



Community Development

"Dedicated to Excellence in Public Service"

Adrian P. Freund, FAICP, Community Development Director
Nathan Edwards, Legal Counsel



Washoe County Planning Commission

Dian A. VanderWell, Chair
Neal Cobb, Vice Chair
William Weber

Roger M. Edwards
Roy H. Hibdon
Vaughn Hartung
D.J. Whittemore

WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

January 5, 2010

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, January 5, 2010, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair VanderWell called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Dian A. VanderWell, Chair
Neal Cobb, Vice Chair
Roger M. Edwards
Roy Hibdon
William Weber
Vaughn Hartung
D.J. Whittemore

Commissioners absent: None

Staff present: Adrian P. Freund, Director, Community Development
Sandra Monsalvè, Senior Planner, Community Development
Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, Community Development
Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Community Development
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney
Dawn Spinola, Recording Secretary, Community Development

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Hibdon led the pledge to the flag.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair VanderWell announced that Mr. Lloyd had requested Item 4 be moved up to the top of the agenda.

Mr. Freund stated Chair and Commission Item d, regarding speaker time limits, would be continued to the February 2010 meeting.

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Hartung moved to approve the amended agenda for the January 5, 2010, meeting. Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

APPEAL LANGUAGE

Mr. Freund recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Cobb moved to approve the minutes for the December 1, 2009 Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Hibdon seconded the motion which carried unanimously

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

CONSENT ITEMS

None

PLANNING ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM 4

PUBLIC HEARING: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER DCA08-009 - To amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110, Development Code, Article 302, Allowed Uses, Article 304, Use Classification System, and Article 326, Wind Machines. The amendments will include the revision to the table of allowed uses to include the addition of new renewable energy use types and the amendments to the standards for wind machines. The proposed amendments would revise all aspects of Article 326 (Wind Machines) including but not limited to setbacks, noise, electromagnetic interference, wildlife impacts, meteorological towers, repair and removal of wind machines and submittal requirements for commercial wind machines.

Mr. Lloyd requested a two-month continuance for the purpose of engaging in further conversation with members of the public regarding the proposed changes.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Edwards reminded the Commissioners that Open Meeting Law (OML) applies whenever a quorum exists. He then brought up that they needed to watch out for serial communications. This is defined as communication between a total of four or more of the seven contacting one another outside of an agendized meeting for the purpose of deliberating or discussing an item. This is a violation of OML.

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

There was no response to the call for public testimony; Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Mr. Freund acknowledged the extensive and excellent work done by the staff regarding this project. He noted they had reviewed ordinances from all over the country regarding the criteria associated with wind machines. He reiterated the importance of the continuance for the purpose of obtaining more public input and involvement prior to presentation of the item to the Commission.

Commissioner Edwards expressed he wished to be notified when the public meetings were to occur.

PROJECT REVIEW ITEMS:

AGENDA ITEM 1

PUBLIC HEARING: SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. SW09-002 (FISH SPRINGS RANCH PV-1 SOLAR PROJECT) – To review the development of a 100 MW Photovoltaic Solar Array on 23 separate properties. Phase 1 of the project will consist of the construction and operation of 20 MW (of the 100 MW Photovoltaic Solar Array) on one (1) 160 acre parcel, and will include: power facilities (2-5 new power poles) to connect to the Nevada Energy Ft. Sage Substation, a new control building, and all associated appurtenances for the purposes of supplying renewable sources of energy production to NV Energy as authorized in Section 110.810.00 of the Washoe County Development Code. The project encompasses twenty-three (23) separate parcels totaling approximately 2,670 acres, located approximately 45 miles north of Reno, in the southeastern Honey Lake Valley in Fish Springs. All the subject properties are zoned General Rural (GR) and are located in the Gerlach/Empire Citizen Advisory Board boundary and Washoe County Commission District No. 5. (APNs: 074-040-15, 074-040-23, 074-040-24, 074-040-56, 074-040-57, 074-040-58, 074-040-61, 074-070-16, 074-070-28, 074-070-72, 074-070-73, 074—070-74, 074-111-05, 074-122-10, 074-122-55, 074-412-18, 074-412-19, 074-412-45, 074-720-07, 074-420-11, 074-420-14, 074-420-15, and 074-420-16)

Chair VanderWell called for disclosures. Mr. Weber noted he had received a call from the applicant but there had been no discussion of the project. Chair VanderWell stated she had spoken to the applicant's representative. None of the other Commissioners had anything to report.

