an area with existing infrastructure.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **Proposed Critical Areas Ordinance Review 2019.001**

***Applicant: Robert Kalberg, 1027 SE Oak Street, White Salmon WA***

Public hearing for Critical Areas Ordinance Review 2019.001 was opened at 6:21 p.m. Chairman Lindley reviewed the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. No concern or objection was voiced by Commissioners nor the applicant to participation.

The public hearing proceeded with a visual presentation and summary of the staff report by WSP Land Use Planner, Sam Roberts; with Staff support.

**Orientation and Background**

WSP/City reviewed the submitted Critical Areas Habitat Study and Habitat

Management Plan (HMP), the addendum memo to the HMP, and the Geologically Hazardous Critical Area Report associated with the proposed Kalberg short plat

application (WS-2018-009). Three types of critical areas were identified on site: (1) a 200-foot Riparian Water Buffer, (2) various Oregon white oak heritage trees, and (3) a steep slope/ landslide hazards surrounding the outer edge of the site. The Applicant is seeking two variances due to site constraints: (1) seeking an encroachment in the 200-foot riparian buffer from Jewett Creek (Type F stream); and (2) relief from the minimum 15-foot buffer from all critical area buffer requirements, with the intent to move forward with a short plat creating one additional lot. Staff finds that the applicant has sustained the burden of prove and that the application complies with the applicable provisions of the White Salmon Critical Areas Ordinance (WSMC 18.10) for reasons being the site is zoned Single-Family Residential, which is the future use of the site; and according to the submitted habitat study with the application, the steepness of the ravine, separating the creek from the site provides a physical limitation to onside riparian habitat functions and values associated with Jewett Creek. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to enhance the undeveloped buffer area with a greater than one to one ratio, including planting 240 shrubs, some within the understory of the Oregon white oak canopy. The applicant is avoiding the buffer as much as possible. The maximum lot coverage of the single-family zone is 50%, where the applicant is only proposing to develop 11% of the entire site while preserving all heritage white oak trees by not proposing any development within the heritage tree protection areas. Therefore, staff recommends approval, subject to the conditions stated at the end of the report.

**Commissioner Comments**

Commissioner David Lindley requested clarification on that although the code states that the critical area stream buffer may be reduced by 25% administratively, the variance request essentially places the whole house within proposed Lot 1’s buffer, reducing the buffer from 200-feet to about 100-feet total. City Attorney, Ken Woodrich, states that variances for critical areas are allowed in order to preserve the economic use of the property and that the planning commission is authorized to allow variances that depart from the standards, but does have obligation to allow as little of a variance as possible, while preserving the economic use. He also stated that the planners have done an excellent job and have tried to limit the variances as much as they could to preserve the economic use of the single-family residential zone.

Commissioner Lindley said the existing south lot, where the buffer is reduced to 150-feet, has reasonable area to build a single-family residence, but in the reduction of the north lot, it is in direct conflict with the buffer. He questioned if it is a reasonable use to short subdivide. Planner Keillor responded that the idea is one may have a legal north lot as long as it is minimizing the impact, in this case, the applicant has provided direct habitat and geotechnical studies that meet those standards.

Commissioner Ross Henry stated that he believes the buffer was recently increased in the latest update of the Shoreline Master Plan. Planner Keillor confirmed that the buffer did become larger under state law and clarifies that the variance would still be required to construct a single-family home, regardless of the proposed short subdivision. He states that the code allows for this kind of variance and provides a discretionary decision on the Commission's behalf.

Commissioner Tom Stevenson said he is glad to hear Staff considered the steepness, regarding the cliff to Jewett Creek, as the situation on site makes it very different than most other encroachments. Planner Roberts agreed with the Biologist’s report that states the steepness of the ravine cuts any connection between the stream and the natural ecology one has with a riparian buffer. Furthermore, Planner Roberts clarified that the creek’s buffer is setback from the creek’s ordinary high watermark.

**Applicant Comments**

***Austin Bell, Applicant’s Representative with Bell Design Company***

Austin Bell stated Bell Design represented Mr. Kalberg with surveying and engineering. He states that the property is zoned R1 Single-family Residential and is over a one-acre in size, adding the majority is located over the bluff. He said that for planning purposes, for an area to be divided, it doesn’t matter where the area is if the square footage is met. He stated that because the lot is encumbered with critical area issues and that for minimal use, the property requires a variance. Bell said the company involved a biologist, a geotechnical engineer, a planner and a surveyor, to present multiple master reports that they felt met the requirements of a reasonable use variance. He stated that the proposed area of development is currently grass with no trees which would be the least area of disturbance on the lot.

