



Community Development

"Dedicated to Excellence in Public Service"

Kimberly H. Robinson, MUP, Community Planning Services Manager
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 4, 2011

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, January 4, 2011, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair VanderWell called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Dian A. VanderWell, Chair
Neal Cobb, Vice Chair
Roy Hibdon
Vaughn Hartung
D.J. Whittemore

Commissioners absent: Roger M. Edwards
William Weber

Staff present: Dave Childs, Acting Director, Community Development
Kimberly H. Robinson, Planning Manager, Community Development
Eva Krause, Planner, Community Development
Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, Community Development
Don Morehouse, Planner, Community Development
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney
Dawn Spinola, Recording Secretary, Community Development

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Whittemore led the pledge to the flag.

ETHICS LAW ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Edwards recited the Ethics Law standards.

APPEAL LANGUAGE

Ms. Robinson recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Hartung moved to approve the agenda for the January 4, 2011, meeting. Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Whittemore moved to approve the minutes for the November 3, 2010 Planning Commission workshop as written. Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion which passed unanimously

Chair VanderWell introduced and recognized the new Acting Director of Community Development, Dave Childs. Mr. Childs reviewed his background which includes planning and Assistant County Manager. He explained the plan was not to immediately fill Mr. Freund's position, but to use existing staff for the near term. He went on to say it was an opportunity to review the department's structure and its place in the county.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

As there was no response to the call for public comment, Chair VanderWell closed the public comment period.

CONSENT ITEMS

None

PROJECT REVIEW ITEMS:

AGENDA ITEM 1

PUBLIC HEARING: Abandonment Case Number AB10-008 (Gregory R. Applebaugh) (Continued from the December 7, 2010 meeting) – To abandon approximately 4,321 square feet of the unbuilt portion of Canyon Drive, as authorized in Article 806 of the Washoe County Development Code. The project is located between Ross Drive and Hunter Place, on the northern portion of Canyon Drive which is undeveloped. The proposed abandonment is adjacent to an ±0.842-acre parcel owned by the applicant. The subject parcel to be abandoned is in the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan and is situated in a portion of Section 20, T19N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. The parcel is located within the West Truckee Meadows Citizen Advisory Board boundary and Washoe County Commission District No. 1.

Ms. Krause reviewed the staff report dated November 22, 2010. She pointed out the right of way was located at the bottom of a steep gully so it would be infeasible for the bordering properties to construct driveways if a public road were constructed there. The adjoining properties all had other accesses to public roads.

Ms. Krause noted at the prior meeting it had been pointed out that this right of way provided access to parks and was used by wildlife. She explained she and Parks staff had attempted to walk through the gully but the underbrush was too thick and there were no established trails that traversed the entire length. There was no reason to maintain it as a road right of way, and the county would still require a utility easement be maintained. Parks staff had recommended it be maintained as a wildlife corridor and no structures be placed in it. She noted she had received a letter of support for the abandonment from a neighbor which she had provided to the Commissioners. She had also heard from a neighbor who was concerned the abandonment would block his access to connect to sewer when that service became available in the area.

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

Applicant's Representative Raymond Heber presented visual aids which demonstrated the steepness of the gully and reiterated there were no established trails. There is evidence that wildlife utilizes the corridor and the applicant had agreed not to fence the area to be abandoned. Mr. Hebert noted the neighbors hoped the entire corridor would eventually be abandoned, because there would likely never be a road built through it.

Applicant Greg Applebaugh stated he would comply with all requirements and that he believed the entire length of Canyon Drive should be abandoned and deeded to the involved property owners.

Kent Specht spoke in opposition of the project, stating it would cut off access to the park and the river. He agreed with the statements regarding the slopes and wildlife. Darla McKenna and Patrick Flanagan spoke in support of the project, verifying wildlife used the corridor extensively. Reg Willison stated he did not have an issue with the abandonment but agreed with Mr. Specht's concerns regarding pedestrian access.

Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hartung asked Counsel if the county was liable for injury occurring on the easement. Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Edwards stated it would require him to speculate, as there are so many factors that go into a lawsuit like that and the defense of it. In general his answer was no, he would not expect the county would be strictly liable for injury on the property.

Commissioner Hartung then asked, if the applicant allowed others to use his property as an ingress and egress, would he then be liable for injury? DDA Edwards pointed out that Commissioner Hartung had just added another layer of complexity to the subject. He was not comfortable providing a legal opinion about the applicant's potential legal liability because it was outside the scope of his role as the DDA. Commissioner Hartung pointed out he was only trying to find common ground for everyone but understood it was complicated.