Ms. Monsalvè reviewed the staff report dated December 24, 2009. Staff was recommending approval of the project. Approval would be for the entire project and it would be constructed in phases. She noted it was a Project of Regional Significance (PRS) so would need to be heard and approved by the Regional Planning Commission.

Ms. Monsalvè went on to note there were no residences located adjacent to parcels slated for Phases One or Two. The project is conditioned so that each phase is reviewed with Community Development staff and the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) to determine if any buffering is required between future phases and any affected residences. Although the CAB had not met, they had been provided the opportunity to review and comment. The Vice Chair had attended the agency review meeting but had been there more in the capacity of a private citizen than a CAB representative.

Ms. Monsalvè stated there were two conditions that had been revised since the staff report had gone out. A copy of the changes had been provided to each Commissioner and the applicant at the beginning of the meeting. Condition 1i requires the applicant to obtain a

business license and provide evidence of a Power Purchase Agreement between the applicant and the utility company. It was determined that the evidence of the Agreement was a business decision and not within the jurisdiction of Community Development to condition. Condition 1j required a decommissioning plan for each phase and was altered to eliminate the requirement for financial assurances for the reclamation of the site. She reiterated the applicant is required to meet with staff prior to the development of each phase of the project.

Applicant Donald Pattalock explained the ownership and development of the project. He pointed out there would not be any mass grading, although there will be brush removal. They are working with the Health Department regarding dust control. He stated they were not planning to modify any of the drainage on site. He complimented staff's professionalism, stating they had gone through the permitting process in other locations and this one had been a joy to work with.

Commissioner Weber expressed concern over companies outside Nevada coming in to develop the project and wanted to know how much local labor would be used. Mr. Pattalock stated they would be going out to obtain construction bids and several local companies had already expressed interest. He noted they were residents and heavily vested in the community, so they would like to see a local company get the contract.

Commissioner Cobb asked if demultiplexing converts the power from DC to AC. Mr. Pattalock explained that occurred at the inverters. The demultiplexing station is required in order to normalize voltage coming off the system to maintain a constant supply.

Commissioner Hartung noted the solar structures were not to exceed 10 feet in height but would be allowed to reach a 65-foot height requirement. Ms. Monsalvè replied the applicant had indicated the structures would not exceed 10 feet. However, an industrial use type on the General Rural (GR) zoning of the property allowed structures up to 65 feet.

Commissioner Hartung asked if it was possible to leave the existing alfalfa fields in place, both to control dust and to provide wildlife habitat. Mr. Pattalock clarified there were a variety of properties in the application. Some were alfalfa fields. When the associated water rights were converted to a municipal use, the alfalfa was replaced by native pasture rotation. Phases One and Two are on open rangeland, so no alfalfa farming is currently taking place. Mr. Pattalock noted some fire concerns and stated, that because of the dust and some other issues, they want to keep the site as natural as possible.

Commissioner Hartung asked if they had any intention of changing the type of material they intended to use for the panels. Mr. Pattalock reiterated they are heavily vested in that valley and the panels are silicone, so they are not dealing with another product that may leach chemical by-products into the system and cause damage.

Commissioner Hibdon asked how they intended to keep the panels clean and if they were to use water, how much would be required? Mr. Pattalock replied that, because the technology uses indirect light, dust does not minimize the effectiveness of the panels to the extent that they must be cleaned. The manufacturer claims that normal rain should be enough to clean them. He stated that if they found efficiency was being compromised by the dust, then they would need to alter their plan to include washing the panels.

Commissioner Hibdon noted other facilities had used the same technology but had been operational for a maximum of a year, so there would be no history of what would be required. Mr. Pattalock pointed out the entire industry was young, although solar panels had been around since the 1960s and 1970s. The industry is only now breaking ground in utilizing the technology on a utility scale.

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

Mark Murphy stated he owned property adjacent to the project and was in favor of it.

Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hartung moved to approve Special Use Permit Case No. SW09-002. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Weber and passed unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. Consistency. That the proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Comprehensive Plan and the High Desert Area Plan;
2. Improvements. That adequate utilities, roadway improvements, sanitation, water supply, drainage, and other necessary facilities have been provided, the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed roadways, and an adequate public facilities determination has been made in accordance with Division Seven;
3. Site Suitability. That the site is physically suitable for a Photovoltaic Solar Array project and for the intensity of such a development;
4. Issuance Not Detrimental. That issuance of the permit will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties; or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area;
5. Effect on a Military Installation. Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of the military installation.