***Stacy Reed, Applicant’s Representative with ASK Engineering and Forestry***

Stacey Reed, a certified senior wetland biologist, she said Staff did a great job summarizing her report. She stated that the creek is 200 vertical feet at the bottom of a ravine and explains a floodplain shoreline ordinance intends to protect the biological, hydrological, and wildlife habitat of the creek. Reed said the buffer is for floodplain connectivity, but because of the vertical distance, stated that the proposed site development provides zero input and the oak trees along the bluff are already avoided and preserved. She added that proposed mitigation measure to plant native shrubs to override the poison oak on site.

Commissioner Stevenson asks why Washington State increased a creek’s buffer to 200-feet. Biologist Reed said she thinks the shoreline buffer was adopted because of the Department of Ecology’s general guideline recommendation. She stated that in theory, if a site is flat, a 200-foot buffer allows wildlife to use it back and forth, providing all functions. Attorney Woodrich added that any critical area ordinance must be approved by the Department of Ecology as Chairman Lindley concludes the administrative reduction exists because of the statewide blanket footage that may be evaluated case-by-case. Biologist Reed concluded by stating the Department of Natural Resources assigns the water type and it is a complicated process to propose a change, regardless of the natural barriers downstream.

***Carl McNew, Applicant’s Representative***

Carl McNew stated that he has lived in White Salmon since 1993, and assisted Mr. Kalberg in purchasing the property over 18 years ago, where his original idea was to build a home. He said circumstances changed, and about 3 years ago began discussing short platting the lot while keeping the neighborhood’s character. McNew agrees with Austin Bell that there are similar and even smaller properties existing the proposed lots in the area and thinks that under today’s standards, the existing houses would not be able to be built. He added that a guiding principle of a short plat is to be a low impact development, which is what he thinks is proposed.

**Public Testimony**

***Luke Bradford, 1045 SE Oak Street, White Salmon WA***

Luke Bradford, a real property owner to the north, states that he does not have any objection to the variance but has a difficult understanding of allowing a short subdivision while the property is encroached by critical areas by approximately 80%. He said he is opposed to the extra step to short subdivide when he thinks there is already an allowed break with a variance for one single-family home.

***Helen Paulus, Rental Property Owner in White Salmon***

Helen Paulus said she believes that if the application is approved, it would set a precedent that any property with critical area buffers would also be able to do as the applicant has proposed.

***Eric Sanford, 163/173 N Main Ave, White Salmon WA***

Eric Sanford stated that he is opposed to any subdivision with that size of lot in White Salmon. He said when he moved to White Salmon 30 years ago, he merged two lots because in his opinion, small lots devalue everyone’s property.

***Jeri Jablonski, 949 SE Oak Street, White Salmon WA***

Jeri Jablonski stated that she opposes the short subdivision. She said she believes it is extreme to allow further development beyond the initial variance request.

**Rebuttal**

***Carl McNew, Applicant’s Representative***

McNew underscored that this is a unique site because of the two overarching restrictions on the property.

**Further Discussion**

Planner Roberts clarified that a decrease of the buffer from 200 to 150-feet and the heritage tree buffer reduction is not the variance. He said it is an allowed modification under the zoning code to provide flexibility to applicants. Planner Roberts said the variance is for the encroachment for the minimum creek buffer from the heritage tree setback. He said additionally, the size of the lots for conformance is determined through the short subdivision process. Planner Roberts also clarified the mitigation plan proposed by the applicant, enforced by the conditions of approval stating that the applicant has to adhere to the entire habitat management plan written by AKS that includes mitigation, a contingency, and additional requirements under the code for habitat management plans that will be deeded to the land. He added that the developer is restricted to building a house that conforms to the specific area.

**Public Hearing Closed at 7:15 p.m.**

**Deliberation**

Commissioners discussed the potential precedent of future applications and the unique features on the property in relation to the creek’s buffer. They acknowledged the very restrictive building site on a large parcel that has a right to be developed. Attorney Woodrich made clear that the planning commission is reviewing the critical area report only, not making a decision on the short subdivision application. Furthermore, he stated that WSMC 18.10.113.D provides for variance criteria for providing reasonable use. Attorney Woodrich said the property owner under this code has an allowable variance. He suggested focusing on allowing the critical area variance for the single, undivided property and after that, the applicant may submit a short subdivision application, which mentioned by the City Administrator Munyan, may be elevated for the Planning Commission’s review.