Chair VanderWell noted a letter from Washoe County Parks that clarified that if the residents wanted access to the park and the river, Parks staff recommended pursuing trail connectivity through alternative routes that would need to be established but would be safer, more suitable solutions.

Jennifer Budge from Regional Parks and Open Space noted numerous other trail easement opportunities in the immediate area. The easement in question did not contain any

public trail access and she stated she would not encourage adding that to the canyon. It was not safe and they could not construct a trail to county standards in that corridor with the steep slopes. Currently the canyon ends at a private parcel where there are no easements, so if people are traveling through that corridor, they are not doing it with permission.

Commissioner Cobb asked if the issue regarding the neighbor concerned about his sewer connection had been resolved and Ms. Krause replied he would be allowed to connect via the utility easement required by Water Resources.

Commissioner Cobb asked Counsel who would be liable if a person trespassing across the private parcel were injured. DDA Edwards reiterated his hesitation to offer an opinion about people's potential liability on private property due to his capacity as the DDA for the county. He told of discussions in law school regarding the liability of private property owners for injuries to people who are trespassing on their property. There are certain rules that apply in terms of known hazards and a whole scope of liability issues could arise for a private property owner, even for people who are trespassing on their property.

Commissioner Whittemore asked the applicant if the sole purpose of the easement were to prevent people from accessing the canyon. Mr. Applebaugh replied it was for access to his driveway and garages. Currently his driveway is located within the easement and he would prefer to have legal right to it. Mr. Whittemore asked if it would prevent people access to the canyon and Mr. Applebaugh replied that it would, but he had never seen anyone accessing it.

Commissioner Whittemore then asked why he needed protection against anyone using it if no one did. Mr. Applebaugh replied he was not asking for protection, although in light of the conversation, he may reconsider. He planned to leave it open for anyone who did wish to access the canyon. Mr. Whittemore reiterated public access would be cut off if the abandonment were granted.

Chair VanderWell explained to Commissioner Whittemore that the Nevada Department of Fish and Game had asked the applicant not to fence the property.

Commissioner Hibdon stated he had no problem with the abandonment and would like to see Community Development and Parks work with homeowners along Canyon Drive to get the entire easement abandoned instead of doing it piecemeal.

Mrs. Robinson told Commissioner Hibdon that Community Development would be happy to get together with Parks and discuss options.

Commissioner Cobb moved to approve Abandonment Case Number AB10-008 to include the new Water Resource condition. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hibdon and passed by a vote of 4-1-2. (Commissioner Whittemore opposed, Commissioners Weber and Edwards absent.)

1. Master Plan. The abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan; and
2. No Detriment. The abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public; and

3. Existing Easements. Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service.

AGENDA ITEM 2

PUBLIC HEARING: Abandonment Case Number AB10-009 (Silva and Blomquist Residences) (Continued from the December 7, 2010 meeting) – To abandon the 33-foot wide government patent easements located along the northern, southern, western, and eastern edges of two contiguous parcels as authorized in Article 806 of the Washoe County Development Code. The parcels are located approximately 550 feet west of the terminus of the paved portion of Taos Lane and 330 feet south of the intersection of Panorama Ridge Drive, Panorama Ridge Court, and Incognito Lane. Each of the parcels are 1.933-acres (Silva) and 1.276-acres (Blomquist) in size and are designated Low Density Suburban (LDS) in the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan, and are situated in a portion of Section 30, T18N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is located in the Southwest Truckee Meadows Citizen Advisory Board boundary and Washoe County Commission District No. 2. (APNs: 142-260-15 and 142-260-16)

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

Mr. Morehouse reviewed the staff report dated November 17, 2010.

Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Whittemore moved to approve Abandonment Case Number AB10-009. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cobb and passed by a vote of 5-2 (Commissioners Weber and Edwards absent).

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. Master Plan. The abandonment is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan; and,
2. No Detriment. The abandonment does not result in a material injury to the public; and,
3. Existing Easements. Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service; and,
4. Reasoned Consideration. That the Planning Commissioners gave reasoned consideration to the information contained within the staff report and information received during the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 3

PUBLIC HEARING: Amendment of Conditions Case No. AC10-010 (Amending Special Use Permit Case No. SW07-006 (Renown Health Spanish Springs) – To amend the conditions of approval to extend the timeline to develop a 60-bed hospital with a helipad on a “medical

campus” with a medical office building and a diagnostic and treatment center as well as a central utility plant as authorized in Article 810 of the Washoe County Development Code, from a phased deadline ending in 2015 to a phased deadline ending in 2026. The project is located at the northeast corner of Eagle Canyon Drive and Neighborhood Way. The ±15-acre parcel is designated Neighborhood Commercial (NC) in the Spanish Springs Area Plan and is situated in a portion of Section 34, T21N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is located in the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board boundary and Washoe County Commission District No. 4. (APN 532-020-15)

Chair VanderWell opened the public hearing.