The following additional findings must also be made in regard to Development of Natural Resources:

6. That the proposed development is not unduly detrimental to surrounding properties, land uses and the environment in general;
7. That the proposed development will not unduly block scenic views or degrade any surrounding scenic resources; and
8. That the proposed development will reclaim the site and all affected areas at the conclusion of the operation.

AGENDA ITEM 2

PUBLIC HEARING: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER CP09-007 (KESHMIRI PROPERTY) - To consider a request to amend the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan, being a part of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan. The amendment request would re-designate a portion of Assessor's Parcel Number 041-051-31 (± 8.40 acres) from the land use category of General Rural (GR) to High Density Rural (HDR), approximately ± 6.31 acres. The subject property is located at 4900 Neeser Lane, just south of Plateau and northwest of Caughlin Parkway. The subject parcel is within the unincorporated portion of the Washoe County Truckee Meadows Services Area (TMSA) and within the City of Reno's Area of Interest, as identified on Map 7 of the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. The subject parcel is located within Section 20, T19N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is within Washoe County Commission District 1 and within the Verdi Township/West Truckee Meadows Citizen Advisory Board boundary. To reflect changes requested within this application and to maintain currency of general area plan data, administrative changes to the area plan are proposed. These administrative changes include: a revised map series with updated parcel base.

Ms. Monsalvè reviewed the staff report dated December 23, 2009, placing emphasis on the different types of land use designations surrounding the parcel and their allowed uses. She showed graphics designating steep topography in the area and on the subject property, emphasizing that substantial portions of the lot were too steep for development.

Ms. Monsalvè went on to list the various policies and plans the land use change must adhere to, and stated it had met all required criteria. She pointed out the parcel was adjacent to a Low Density Suburban (LDS) parcel and a GR parcel that belongs to Washoe County and is common area for the Caughlin Ranch subdivision.

Ms. Monsalvè noted that a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) is simply to change the land use of a property and cannot be conditioned because it is not project-related. The review and imposition of conditions would happen at a future time if the applicant were to submit an application for a project such as a Tentative Map. The conditions may include, but not be limited to, requirements regarding amount of water, sewer connection, access improvement and fire safety plans.

She went on to note the item had been heard at two Verdi Township/West Truckee Meadows CAB meetings, one on October 14 and the other on December 9, 2009. Staff attended the second meeting to answer questions. The CAB unanimously recommended approval. She noted she had received both positive and negative input from the community and that all noticing had been completed according to the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) requirements for the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Monsalvè stated staff had been able to make all required findings, one was required for approval. She pointed out approval required a two-thirds majority vote from the Commission.

Applicant's Representative Britta Tryggvi stressed that of the 8.4-acre parcel, they would be re-designating 6.3 acres to HDR, which would allow one additional dwelling.

Chair VanderWell called for disclosures. None had any to report.

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

Michael Ginder submitted a packet of evidence to the Commissioners and staff. He clarified he was speaking for his wife and himself and neighbors Bill Pearce, Marjorie Uhalde and John Lopez. He expressed concerns regarding amount of notice and engagement, the apparent conflict of land use with the Southwest Truckee Meadows (SWTM) Area Plan vision and character goals and policies and some misstatements by the applicant.

Mildred Burke introduced herself as the Interim President of Caughlin Ranch Homeowners Association (HOA). They felt they had not been provided adequate notice so that they could have sufficient time to comply with the laws governing the HOA. She stated they wished to request a continuance of the item so that they might agendaize and discuss the issue with the homeowners.

John Hara provided an overhead photo of the location of his property near the subject parcel. He expressed concerns regarding visual impact, setting of precedence, continuing to minimize development on steep hillsides and respect for surrounding character and zoning of the existing neighborhood.

Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing and asked Ms. Monsalvè to explain noticing and clarify the CPA process. Ms. Monsalvè stated requirements included property owners within a 750-foot radius and to include no less than 30. She verified noticing went out to 32 property owners and displayed the noticing map. She also pointed out that Community Development sends out a Courtesy Notice regarding the CAB meeting, which is not required by NRS, in addition to the legally required notice. The legal notice went out 10 days prior to the meeting. She noted she was told some property owners did not receive the notice, but she pointed out they were on the mailing list. Caughlin Ranch HOA and Eagle's Nest HOA were both sent notices. Budget restrictions do not allow the use of registered, return-receipt notices and Community Development does not post noticing at the site.