Planner Roberts explained how the second variance request, regarding requirement 15-foot standard setback from all buffers (heritage trees and riparian) is also a minimum necessary to build. He stated that no development would be possible. Commissioner Stevenson suggested making a focused decision on the buildable site. Commissioner Henry agreed and further discussion continued to determine what is the minimum variance necessary to grant relief.

Moved by Tom Stevenson.

*Motion to adopt Staff’s facts and findings and conditions of approval of both variances as shown in the staff report.* Motion died for a lack of second.

Moved by David Lindley.

*Motion to table the critical areas review until a future time of when a clean critical areas ordinance review can be brought back that is devoid of the short plat, or both applications are brought back concurrently with a short plat.* Motion died for a lack of second.

Moved by Ross Henry. Seconded by Tom Stevenson.

*Motion to approve Staff’s facts and findings of approval as it relates to critical area ordinance and have city staff determine the short subdivision process.*

*AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION by Tom Stevenson. Seconded by Ross Henry.*

*Motion to supplement the motion to allow the 18 conditions listed to any further land division that may occur on the property, including a site plan review.*

**Further Deliberation**

Chairman Lindley commented he found the application, as presented, extremely confusing because of the proposed land division addition. Commissioner Stevenson expressed his concern about not making a decision.

*Motion to approve CAO-2019.001 as amended.* CARRIED 2 – 1.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. **Proposed Conditional Use Permit 2019.003**

**Applicant: Tao Berman, Mt. Hood View Apartments LLC, 115 N Main Street, White Salmon WA**

Public hearing for Conditional Use Permit 2019.003 was opened at 8:02 p.m. Chairman Lindley reviewed the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine. No concern or objection was voiced by Commissioners nor the applicant to participation.

The public hearing proceeded with a verbal presentation of the staff report by City Administrator, Patrick Munyan, and Associate Planner, Erika Castro-Guzman.

**Orientation and Background**

The Applicant’s current apartment building use is a grandfathered non-conforming use within the General Commercial District. The Applicant is seeking to obtain a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to construct a new long-term apartment complex combined with a mix of short-term rentals and other retail space on the same lot. Short-term rentals and retail space are an out-right permitted use in a General Commercial Zoning District. The staff report focuses on the conditional use request for the long-term apartment portion of the project and the potential impacts on public facilities and neighboring property use.

**Commissioner Comments**

Commissioner Henry requested clarification regarding the Comprehensive Plan 2012 projection of multi-housing needs for 2030.

**Applicant Comments**

***Tao Berman, Applicant and Property Owner of 115 N Main Street, White Salmon WA***

Tao Berman supplemented the record at the time of his comment period and read the document to the Planning Commission. He listed personal observations he loves and about what he does not like about White Salmon’s community. He stated that White Salmon is near an inflexion point and he would like to preserve what is loved while planning for future growth; and believes the proposed project would enhance everything he likes about the vibrant community to help provide housing and capture tourism dollars for businesses.

Berman explained the proposed structure is one commercial unit (647 sq. ft.) and 18 apartments, 6 of which will be short-term rentals to meet the Commercial Zoning requirement. Berman states that he is considering proposing all short-term rentals to avoid needing a planning commission decision, as it is an outright use in the code, but feels the community would benefit more by having long-term rentals. Berman commented that he would move forward with all short-term units if his application is denied.

Berman reviewed the size of the proposed parking stalls, location and parking requirements for a short-term unit versus a long-term unit, providing a total of 43 parking spots. He stated that the code does not outline the number of parking spaces required under a conditional use application, and believes it is because every application is unique and should be decided on a case-by-case analysis. Berman compared White Salmon’s parking ordinance to other municipalities.

Berman shared that his estimated rent price will be likely based on White Salmon’s median household income and discussed the economics of short-term rentals and tourism dollars. He listed the reasons why people may be opposed to this project. Berman stated that a precedent has been set by allowing a conditional use permit for the property directly to the north, as he believes his request is similar. He requested the Planning Commission adhere to Staff’s recommendation, as he has no concern with the conditions.

Commissioner Lindley asked the applicant what a parking management plan might consist of. Berman said he has owned apartments for the last 10 years and is a member of the Washington Landlords Association. He stated he understands parking is always an issue and details the management plan to his tenants through a parking addendum in the lease agreement. Commissioner Henry confirmed that the applicant is not opposed to adding specific language, if needed, to maintain vehicles off the street. Berman said that if a tenant is not in compliance with all aspects of the lease, it would be grounds for eviction. He additionally clarified the proposed tandem parking stalls would be allocated for the two-bedroom units and single parking stalls would be allocated to the one-bedroom/studio units.

