

GMHB EXHIBIT 221

2024-03-27 Planning Commission Transcript

0:00

are we still in a practice session here no we're recording

0:07

okay here commissioner Carolyn Bozman here

0:13

commissioner Chris gills here commissioner Victor rashis here and

0:19

Commissioner Adam riam here thank you okay we have a quorum welcome to the

0:26

March 27 2024 regular hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Mike Murphy chair

0:33

tonight's meeting is brought to you courtesy of Zoom welcome to all and thank you for joining us tonight so uh

0:41

our first item of business is public appearances this is the opportunity for

0:46

anyone to speak to the commission about issues of concern Deb is there anyone

0:51

who has signed up for appearances that wishes to address the commission no sir we have no one signed

0:59

up for this evening okay since there are no appearances we'll now move on to regular business

1:05

the first item of regular business is to review and consider approving the minutes of the last two meetings

1:13

February 28th regular meeting and March 20 special meeting Commissioners may I

1:18

have a motion to approve the minutes so moved second uh been moved and seconded are

1:26

there any is there any discussion about the minutes seeing none uh Deb can you please

1:34

conduct a roll call vote on approval of the minutes I'd just like to confirm that it was
commissioner GS that made

1:40

the motion was it commissioner rashis yes thank

1:48

you your voices sound the same when you this seems to be an ongoing issue I know

1:54

right it's you know I I since I was need to work on

1:59

here first I demand that Chris change his

2:05

voice okay uh chair Murphy

2:10

I Vice chair ream I commissioner Riz I

2:16

commissioner GS hi commissioner cuse hi commissioner bazo I and commissioner

2:27

boatsman hi thank you you okay minutes are approved our second and final item

2:34

of regular business is a continued discussion of the Planning Commission

2:40

agenda commission agenda Bill PCB 245 comprehens and plan periodic review

2:48

housing element commission comments uh welcome Adam Zach the senior

2:54

planner um and uh he's going to walk us through tonight's process

3:01

great thank you uh chair Murphy so tonight we're going to take a look at the comments that were received on the

3:08

housing workg group draft of the housing element and some land use uh element

3:14

consistency amendments that were part of that recommendation as well from the housing work group um we uh I briefed

3:23

the Planning Commission on this matter um at our last meeting last Wednesday um

3:29

March 20th um and following that meeting we received some comments from uh

3:35

planning Commissioners on proposing some changes to those the housing work group draft um the housing

3:43

element uh yesterday I provided uh PCB

3:49

246 which provided those comments uh provided you with a copy of the or with

3:54

a summary of the comments and then also um outlined a categorization of those

4:00

comments so we divided them up into a couple of buckets um for our

4:05

consideration tonight to try to get this uh to move forward um there were some of

4:11

the comments were proposing changes to policy that would change the direction of the policy so those were labeled as

4:18

substantive comments and we'll take a look at those here in a minute I'll I'll open up the the draft and walk through

4:24

those substantive comments um quite a few of the comments were categorized as

4:29

minor comments those are um or were the comments that were like uh proposing you

4:36

know changing one word that wouldn't really like change the policy direction of

4:45

the were like housekeeping for those I'm going to recommend that the Planning Commission uh treat those kind of as a

4:51

block just because they're not they're not really changing the policy Direction within the draft um the final there were

4:59

two categories there was the challenging category and those are things where they

5:05

the the amendment as proposed uh would be challenging um to meet some of our um

5:13

requirements um and those are summarized in the um in the bill and then there

5:18

were also questions and so we provided responses to those questions um speaking

5:23

of questions I see um Victor has his hand up um so at least on my screen you froze

5:31

a little bit and so um I didn't hear what you said in terms of what's being treat what do you want what are you

5:36

proposing to treat as a block the minor amendments those things that are just clarifying edits or

5:43

housekeeping edits got it

5:48

thanks um all right well we I'll just jump in here and I'll share my screen

5:54

and we'll walk through those substantive comments um if if you have the if you have the document

6:00

open um this is uh if you have that Planning Commission Bill 2406 open that

6:07

I sent yesterday um evening um this would be on page three um the table on

6:12

page three those comments but I'll I'll open up the document

6:21

here so the first substantive comment we received um is um a proposed amendment to to policy

6:30

1.4 and the substant substantive comment is on 1.4 C so the housing work group

6:37

draft um 1.4 C said that we were going to provide Equitable access to or plan

6:45

for neighborhoods with Equitable access to Safe pedestrian and bicycle routes um

6:51

the proposed amendment would change it to this underlined text here streets that are safe for pedestrians bicyclists

