

## **Rivergrove Planning Commission Minutes November 6, 2017**

---

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL** The meeting was called to order at River Grove Elementary School library at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Commissioners Andrew Dausman (chair), Jennifer Crock, Jonathan Sweet, and Jeff Williams. Leanne Moll declared a quorum. Mayor Heather Kibbey and City Planner Carole Connell were also present.

### **1. Swearing-in of Jacob McKay**

Mayor Kibbey swore in new Commissioner Jacob McKay.

### **2. Election of Vice-Chair**

**Motion:** Commissioner Dausman **moved** to nominate Jonathan Sweet to serve as the Planning Commission Vice-Chair, citing his experience and tenure. The motion was **seconded** by Commissioner Williams. The motion **passed 5-0**.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **1. Minutes from the October 2, 2017 Meetings**

**Motion:** Commissioner Dausman **moved** to approve the Minutes from the October 2, 2017 meeting with the following amendment. **Seconded** by Commissioner Sweet. The motion **passed 4-0**. Commissioner McKay abstained.

- Page 1, New Business, paragraph 2 to read, "...Chair Dausman wanted to make sure that the Commission had enough information to determine if the application was complete, not if the Commission had enough information for approval or denial...."

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **1. Type III Hearing for a Development Permit Application for a single-family home at 4620 Dogwood Drive, submitted by Larry Todd of Maywood Homes.**

City Manager/ City Recorder Leanne Moll read the quasi-judicial hearing disclosure. Commissioner Jeff Williams, 4550 Dogwood Drive, disclosed his bias as the neighbor directly to the east of 4620 Dogwood Drive, recused himself, and left the Commissioners' table.

City Planner Carole Connell summarized the staff report. The application materials received since the Completeness report include an updated arborist report from an ISA Certified Tree Risk Assessor and agency comments. Brian French, City Arborist, noted that tree 57 should be retained and the applicant should provide a development tree protection plan. WES was not satisfied with the impervious surface area calculations provided, but will not be able to determine if the home is under 5,000 square feet of impervious surface until they examine the scaled site plan drawings in the building permit phase.

Ms. Connell also noted that there were twelve letters of testimony submitted, all in opposition to the application.

City Planner Carole Connell continued by presenting the criteria for approving the development permit application:

She noted that the home is a permitted use in the R Zone and the lot complies with all conditions in the Rivergrove Land Development Ordinances (RLDO); the home complies with all zoning requirements, including minimum setbacks and maximum height limits.

Ms. Connell noted that the Flood Hazard District section of the RLDO defines development standards in the floodplain and floodway, much like Ordinance #70-2001. She explained that an estimated 35' of the home is still partially in the floodplain. 15' is the actual dwelling and 20' is the hardscape, extending into the floodplain. Any portion of the dwelling is just crawl space and not habitable space.

Ordinance #70-2001 (Flood Management and Water Quality Resource Area) criteria: There is a prior approved cut and fill grading plan. Much of the grading has already been completed. There will be some grading necessary for the foundation. WES will need to demonstrate flood storage capacity, water course and velocities, and plans for drainage facilities. Actual structural flood proofing, venting, and anchoring will be a County building permit requirement. The development of the home does not infringe upon the vegetated corridor or the top of the river bank.

#### Tree Cutting Permit:

The revised site plan illustrates removing 13 trees: 7 are in house footprint and 6 are within 5-10' of the proposed dwelling. The applicant has proposed 2:1 tree mitigation with 13 sunset maples planted on the side property line and near the vegetated corridor line the installation of a 6' chain link fence for protection. South of the fence, the applicant proposes 6 Western Red Cedar Trees. Ms. Connell noted that there is a typographical error in the site plan. She assumes the Western Red Cedar trees will be 6' tall at planting. Nineteen mitigation trees are proposed. A 2:1 ratio requires 26 trees, if 13 trees are removed. The City Arborist recommends that Tree 57 is preserved; therefore 24 trees would be required to meet a 2:1 mitigation ratio.