Ms. Monsalvè explained that, for a CPA, staff is required to look at the policies within the area plan, policies within the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan and the findings in the Development Code under Article 820. The request must conform and meet those policies. The Area Plan is a guiding document that does not set regulations. It sets the vision of an area. The SWTM Area Plan was recently updated and during her review she located several policies that showed the request was in conformance. She reiterated that staff could not recommend the CPA if it did not meet at least one of the five required findings and she found that the project had been able to meet those findings during her analysis. Additionally the project complies with the 2007 Regional Plan.

Ms. Monsalvè went on to note they could not condition the CPA because there was not an associated project and it was just to change the zoning. If the applicant wished to build another home on the property, they would be required to submit an application for a Tentative Parcel Map. At that time, other agencies will review the project and Community Development would apply conditions to the property. The Department of Water Resources will issue conditions relating to water. Community Development also has a Hillside Ordinance that allows them to limit development on slopes. Community Development can add a condition to the Parcel Map requiring the building envelope be delimited on the map.

Chair VanderWell called for disclosures. Commissioner Cobb recused himself from the vote, citing a personal friendship with Mr. Hara and the fact Mr. Hara was directly affected. DDA Edwards asked Commissioner Cobb if he felt there were any pecuniary interests, if he had been influenced by a gift or loan or had a commitment in a private capacity to the interests of others. Commissioner Cobb stated none of the listed items had occurred or were occurring. DDA Edwards noted Commissioner Cobb needed to decide if the relationship would materially impair his ability to remain impartial. Commissioner Cobb replied it would not; he was basing his decision on being very uncomfortable having been surprised by the appearance and testimony of Mr. Hara and not wanting to overstep his bounds.

DDA Edwards stated the recusal of Commissioner Cobb did not reduce the quorum required for the two-thirds majority vote for the item. He advised Commissioner Cobb leave the meeting for the duration of the hearing and vote on the item and Commissioner Cobb did so.

Ms. Monsalvè noted she had contacted the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, who are responsible for issues regarding wildlife and historic preservation. She had received no response from them. She stated it would be necessary to add Finding 8, which would state: "The specific findings required by the Southwest Truckee Meadows (SWTM) Area Plan, including Policy SW 20.1 have been met."

Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hartung asked if viewsheds would be taken into consideration if a project should come forward. Ms. Monsalvè replied there were no view easements in the county, but ridgeline protection is a consideration. The Hillside Ordinance restricts building on slopes greater than 30%. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) does have viewshed protection in the lake basin. Mr. Freund reiterated the restrictions imposed by the Hillside Ordinance but stated there was nothing in code that would require, or give the department the ability to enforce, scenic viewshed protection or ridgeline protection. The Area Plan Vision and Character statements, as well as the Goals and Policies are to be considered broad guidelines.

Commissioner Hibdon noted he had lived in the area for 27 years approximately one mile east of the project. He stated he had championed an organization of 1,600 property owners in the area to remove the properties from the City of Reno Sphere of Influence and they had been successful. Mr. Hibdon saw no problems with the application.

DDA Edwards asked Commissioner Hibdon if he believed his proximity to the property in question would materially affect his independence of judgment in this matter, if he had received any gift or loan in connection with the project, if he had any commitments in a private capacity to the interests of others or any pecuniary interests. For each item, Commissioner Hibdon replied negatively. DDA Edwards stated it was Commissioner Hibdon's decision to determine whether or not his independence of judgment would be materially affected and if not, he could proceed.

Commissioner Hibdon moved to approve, with the addition of Finding 8, Comprehensive Amendment Case No. CP09-007. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Weber and passed by a vote of six-zero-one. (Commissioner Cobb having recused himself from the item.)

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with existing and planned adjacent land uses and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
3. The proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.
4. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element, or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
5. The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the county based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.
6. The proposed amendment will not affect the location, purpose and mission of the military installation; and,
7. The Washoe County Planning Commission gave reasoned consideration to information contained within the staff report and information received during the public hearing.
8. The specific findings required by the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan, including Policy SW 20.1, have been met.

Commissioner Cobb returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Hibdon complimented Mr. Freund and staff for a job well done.