6:57

and Vehicle drivers and passengers um so we can really this is kind of more

7:03

of a style thing but there's a little bit of a change in emphasis and this was proposed by Adam RAB if uh Vice chair

7:10

RAB if you want to provide commentary but we basically need to to arrive at a

7:16

direction here for this policy um yeah sure the rationale behind this comment was um someone could use

7:25

this I you know to say hey we need to start building sidewalk where we need to

7:31

you know remove um you know narrow lanes and build bike

7:36

paths um and perhaps that may only focus on some of our more arterial roads but I

7:42

I think it's important to articulate and this is some this is some verbiage from some of the recent housing laws that

7:49

have been passed that say hey these streets all streets need to be safe for those who use them pedestrians

7:54

bicyclists as well as Vehicle drivers and passengers um you know some

8:00

sometimes I've seen some cases where you know one or two of those uses are

8:05

prioritized and it makes for some hairy driving uh situation so that's the rationale behind this just making sure

8:12

it's applied broadly to all users of the roads and um not at the at the expense

8:20

of those in

8:25

vehicles So Adam I have a question for you before I go to commissioner bodman

8:32

um are you proposing that we discuss these and vote on them give a thumbs up

8:38

thumbs down kind of approach what are you thinking of here yeah here we could

8:44

probably just do consensus um provided no one would block consensus to making

8:50

the change or um if there's consensus to not make the change we don't need to

8:55

make a motion for each one of these unless unless that's helpful yeah okay Carolyn do you have a question

9:03

on the process here you're you're

9:09

mute yeah I have a a question on the process but also a comment on the um

9:15

policy so first regarding the process um in my preparation for the meeting I have

9:22

put all my notes in the order of which the substantive comments were provided

9:28

to us in the staff memo so if you start here it looks like you're going through

9:34

chronological order in the document is in the the draft is that right that is

9:39

right yes okay um if you tell us what the comment well okay it does say what

9:47

comment number it is there okay it's number 21 I'll table okay very good then my

9:55

comment about the actual policy if I can get my thoughts together here um I believe that the word

10:04

roots um safe and safe pedestrian and bicycle Roots means paths and streets so

10:11

I don't think we should try to tangle up the policy with drivers and passengers

10:16

in

10:23

cars uh Kate and I agree with Carolyn that the

10:30

change changes the intent um a big in intent of many of the bits of

10:35

legislations that have passed recently are to make housing more convenient and

10:41

accessible to people without high means and that includes people that um can't afford to maintain or drive a vehicle

10:48

we're talking about putting a lot of affordable housing in and that's going to mean looking at alternate forms of Transportation uh especially near

10:55

Transit corridors so I would propose that if a change is needed here um that leave pedestrian and bicycle

11:04

routes as is and if someone wants to propose another change that would add

11:11

Safe Streets for drivers um they could do that but but by doing

11:17

this you're restricting um bicycles to streets and there are plenty of other places bicycles go other than

11:28

streets

11:34

Adam i' I'd be amenable to suggesting my text edit as an addition um and not

11:41

striking one 14c I like commissioner hughes's

11:49

suggestion okay do we have a consensus on that or is there anyone who is

11:54

opposed to that approach

12:01

okay is that enough Clarity for you Adam yeah so it sounds like what I took

12:08

from that was that there would just be a second uh this would just split into two um two

12:18

policies yes okay um all right the next policy um the

12:26

next substantive comment we got a couple of comments on 2.5 here um this is uh

12:35

looking at the um looking at the incentives that we're

12:41

going to use to or approaches that we're going to use to encourage new income

12:47

restricted housing um and the substantive change is adding this

12:54

2.5h which is addressing the building requirements and there's staff proposed

13:00

alternative here that I've labeled as alt um that just might make this a

13:06

little bit more clear or as an alternative it would kind of direct more at the um the development code rather

13:14

than building requirements um and this was proposed by uh

13:20

commissioner GS if you want to speak to this

13:26

um sure just speak briefly I mean it's something we raised last week and you

13:31

know the idea that maybe we didn't cover all the possible incentives in the list and just to create the some support for

13:37

the idea that maybe people can look deeper and I think uh I think Angie made a good point about making sure that uh

13:44

we didn't want to turn this into substandard housing by doing that so I added the the provision on on health and

13:50

safety and I like the alternative is fine but uh you know people don't think it's necessary that's fine I just thought it might make uh the people who

13:57

are trying to work out what I think is going to be a real difficult challenge in creating the affordable housing a