Ms. Connell listed the five criteria for a Tree Cutting Permit and asked the Commissioners to consider how the tree removal permit application in this case meet these criteria:

1. Are the trees dead, dying, or dangerous? Based on the two arborist reports and the input of the City Arborist, none of these trees are dead, dying, or dangerous.
2. The necessity of removing the 13 trees in order to construct the proposed building or to use the property in a reasonable manner.
3. The topography of the land, and the impact of the removal of the trees on erosion, soil retention, flow of surface water, protection of nearby trees, windbreaks, and a desirable balance between shade and open space.
4. The number of trees existing in the neighborhood, the character and property uses of the neighborhood, and the effect of the tree removal on the neighborhood characteristics, beauty, and property values.
5. The Planning Commission may require an adequate mitigation plan be submitted as a condition of approval for the permit, including requiring the submission of a drainage plan, if appropriate.

The applicant's plan necessitates the removal of 13 trees, except for tree 57, the trees are not in the protected vegetated corridor. However, 10 of the trees are in the floodplain. In the review of a prior application, Brian French stated the parcel can be divided into two groves. Mr. French recommended that the prior application for a single-family home be adjusted to save grove #2. There is evidence based on the testimony of people who live on the riverbank that the removal

of 10 large, mature trees will likely destabilize the soil and cause erosion on the riverbank during high river water events. In addition, there is substantial testimony that the tree removal will affect the neighborhood's beauty, characteristics, and property value. Finally, the Commission may suggest a mitigation plan. If the Planning Commission approves this tree removal permit application, the City Arborist recommends a 3:1 tree removal ratio, minimum 6' conifers, that should all be planted in the vegetated corridor along the riverbank.

Ms. Connell explained that the last set of criteria is site design review. In this case, the Commission may suggest site review because of the location in an environmentally sensitive area of the floodplain. The Commission may recommend changes to the plan to ensure that the following criteria are met to the maximum extent practical. There are six criteria; two (A and F) do not apply:

- A. A safe and efficient traffic circulation system; does not apply in this case.
- B. The project will not create a situation which contain significant hazard to life or property. Testimony attests to loss of large trees contributes to the erosion of the riverbank, which can affect property values. The is not evidence to the contrary in this case.
- C. In an environmentally sensitive area, grading and filling shall be minimized. At least 35' of lot is being developed in floodplain. The proposed plan is in accordance with the FEMA-approved Base Flood Elevation map and the grading cut and fill plans. The site drainage is not satisfied.
- D. Natural vegetation, specifically large trees, shall be preserved whenever practical. All 12 letters are concerned about removal of 13 mature trees on the river. For the reasons stated in the testimony, staff concur that the dwelling plan design is insensitive to the numerous and valuable attributes of the very large trees and the canopy that they create for river shade, wildlife protection, and air quality. Preservation of trees is premise of multiple City goals, policies, and development standards designed to protect them. It is practical to preserve the trees and request a site redesign to more carefully consider Rivergrove values. At this point, there are no know homeowner needs that dictate this design.
- E. The site design should meet the criteria established in the Comprehensive Plan, when relevant. There are seven Comprehensive Plan policies that are relevant and coincide with the negative site impacts as communicated by neighbors. The testimony indicates that the intent of the City is to preserve groves of trees, protect large trees, maintain air quality, preserve areas in the floodplain, to protect the riparian habitat, and to protect the riverbank. There is an adequate amount of land that is clear of trees. There is no demonstrated need for the current design. Thirty-five feet of the southern portion of the home is in the floodplain. Although it is not habitable (crawlspce and hardscape) it will necessitate 10 of 13 trees removed. Mitigation is a possibility, but it is a compromise, and it is not equal to preserving the existing mature tree canopy. The State of Oregon is in the process of developing additional restrictions to protect fisheries as a result of the FEMA/ NOAA lawsuit. The FEMA/NOAA lawsuit was noted in the testimony several times.
- F. Appropriate screening between multifamily homes. Not applicable.

In conclusion, Ms. Connell suggested the following three options for the Commissioners:

1. Move to continue and request the applicant provide a modified house plan that would reduce the number of trees removed in the floodplain and mitigate the negative site design impacts; or
2. Move to deny the request; or
3. Based on some revised site design findings proposed by staff, the Commission could move to accept the application.

**Applicant's Response:**

Larry Todd of Maywood Homes, 5332 Lower Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Mr. Todd asked whether or not a prior application for a single-family home had been approved for this lot. Ms. Moll replied that there was no decision because the application had been withdrawn before the 10-day appeal period.