PLANNING ITEMS

AGENDA ITEM 3

PUBLIC HEARING: PUBLIC HEARING: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER DCA09-002 – To amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110, Development Code, Article 302, Article 304 and Article 410: Table 302.05.1 to allow attached accessory dwellings in the General Rural regulatory zone; Table 302.05.3 to require special use permits instead of administrative permits to approve commercial stables in the Low, Medium and High Density Rural, Low Density Suburban, Parks and Recreation, and General Rural regulatory zones; Table 302.05.3 and Section 304.25 to create a new use for senior continuum of care facilities; Table 302.05.5 to allow Agricultural Sales subject to a special use permit in the Medium and High Density Rural and the Low Density Suburban regulatory zones; Section 304.35(c) to add “aquaculture” to the definition of “Animal Production”; Section 304.25(d)(5) and 304.30(d)(3) and 304.30(f) to add storage of manufactured homes to the typical uses of “Equipment Repair and Sales,” “General Industrial – Heavy” and “Inoperable Vehicle Storage”; Section 304.20(k) to add “private not for profit” ownership to the definition of “Parks and Recreation” use type; Section

304.05(c) to include a reference to the North American Industry Classification System when a use type is not clearly identified in Code; Section 304.25(d)(7) to remove "car and truck rental lots" from the typical uses specified for Automotive and Equipment, Storage of Operable Vehicles" use type; Section 304.25 to require all permanent commercial uses to construct a commercial structure; Section 304.25 to include convention facilities and wedding chapels as typical uses under the Convention and Meeting Facilities use type; Table 302.05.5 and Section 304.35 to create a new use type Commercial Animal Slaughtering, Mobile; and Section 304.35 to allow small scale Produce Sales, for a maximum duration of 30 days in any one calendar year in all regulatory zones; Table 302.05.2 to change Public Service Yards from a special use permit reviewed by the Planning Commission to one reviewed by the Board of Adjustment; Table 302.05.5 to change Commercial Animal Slaughtering from a special use permit reviewed by the Planning Commission to one reviewed by the Board of Adjustment; Table 410.10.3 to add parking standards for senior continuum of care facilities; Table 410.10.5 to add parking standards for Commercial Animal Slaughtering, Mobile.

Mr. Pelham reviewed the staff report dated December 18, 2009, emphasizing the changes being requested to the code were simply meant to help it be cleaner. Also, some uses had come into existence since the creation of the code and needed to be added. A citizen workshop had been held, offering the public an opportunity to submit their input.

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

There was no response to the call for public testimony; Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Discussion ensued regarding the requirement for all permanent commercial uses to construct a commercial structure. Mr. Pelham explained it was primarily to provide public facilities at a permanent commercial establishment.

Commissioner Hartung moved to recommend approval of Development Code Amendment Case No. DCA09-002 and for the Planning Commission to authorize the Chair to sign the Resolution recommending approval on behalf of the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Edwards.

DDA Edwards noted Commissioner Hartung's motion had referenced the changes recommended in the description for Articles 302 and 304 but not Article 410. Commissioner Hartung amended the motion to include Article 410. Commissioner Edwards confirmed he concurred as the second. The motion passed unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. The amendments are in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan;
2. The amendments will not adversely impact the public health, safety, or welfare, and will promote the original purposes for the Development Code as expressed in Article 818, *Adoption of Development Code*;
3. The amendments respond to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the Development Code was adopted by the Washoe County

Commission, and the requested amendment will allow for a more desirable utilization of land within the regulatory zones; and,

4. The amendments will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
5. This recommendation is based upon due and careful consideration of the information provided in the staff report, other written testimony received and the testimony presented at the public hearing.

OTHER ITEMS

None

CHAIR AND COMMISSION ITEMS

Neither Mr. Freund nor DDA Edwards had updates for the Commissioners.

Mr. Freund asked the Commissioners if they wished to change the meeting date of March 3, 2010 back to the original hearing date of March 2, 2010, to be held in the Washoe County Commission Chambers. Commissioner Hartung moved to change the meeting date to March 2, 2010 in the Chambers. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Weber and passed unanimously.

DIRECTOR'S ITEMS

Mr. Freund explained to the Commissioners the Board of County Commissioners had named the One-Map Two-Map System conversion as potentially one of their new strategic priorities.

Mr. Freund then requested Item 4 be reopened in order to obtain a clear motion and approval of the continuance of the item to the March meeting.

Commissioner VanderWell reopened the public hearing.

There was no response to the call for public testimony; Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Cobb moved to continue Development Code Amendment Case No. DCA08-009 to March 2, 2010. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hartung and passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Spinola, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on February 3, 2010.

Adrian P. Freund, FAICP
Secretary to the Planning Commission