City Administrator Munyan clarified that Staff’s recommendation for approval is based on the outcome of the traffic analysis. Furthermore, he suggested that as the Planning Commission is the deciding body, Condition 1 be to change from ‘administration review’ to Planning Commission review of the traffic analysis and parking management plan.

Berman reiterated the conditional use permit request is to allow long-term rental in the commercial district. He said he believes that this project would benefit the community, but that he could still move forward with all units designated as short-term rentals. He said he would like to start this project in the spring. Berman restated a comprehensive parking management plan is reasonable and that he is not opposed to the conditions. He requested the analysis to be reviewed by staff, instead of waiting a for second planning commission meeting to avoid delaying the project.

Commissioners, Applicant and Staff discussed the definition of short-term rental and its outright use, in relation to parking, in the Commercial Zone.

Applicant Berman questioned the interpretation of the last sentence in WSMC 17.72.060: “Nothing in this provision shall be construed to require off-street parking spaces that a portion of such building existing as of September 12, 1973.” Berman stated that his attorney reads it to say that none of the existing parking needs to be allocated for the existing building because it was built prior to 1973. Attorney Woodrich stated he understands his attorney’s interpretation but that the proposal is taking away existing parking, which he does not think was contemplated the sentence; adding that it does not say parking can be removed from parking already provided to an existing building. Attorney Woodrich concluded that the conditional use permit requires an impact analysis aspect, and as part of that a parking management plan is a reasonable request.

Commissioner Henry clarified the parking stall reduction is within an inch of a standard parking stall. Berman said the existing garage stall is in current operation.

**Public Testimony**

***Eric Sanford, 163/173 N Main Ave, White Salmon WA***

Eric Sanford stated that the applicant and he are good friends but have different views for the future of White Salmon and that he is opposed to the application. He said he is the owner of the property north of the proposed site that was referred to earlier by the applicant. Sanford stated that there are 20 parking spaces for 2,000 square feet of constructed buildings with no variances needed. He claimed the applicant was aware he would require a conditional use permit and parking variance prior to the purchase of the property. Sanford compared the current parking to proposed parking stalls and emphasized that tandem parking stalls are difficult to use. He questioned the realistic loss of half of the parking space that exists for the current units and the actual room for daily use of the proposed parking. He stated that he has been living in White Salmon for 30 years and has seen explosive growth in the last 5 years. He believes the city must control its growth. Stanford adds that the rampant and unmanageable growth of new construction has resulted in tightly packed buildings with insufficient infrastructure that has led to a parking and traffic mess, with some intersections being virtually unusable on busy weekends. He said he believes that as population increases, the small town could quickly lose its charm and livability and therefore suggested tightening and enforcing existing rules to manage and stop growth to preserve value. Sanford requests the Planning Commission, if approval is granted, to enforce two standard parking spaces for each unit, the height of the building be limited to two stories (including the underground parking) and all the existing parking spaces be preserved for the building.

***Geri Chaton, 173 NW Lincoln Street, White Salmon WA***

Geri Chaton stated because of the proposed lack of parking she is opposed to the building project. She said she believes there has been a misrepresentation of the number/type of bedroom units and parking widths. Chaton states that tandem parking is not going to attract people and may not be managed correctly. She believes she is the one that the applicant referred to earlier as the author of a comment letter calling the application a parking variance as it is what it appears to her to be. Chaton said she believes that even if approval is granted, the downtown area was not planned for parking and is supplemented by N Main Street and 1st Avenue. Chaton said she does not think business parking interferes with residential parking at this time and would like it to remain harmonious.

***Kathy Bustle, 707 Waubish Street, White Salmon WA***

Kathy Bustle stated she is opposed to the project in its current form as she believes it to be ambitions and too high density for the area. She said she understands that parking will be an issue for those that rely on fast access to street parking and that apartment renters will have cars, as this is not a bicycle community. Bustle said she thinks that something less ambitious, like half the size would be doable. She questioned if short-term rentals qualify as commercial use to meet the minimum residential/commercial percentage split and stated concerns with the potential of unlimited short-term rentals in the commercial zone.