Mr. Todd stated he has read a number of the letters in opposition and the ordinances and the site plan. He noted that the lot is only 70' wide and that the site plans are in compliance with all the setbacks, including not intruding into the floodway and the vegetative corridor. He stated that he feels it is unfair that a sitting member of the Planning Commission, who is a neighbor to the lot, is using his privilege as a Commissioner to oppose the development.

Steve Edelman, 4650 Dogwood Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon. (Owner of 4620 Dogwood Drive).

Mr. Edelman submitted a chart that displays the 137 homes that have recently been built in Rivergrove. Mr. Edelman claimed that the size/scale of the proposed home at 4620 Dogwood Drive is similar to many homes that have recently been built in Rivergrove.

Mr. Edelman explained that the application leaves eleven trees in the floodway close to the riverfront, even with removing the proposed 13 (or 12 with the City Arborist's recommendation). He noted that on the three existing lots (4650, 4640, and 4620 Dogwood Drive), there are 68 existing trees and the current tree removal permit application will leave 44 trees.

Mr. Edelman also noted that many of the homes that oppose the development are larger than the proposed home, and that there are some neighbors that do not have any trees in their backyard. Mr. Edelman believes that the mitigation trees would be an adequate compromise.

Mr. Edelman stated he does not understand what has changed since he received approval to remove trees to build his single-family home at 4650 Dogwood Drive in 2015, the Fisher application in 2016, which requested removal of 13 trees on the same lot, and the current application.

**Proponents:**

Connie Dalton, 4640 Dogwood Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Ms. Dalton, the property owner directly west of the lot, has no opposition to the site design and plans.

**Neutral:**

None.

**Opposed:**

Carolyn Bahrman, 4870 Dogwood Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Ms. Bahrman explained she has lived on the river for a long time and knows the bank will erode during flooding, and that tree removal is detrimental to the security of the bank. She cited the large numbers of letters in opposition to the proposed dwelling and encouraged the Commissioners to deny the tree removal permit application.

Jeff Williams, 4550 Dogwood Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Mr. Williams stated that he was not opposed to development in general, but is opposed to the particular design of the lot. He believes the proposed home is an inappropriate design for a 70' wide lot. He also noted that if the impervious surface calculations are incorrect, the construction of water detention facilities could push construction back even further into the floodplain. He cited RLDO 5.080 to explain that with the large garage out front, the home is really about 60' setback, which is excessively far from the front of the lot. He believes the home will appear like a "warehouse" next door with large windows that would look down on the Williamses home. He also cited 6.234: Trees should be preserved when practical and stated that there should be appropriate screening between homes. Mr. Williams asked that there be a balance between the development and the neighborhood. Mr. Williams noted that the developer will not live in this home, and has no investment in the neighborhood. Mr. Williams lives directly downstream from the home, and will be impacted by the development and potential riverbank erosion. He also noted that Rivergrove is a Tree City, USA, and is called to protect mature trees. He asked that the Commission deny the application or request a redesign.

Dave Pierce, 5700 Childs Road, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Mr. Pierce explained that the large response from the community is an effort to respect the community's goals and ordinances. He asked the applicant to come up with a plan that is sensitive to the neighborhood and community. Mr. Pierce also suggested that just because similar plans are approved elsewhere, does not make the plans right for this community. Mr. Pierce noted that the mitigation is problematic because of the lack of diversity of species, and he noted that planting the trees 8 feet apart does not allow for long-term survivability.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**

Debbie Todd, 5332 Lower Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

Mrs. Todd noted she and her husband, applicant Larry Todd, are long-time community members and have the best interests of the community in mind.

Michael C. Robinson, Land Use Attorney, 1120 NW Couch Street, Portland, OR 97209-4128.

Mr. Robinson presented the rebuttal. First, he reminded the Commissioners that their decision is based on the approval criteria and substantial evidence, not on the number of letters of testimony. The evidence that Ms. Connell cites in the staff report as to why the approval criteria are not satisfied is not substantial evidence. The items in the testimony are lay opinions and not relevant to the criteria in the ordinances.