Mr. Pelham reviewed the staff report dated December 17, 2010. He presented the language of the condition requested to be changed, which read as follows:

“The applicant shall substantially complete construction of all structures used to further the operation within ~~twelve years~~ fifteen years from the date of approval of the condition amendment by Washoe County. Phase 1 shall be substantially completed by ~~2014~~ December 2016. ~~No extension of building permits for Phase 1 shall be issued after May 1, 2011.~~ Phase 2 shall be substantially completed by ~~2015~~ December, 2021. ~~No extension of building permits shall be issued for Phase 2 after May 1, 2015.~~ Phase 3 shall be substantially completed by ~~2019~~ 2026. ~~No extension of building permits shall be issued for Phase 3 after May 1, 2019.”~~

Mr. Pelham summarized the request to clarify the applicant was requesting to extend the time period from the initially-approved 12 years to 15 years from today’s date. He noted the project was an important part of the community and needed to be preserved. He felt just opening up the completion date for 15 years was a poor policy decision due to the uncertainty of potential events during that time span. Therefore, staff recommendation included timeframes similar to the ones that were approved initially.

For the reasons noted above, a compromise condition had been compiled which presented a fair but regimented way to proceed with approval of the project. The condition specified each phase be required to obtain a building permit and be completed within a designated amount of time. The final completion date would be January 1, 2022. Mr. Pelham acknowledged projects are not always completed as anticipated and the final portion of the proposed condition described an opportunity for the applicant to return to the board and request a new modification of conditions were they unable to complete the project in the designated time frame. Any changes to the Area Plan, Master Plan or Development Code during that time could be incorporated into the decision at that time.

Applicant’s Representative Melissa Lindell described efforts Renown had made to improve the site and area since purchase and assured the Board they fully intended to complete the project as planned. The economic conditions and uncertainty of the effects of health care reform had delayed construction. She noted assisted care and senior care facilities had been constructed nearby.

Ms. Lindell stated Renown was interested in preserving the entitlements and certainty for the future, that was why they had not closed escrow on the property until they had the certainty

of a master plan. They also want certainty in terms of the time frame. She reiterated they had asked for five years for each phase, without the need to have a specific timeframe to obtain building permits.

Chair VanderWell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hibdon recapped the extension dates and times, noting the original approval was in 2007 with 12 years to complete, which would have been 2019. Now they were requesting 15 years from today, 2010, which would put completion at 2025. Subtracting 2019, that was an additional six years, not 15. Mr. Pelham agreed it would be an additional six years over the end of the third phase as it was originally approved. Mr. Hibdon went on to say they were asking for an additional six years from the 12 years they already have, so from 2019 to 2025.

Chair VanderWell read into the record a letter of support from Cascade Living Group (attached to minutes).

Commissioner Hartung asked Mr. Pelham if there was a time condition for permitting on the original application. Mr. Pelham replied answered yes and no. It was specified that there would be no additional extensions of the building permits past the 18 months that they are typically allowed. It was possible, if a sunset date did not exist for those permits, that one could pull a permit, keep renewing it and never actually build. Originally it was being dealt with at the end of the project and now it was being dealt with in advance.

Commissioner Hartung asked what would happen if they did not pull the permit by June 1, 2014. Mr. Pelham replied they would need to return to the board and provide justification as to why and to talk to the Board about whether or not it was still viable.

Commissioner Cobb thanked Commissioner Hibdon for clarifying the extension dates; he was more comfortable with the six year extension. He indicated he would support the request, and that Renown had shown that they were serious about the project.

Commissioner Whittemore agreed with Commissioner Cobb and also intended to support the project. He expressed his thanks to Mr. Pelham for his comments but supported the extension of six years without further conditions.

Commissioner Hartung asked if the motion would have to be re-written. Ms. Robinson stated that if whoever is intending on making a motion intends to suggest something other than what has been recommended by staff, then that is the language that needs to be in that particular motion. The Board could give staff direction and they could craft it, or the Board could craft it themselves.

Chair VanderWell asked Mr. Pelham to re-clarify the dates referred to by Commissioner Hartung. Ms. Robinson noted that information was also available to reference in the action order. Mr. Pelham displayed the text of the applicant's request and clarified it was based on the existing condition. Commissioner Hartung's question had been was there a requirement to pull permits within a certain time frame. The answer was both yes and no. They actually had to complete Phase 1 by 2011. They could have pulled permits any time in the last four years. Building permits would not be extended past May of 2011. Continuing beyond that time would be to the detriment of the approval of the project as required by the Board. Mr. Pelham went on

to state that the only difference between the applicants proposed wording and the recommendation by staff was the limits were being put on the front end instead.