***Archer Mayo, Owner of Multi-business structure at 107 W Jewett Blvd, White Salmon WA***

Archer Mayo stated he owns a building across from the proposed development site with 25 parking stalls on private property. He shared he was a planning commissioner during the Wyers End planned unit development and appreciates the residents and city working together to resolve an identified housing problem. Mayo said he believes the city should address what a short-term rental is instead of processing it in the manner of a variance or conditional use permit. He said he does not believe the project is worth adjusting the city’s residency to increase 2% while affecting 30% of downtown parking. Mayo concluded by adding he appreciates the focused deliberation of the Planning Commissioners.

***Helen Paulus, Rental Property Owner in White Salmon***

Helen Paulus said she appreciates the meeting’s discussion and Mr. Sanford’s comments. She shared that in her years of studying for an MBA degree and serving on Skamania County’s Planning Commission, she does not comprehend why there are planning efforts and laws established to then routinely grant variances. Paulus said she believes the applicant is only considering their bottom line while parking spaces disappear. She concluded by sharing she moved from a place where traffic and parking problems made it unlivable.

***Jeri Jablonski, 949 SE Oak Street, White Salmon WA***

Jeri Jablonski stated that she appreciates the thoughtfulness of the Planning Commission. She said she would like to remind all of what a jewel White Salmon is and how difficult it has been to pull out of many streets in town due to the increased volume of traffic in the last five years. Jablonski said she is opposed to the development as she believes the proposed parking will ruin the community. She noted that there was a recent city council meeting addressing the concerns for the increased numbers in short-term rentals.

***David Dierck, Owner of the White Salmon Inn at 172 W Jewett Blvd, White Salmon WA***

David Dierck stated he has looked through the code and questions what a short-term rental is and if it qualifies as commercial, as Commissioner Henry had commented prior.

**Rebuttal**

***Tao Berman, Applicant and Property Owner of 115 N Main Street***

Tao Berman restated he is not asking for a parking variance, that it is not the reason for the application. He stated that Building Official, Bill Hunsaker, and City Administrator Munyan met with him onsite to gage the turning radius, and he believes the distance will be sufficient as excavation will be further north than the existing parking. Berman said that regarding the height of the building being alluded as too tall, he will comply with WSMC zoning and building codes. He said will he is aware that tandem parking is not ideal and that there are downsides to having an apartment building downtown but believes the upside is that it helps limit suburban sprawl. Berman said that he is aware parking will have an impact, but he intends to manage it well. He requested the analysis report to be reviewed by staff. Berman stated that the reason for the size of the project is economics. He said that the larger the building, the more people can help drive the cost down to make a viable project. Berman said the community has not seen a new apartment building in 50 years while the community states that it needs more affordable housing options, and he believes that this is what he is trying to do. He concluded by stating the project and parking is good enough to where it benefits and outweighs the valid concerns that have been brought up and will be addressed in the parking management plan.

Berman clarified for Commissioner Henry why the number of units proposed works economically, the risk of the construction and detailed potential expenses. He added that a lot of cities categorize hotels and short-term rentals in different asset classes, although similar.

Berman identified the proposed building’s residential/commercial areas and distances between the proposed parking stalls for Commissioner Stevenson. Berman clarified the site plan is an estimate as the property has not been surveyed.

**Further Discussion**

Commissioners and Staff discussed the request of the conditional use permit’s long-term residential use and followed up on short-term rental comments as it relates to city code. City Administrator Munyan clarified that under state law, short-term rental means lodging for less than thirty days. Additionally, Munyan stated the parking concern is clear and staff has proposed a way to address those concerns through a professional impact analysis. He stated the conditional use permit criteria is not prescriptive about the number of parking stalls and therefore a general traffic impact study governs flexibility to determine the projected impact.

**Public Hearing Closed at 9:55 p.m.**

**Deliberation**

Commissioners discussed Staff’s recommendation for a traffic and parking analysis to be presented to better determine the impact of the voiced concerns, to be reviewed by the planning commission, instead of staff. More discussion took place related to the opportunity to adopt explicit parking provisions. Commissioner Stevenson and Attorney Woodrich suggested the applicant confirm measurements to Staff’s satisfaction. City Administrator Munyan stated that the building must meet setbacks among other building requirements for the building permit to be issued. Commissioners discussed potential avenues to mitigate overflow parking through a public parking lot or lease agreement on an adjacent property to avoid on-street parking.

Moved by Tom Stevenson. Seconded by Ross Henry.

*Motion to adopt Staff’s facts and findings, and conditions of approval (with one-word change: to replace administrative to planning commission).* CARRIED 3-0.

**Further Deliberation**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.
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| , Chairman | Erika Castro Guzman, Associate Planner |