Second, he stated that if one has looked at the site plan and lot the vast majority of trees are preserved on site are in the floodway and floodplain. Some of the trees that need to be removed are in the floodplain, but the trees that are preserved are back towards the river, so the trees that are retained on site do protect the riverbank.

In Mr. Robinson's opinion, the site design approval criteria does not give the Planning Commission the right to force a redesign of a home that already meets the dimensions required by the residential zone.

That site design approval criteria is actually a limited land use application, and the City does not have the ability under state law to apply plan policies unless they are directly incorporated into the land use regulations. Even if you did, the policies that you listed in the staff report are really policies that go to suggestions for legislative enactments by the City; they are not the kind of policies that are applied to quasi-judicial decisions such as this. Metro's Title 13 does not apply

directly to a permit decision. In addition to what the owner Mr. Edelman has testified, the evidence demonstrates the applicant has satisfied the approval criteria. In addition, there is a history of the Planning Commission tentatively approving this type of tree removal in the past. Finally, the two trees that provide the most shade and privacy to the Williamses property line must be removed due to the narrow 70' wide lot. In order to have a reasonably-sized dwelling that meets the setback requirements on that lot, those trees must be removed. They are deciduous trees that currently have no leaves. During this time of year, the trees do not provide any privacy.

Mr. Robinson urged the Commissioners to tentatively approve the application, citing the third option presented in the staff report. He reminded the Commissioners that if someone disapproves of the decision to approve, they can appeal to the City Council.

### **City Planner, Carole Connell's Response:**

Commissioner Dausman asked Ms. Moll to summarize the written testimony received by the City. All 12 items of testimony were opposed to the development permit application:

- Jeff Williams 4550 Dogwood Drive (10-31-17)
- Jim Hart 4680 Dogwood Drive (10-26-17)
- Todd Kindorf 4613 Dogwood Drive (10-25-17)
- Elaine Lees 4545 Dogwood Drive (10-24-17)
- Jeff Williams 4550 Dogwood Drive (10-23-17)
- Roger Knight 4800 Dogwood Drive (10-23-17)
- Michael Getlin 4591 SW Dogwood (10-19-17)
- Gregory Patton 4531 West Rd (11-1-17)
- Brenda Ruble, 4840 Dogwood Drive (11-4-17)
- Carolyn Bahrman, 4870 Dogwood Drive (11-5-17)
- Dave Pierce, 5700 Childs Road (11-6-17)
- Mary Mann, 5215 Childs Road (11-6-17)

Ms. Connell asked Mr. Robinson that if the Planning Commission is engaging in a limited land use decision, the criteria in Rivergrove's Land Use Ordinances for making these decisions are out of order, illegal, unfounded, out of place?

Mr. Robinson responded that site design review permits are limited land use applications under 197.015 (12). The statute says for cities to be able to apply policies of land use decisions, they have to incorporate whatever policies they want to apply directly into their land use regulations. Mr. Robinson cites two arguments that support this claim:

1. The city hasn't incorporated these criteria into the land use ordinances, so it can't apply land use policies to a permit or limited land use decision.
2. Some policies cited in the staff report are legislative directions later enacted by the City Council; some policies, like Metro's Title 13, do not apply in this situation.

Ms. Connell suggested that it would be difficult for the Planning Commission to evaluate these claims without receiving another opinion. Ms. Connell also noted that many of the criteria in the site design review section are also present in the tree removal ordinance.

Commissioner McKay asked Mr. Edelman to clarify the column labeled the "Trees" on the chart he presented. Mr. Edelman explained that these are the trees that are visible from the street.

Commissioner McKay asked if the number 14 is correct for Dogwood Drive, that there are only 14 trees visible from the street on all of Dogwood Drive. Mr. Edelman admitted that that number was an error.

**Motion:** Commissioner Sweet **moved** to close the public testimony. **Seconded** by Commissioner Dausman. Motion **passed 5-0**.

The Planning Commission adjourned briefly for a break.

**Deliberation by Commissioners:**

Commissioner Crock asked Ms. Connell about the perpendicular location of the garage opening. She noted that changing the garage orientation would reduce the amount of hardscape, maintain the value of the square footage, and preserve many trees.

Commissioner Dausman noted that in the past the Commission has suggested changes to the front setback in order to preserve trees.