Chair VanderWell expressed to Applicant Steve Tapogna that the Board was sympathetic to the challenges brought on by the economic downturn. She asked if they felt it was reasonable to expect the urgent care portion of the project could be completed within five years and the next phase within three. Mr. Tapogna replied he did not think that was enough time. He gave examples of the amount of time required to complete another project in the region

Mr. Tapogna explained the original Special Use Permit (SUP) had provided an option to complete project segments interchangeably depending on which the community needed most. The decision regarding which to start with had yet to be made. He stated the requested three five-year extensions allowed them the freedom to not have to return to the Board to request extensions. He pointed out the community still has the potential for growth and needs the facility.

Mr. Tapogna and Chair VanderWell discussed the requested date of completion of each phase. He clarified the original application requested 12 years and three had been used. They were requesting 15 more so that essentially added up to a total of 18 years.

Chair VanderWell asked if Mr. Tapogna knew if the senior care facilities in the area were at capacity. He replied Cascade Living Group was doing very well and was a wonderful complementary partner in health care in the area. Chris Mirando of Cascade stated they were at approximately 60 percent capacity and had a vested interest in Renown's success.

Chair VanderWell asked Mr. Mirando if they needed a facility sooner based on their capacity. He replied they would like to have it tomorrow but were realistic with regards to the economic problems. It was better to have the project delayed than not to have it at all.

Commissioner Hartung noted they were discussing a sunset date of 2022 and asked if the desired date was 2025. Mr. Tapogna verified that was correct. He added that if they calculated the full 15 years they would be at January 2026.

Commissioner Whittemore agreed with the mind set of better late than never and felt that the more conditions were placed on the project, the less likely it was to ever get done. He felt that giving them the most freedom possible was the best idea. He agreed with Mr. Pelham that things could change in that amount of time but it was a substantial enough project and the need was great enough that the real responsibility to the citizens was to give Renown the best opportunity to complete the project. He stated he was prepared to make a motion to give them what they had asked for.

Chair VanderWell pointed out facts that had been included in the staff report relating to decline in the population of Washoe County and the State of Nevada. She reiterated to Mr. Pelham the Board agreed with the idea changes could occur over time with the area plan and the development code. She asked him if the extension could cause issues with any future versions of the area plan.

Mr. Pelham noted the conditions were crafted the way they were because that question cannot be answered. Spanish Springs will change in the next 10 to 15 years, as will the area

plan. The unknown is how they will change. The conditions allow another opportunity to review the project in the future if things do change and the applicant does not get the permits in the specified amount of time. He stated it was appropriate to review it and incorporate any new area or master plan policies that may have an effect on the project.

Commissioner Cobb agreed with Commissioner Whittemore in that they should offer every advantage to help this project come to fruition. He noted Renown had made great investments in the project and paid their dues. He felt they owed a project of this magnitude and significance any consideration they could. He asked if it was within their power to give them whatever modifications they needed. Mr. Pelham reiterated the text of their request was shown on the screen.

Commissioner Cobb noted there had been other requests besides timing. Mr. Pelham stated he would be very reluctant to look at changing any conditions of approval other than the one agenda item, noticed and addressed in the staff report. Ms. Robinson clarified they did not have the room to discuss other conditions. She reiterated the applicant's exact request was what was up on the screen.

Commissioner Hartung explained he had been chair of the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) and the CAB had made every attempt to not hobble the applicant in any way. He agreed with the idea of giving the applicant as much leeway as possible and noted the residents of Spanish Springs are in full support of the project.

Commissioner Whittemore opined there was the opportunity to make three different decisions. One would be to deny the application. Two would be to approve it as staff has written it. Three would be to craft their own motion that would mimic the wording of the applicant's original request. He reiterated staff had made great points, but the Board had been discussing allowing them to have what they asked for, without extra requirements requiring building permits at certain times.

Commissioner Hibdon moved to approve Amendment of Conditions Case No. AC10-010 for Renown Health, extending the time limit to December 2025. He clarified his motion gives them until that time and sets no other conditions. Ms. Robinson asked for clarification as to whether the phrasing was part of the motion or not. Commissioner Hibdon stated he did not intend to include that. Ms. Robinson pointed out the way he had phrased the motion inferred he was moving to approve their request as submitted. Commissioner Hibdon stated the motion he made gave them until December of 2025, with no other conditions, excluding in particular the requirement for them to pull building permits at a certain time.