Commissioner McKay asked Ms. Connell about the criteria of preserving trees whenever practical.

Ms. Connell noted that there are two criteria to consider. The tree cutting permit has its own criteria that are not site design criteria, but tree cutting criteria. If the Commissioners felt uncomfortable relying on the site design criteria, they may rely on the tree cutting criteria. They're similar.

Ms. Connell noted that the Commissioners should not be expected to question whether the Ordinances are valid or not. The tree cutting criteria stand on their own. Are the trees dead, dying, or dangerous? Is the removal of the trees necessary in order to construct the home? What is the effect of the tree removal? The other criteria are the site design policies. They are both in the staff report because they both pertain to the situation.

Commissioner Dausman clarified the recommendation for mitigation. City Manager/City Recorder Leanne Moll noted that the ratio of 3:1 is the current federal guideline for mitigation in the floodplain.

Commissioner Sweet asked about the third criteria that the tree cutting will affect the riverbank. He feels uncomfortable making a decision on loose criteria. He cited the City Arborist's recommendation that only tree 57 be preserved and reminded the other Commissioners that the applicant has complied with all of the requirements. The issues that have brought up by the testimony are gray areas that are open to interpretation.

Ms. Connell asked the Commissioners if the applicant has met the burden of providing the criteria? Does the Commission need more information?

Commissioner Dausman wanted to understand what some of the alternatives were. He was not convinced that a design based on the current plans would be able to be adjusted much to save many trees because the groves are intact entities. Can the trees that are left survive if some are taken from the grove? Commissioner Dausman's concern is that the Ms. Connell seems to think there are alternatives.

He asked what can the Commission require to make the home a better fit for the lot? He was not convinced that the current design works well within the lot.

Commissioner Sweet asked if the Commission can require a home redesign. Ms. Connell replied yes, and noted that this would be a continuation of the hearing, not a new development permit application. There is a chance that the new site design could still not save any trees, as happened with the Fisher application at the same lot.

Commissioner Sweet asked about the impervious surface area. Ms. Connell said that the calculations are premature, and the Planning Commission can require the City engineer to weigh in.

Commissioner McKay asked if a tree is removed in the floodplain does it affect the quality of the soil. Commissioner Dausman responded that FEMA recognizes that if a tree is removed in the floodplain that it has negative consequence for the floodplain. Removing a tree in the floodplain causes a higher standard of review.

Commissioner McKay asked for a continuance for more information, particularly regarding tree removal and mitigation.

Commissioner Dausman noted he would like to see the plans revised with an alternative setback to save half of the west grove and half of the east grove.

Ms. Connell noted that the application was deemed complete on October 2, 2017. The City has 120 days to make a final decision, including an appeal period. If the Commission continued the hearing, a decision would have to be made at the December 4, 2017 meeting in order to allow for an appeal at the January 8, 2017 City Council meeting.

Mr. Robinson told Ms. Connell that the applicant would not grant a waiver to the 120-day deadline.

Commissioner Dausman noted that it would be beneficial for Planning Commission to make a decision and the affected parties may appeal to City Council, if necessary.

**Motion:** Based on the findings in the staff report, primarily due to the impacts of the tree cutting permit and the impacts of the health of the floodway, Commissioner Dausman **moved** to deny the request. **Seconded** by Commissioner Crock. **Passed 3 in favor, 1 opposed.**

Commissioner Williams returned to the Planning Commission table.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **1. Completeness Review for a Development Permit Application for a deck renovation and new patio in the floodplain at 4640 Dogwood Drive, submitted by Connie Dalton.**

Ms. Connell explained that the application proposes a renovation of an existing deck and the construction of a concrete patio in the floodplain. Every relevant item has been submitted. The deck is being elongated to be flush with the sides of the home, and a stairway is being added. At the ground level, a concrete patio would be added. The setbacks, heights, etc. are all in order. There may be additional information about the side setback provided by the applicant. The alteration requires a permit unless it can be determined to not impact the use of the land or the structure, per the RLDO. In the Flood Management standards, a permit is required. There is



some latitude for the Commissioners to determine if this application is exempt from a development permit. Everything on the property is in the floodplain, but the deck is elevated 12' above the ground, so it is not in the floodplain. The vegetated corridor is not delineated, but the home is 80' from the top of the bank, and likely out of the vegetated corridor.

Ms. Connell noted that due to the flood management requirements, there should be no grading/fill except at the base of the beams. The stairway might block some water, but because it is not in the floodway, it may be exempt.

Ms. Connell suggested two options for the Commissioners:

1. Determine the application is exempt; or
2. Schedule a Type III Hearing.

Commissioner Williams and Commissioner Crock supported exempting the application.

Commissioner Dausman stated that a hearing should be scheduled because the structure is in the floodplain.

Ms. Moll noted that a development permit is pending mitigation of three Oregon white oak trees in Heritage Park.

**Motion:** Commissioner Dausman **moved** to accept that the application is complete and that a Type III Hearing be set at the next Planning Commission meeting on December 4, 2017.

**Seconded:** Commissioner McKay. Motion **passed 5-0**.

Ms. Dalton asked if this type of development always requires a hearing. Commissioner Dausman clarified that it is required because the structure is in the flood hazard zone.

## **2. Retroactive Tree Removal Permit Application for an apple tree in the floodplain at 6540 Childs Road, submitted by Steve Mason.**

Ms. Moll presented the retroactive tree removal application for an apple tree that was damaged by a beaver. The City issued an emergency tree removal permit on September 25, 2017 for an apple and willow tree, both in the floodplain, and both damaged by beavers. The willow was likely in the floodway. City arborist Brian French viewed both trees and suggested the apple tree, because of its proximity to the home and electrical wires, be removed. The applicants will wait and see if the willow can survive. The apple tree was removed on October 6, 2017. Because the tree is in the floodplain, it is now up to the Planning Commission to retroactively approve the tree removal permit and suggest if there should be any mitigation. In addition, the applicants are working with Clean Water Services of Washington County to plant native species in their yard that will coordinate and help protect native plants that will be planted to beautify the sewer lift station that adjoins their property. The City recommended the permit be approved with no mitigation.

**Motion:** Commissioner Dausman **moved** to approve the retroactive Tree Removal Application and to suggest, but not require, that the applicant mitigate with one tree, and species to be recommended by Brian French. **Seconded:** Commissioner Sweet. Motion **passed 5-0**.

## **3. Type IV Hearing for an amendment to Ordinance 70-2001 to allow docks, City File No. 2017-01.**

For the record, the Hearing disclosure statement was read at the beginning of the meeting.

Clackamas County reported that a building permit is required for the structural safety of the stairway and platform for a dock. However, the dock itself is regulated by a number of entities outside of Clackamas County. The Clackamas County Planning and Zoning Division will oversee referring the applicant to the correct agencies. Department of State Lands would oversee any grading or fill on the riverbank, but not the dock itself because the Tualatin River is not considered navigable (like the Willamette River, which is owned by the Department of State Lands). The US Army Corp of Engineers oversees docks.

Generally, staff support the ordinance as drafted as it supports the City's goals to encourage river recreation. Staff is concerned about limiting the impact of docks on the ecosystem.

**Proponents:**

Dave Pierce, 5700 Childs Road, Lake Oswego, Oregon, applauded the Commission for making this Ordinance. He is interested in installing a seasonal dock that is removeable.

Jim Hart, 4680 Dogwood Drive, Lake Oswego, Oregon, noted that he already has a dock, but is curious about the specific standards, particularly the width and the length and the orientation of the docks. He noted that "sized and placed" are subjective criteria that should be explained. He also asked about the criteria that determines the color of the dock.

**Opponents:**

None.

**Neutral:**

None.

**Deliberation:**

The Planning Commission did not further deliberate the proposed ordinance.

**Motion:** Commissioner Dausman **moved** that the findings in the staff report dated October 31, 2017 be recommended to the City Council for approval of Ordinance 91-2017 which amends Ordinance 70-2001 and RLDO 5.060 and 5.070. **Seconded:** Commissioner Williams. Motion **passed 5-0.**

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

None.

**CORRESPONDENCE & REPORTS**

None.

**COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Dausman asked Commissioner Sweet or another commissioner to join him at the City Council meeting to give the Planning Commission report.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Dausman

**Seconded by:** Commissioner Crock.

**Motion passed 5-0.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leanne Moll, City Manager/ City Recorder