DDA Edwards stated he understood what Commissioner Hibdon was driving at but it was complicated because he had changed the staff recommendation. He suggested to Chair VanderWell that she wait to hear what he expected would be essentially the same motion from Commissioner Whittemore, opining it would help with what Ms. Robinson was attempting to clarify. He expected it would clarify the motion was to approve the SUP as requested by the applicant as specifically offered in the new paragraph outlined in Exhibit B of the staff report.

Chair VanderWell called for a second to Commissioner Hibdon's motion and received none.

Commissioner Whittemore moved to approve Amendment of Conditions Case No. AC10-010, without the modification recommended by staff, including Paragraph Two from the Wood Rodgers letter which stated: "The applicant shall substantially complete construction of all structures used to further the operation within fifteen years from the date of approval of the condition amendment by Washoe County. Phase 1 shall be substantially completed by December 2016. Phase 2 shall be substantially completed by December, 2021. Phase 3 shall be substantially completed by 2026."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cobb. He noted it was a reluctant second because his understanding was that they could not make changes to the proposed motion and he was not attempting to alienate any of the other Commissioners by seconding one motion and not another. He explained he had considered requesting the same kinds of changes the two Commissioners had and was confused why he had not been able to do something that had just been done.

Commissioner Whittemore explained the motion was made to approve the application as it was originally requested, which had no requirements for building permits, but simply asked for five more years for each phase from today's date. Originally the application was approved with three four-year phases for a total of 12. They have asked for approval of five years for all three phases from today's date. Staff recommended approval of five years for all three phases but that they also condition them to pull building permits 18 months before that date. What they had decided was that they could not give them a blanket window to complete the project 15 years from now without asking them to do what they had already agreed to do, which was what had already been approved, which was to complete the project in three phases.

Ms. Robinson clarified hers and Mr. Pelham's understanding was that Commissioner Cobb had asked if they could change any other conditions besides the one regarding time. She apologized for causing any confusion. Ms. Robinson pointed out to Chair VanderWell the motion included a month and a year for the first two phases and only a year for the third. She recommended the motioner might designate a month. Commissioner Whittemore stated the month would be December of 2026 for Phase Three.

Commissioner Hartung pointed out December 2026 was essentially the same as 2027. The motion commissioner Hibdon had proposed inferred December 31, 2025, which was really 2026. So by saying December 2026, that added an additional full year. Chair VanderWell reiterated Commissioner Whittemore had noted they had three choices and they agreed with the applicant's request. Commissioner Hibdon had motioned to approve through December of 2025 instead of December of 2026 and all of this caused confusion.

DDA Edwards pointed out the motioner had also read the applicant's requested language which said it would be completed by 2026, which he thought could be read to mean January 1, 2026. If he wanted to stand by the December 2026, they were agendized to do that if that is what they wanted.

Commissioner Hibdon opined the only difference in the motions was the time frames for phasing. He noted his motion did not contain phasing.

Commissioner Hartung stated that was the applicant's language and if they were comfortable with the phasing they should grant them that. He reiterated he wanted to give them some leeway. He asked if the motion was to approve the project through December 2026.

Commissioner Whittemore stated the December date was used to stay consistent with the rest of the request and motion.

Commissioner Cobb as second agreed. The motion passed (by a vote of 4-1-2. (Commissioner Hibdon opposed, Commissioners Weber and Edwards absent.)

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 Name of 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 type of development, i.e. a hospital, and for the intensity of such a development;
4. Issuance Not Detrimental. That issuance of the modification of conditions for 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; and
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.

Chair VanderWell thanked Mr. Pelham for all of his work and assistance to the Board.

PLANNING ITEMS

None

OTHER ITEMS

None

CHAIR AND COMMISSION ITEMS

Ms. Robinson told the Board there would be a second reading of Development Code Amendment (DCA) for Article 416, which deals with the floodplain, on January 11 at the Board of County Commission meeting.

She then noted there would be a first reading of the DCA for Article 406, Mobile Home Lot Sizes, also on January 11, with a second reading scheduled for January 25.

Ms. Robinson explained the Design Review Committee has seats for a principal member and an alternate from the Planning Commission. Commissioner Cobb's term as principal had

expired and a volunteer was needed to take his place. Commissioner Hartung volunteered for the position and Chair VanderWell officially appointed him.

DIRECTOR'S ITEMS

Ms. Robinson raised the issue that modifications had been made to the agendas and comments were welcome.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Spinola, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on February 2, 2011.

Kimberly H. Robinson, MUP
Secretary to the Planning Commission