14:03

little more flexibility and trying to do their job uh

14:10

okay uh I did not intend to have my hand up does it look like it's still up yeah

14:17

okay well I will pop it a couple times here is it off now got it yes Carolyn

14:23

okay I do think it's a good idea though um I I

14:31

um think that we should not try to have different requirements

14:36

for um income restricted units in in any way

14:42

um uh I think that our requirements for construction for for you know our

14:47

development standards are adopted for good reasons and um I don't think we should

14:54

try to remove some of them for some of the housing

15:00

whether it's health and safety or um you know sometimes we call things health and

15:05

we don't call things health and safety that are health and safety for example setbacks for example place to plant

15:12

trees um you know height height that allows some sun

15:19

to come into your yard instead of being next to a really tall wall so there's I just think that would be best to to to

15:26

leave it alone Adam I second commissioner Batman's

15:32

comments we don't want to create a lower tier of quality of life um just because

15:38

a builder says this is you know this is going to be this type of housing I mean

15:43

at the end of the day they benefit the people who live there suffer so I second I I agree with commissioner

15:50

Bozman uh

15:56

Chris the example I started with was some of the green you know I'm looking forward to the discussion where we can

16:02

add in a lot of Green Building Material requirements which I think mostly will add expense to the building as opposed

16:09

to have an impact necessarily on the U the people inside it and so that you

16:14

know I think the suggestion was made to do something a little broader than that but you know if people think it's more trouble than it's worth I'm I'm not

16:20

going to die on this hill so uh Victor agree with uh commissioner Bozman

16:28

and uh Vice chair R uh

16:33

Kate yeah that's a real hand I I wasn't sure we were introduced to two different

16:39

things at the same time um so if we're talking about reduced parking

16:44

requirements uh the the problem is that

16:49

developers will not build income restricted units without some easing it

16:57

it doesn't pencil out economically so many of the things and I'm guessing this theme is going to come up in comments

17:03

throughout this document um uh maybe I'll be happy to be proved wrong that

17:08

that won't happen um but the point is that um there was a consensus among the

17:14

folks on the housing work group that we are going to have to make um some uh

17:19

what do you call it accessions uh incentives we we need more incen if we

17:24

want more affordable housing we need more incentives for Developers and that might not sit well with people that

17:31

might not sit well with people that don't want anything to change but the purpose of the housing element is to

17:37

meet the requirements of the state and those requirements require change and in order to get that change um there's two

17:44

things we can do we can tax ourselves and uh pay for it out of our property taxes or other taxes or we can create

17:52

incentives um and we might have to do both to meet the state requirements so I just want to be clear that we are going

17:58

to have to have some change to meet the state requirements so um you know unless

18:04

somebody for these items that appear in this housing element unless somebody

18:09

offers a substitute way to um or a substitute incentive I am not going to

18:15

be supportive of taking incentives out and um I I would be surprised to see the

18:20

housing work group um including three council members support things that take incentives out because there was just

18:26

much dis so I wanted to share that with this group since it was a smaller group that put this out

18:32

there uh Carolyn are we talking about comment log

18:37

number one or comment log number 26 in this discussion we're having right now

18:43

at at the moment we're looking at uh at number one and then we'll come back to number 26 this um okay thank you I

18:52

inadvertently skipped a head one sorry so we're on number one okay thank you

18:57

yes

19:04

so it sounds like there's there's maybe no consensus for making the change proposed for to add this

19:12

2.5. this this one here that I'm highlighting um wait are sorry we're

19:18

jumping between we keep jumping between these two are we talking about parking requirements I was just talking about

19:24

the parking requirements and now we've jumped back to yes we I inadvertently

19:29

started at this at this point here and that's what we were talking about before and then we'll come back to the parking

19:35

one because we I I inadvertently skipped that one yeah I thought I thought we had

19:41

consensus on the staff alternative is that not true I I didn't hear

19:50

consensus um I we should do a quick thumbs up thumbs

19:57

down yeah I think that would be helpful which are we doing thumbs up

20:02

thumbs down on uh why don't we start with the um just the alternative I'm I

20:09

don't want the other one I think alternative is better so let's just do that one and get it over with yeah I

20:15

agree so it would be a thumbs up for making the change proposed in the staff alternative highlighted

20:27

here oh that's four thumbs up and three thumbs

20:34

down um so we'll keep it in there and then the the advantage is at this point

20:40

um I mean unless we want to have a formal vote but at this point this will go to public comment uh we'll be able to

20:47

gather comments on on the alternative and then you can consider this again if

20:52

if it's if we got a lot of comments that are um opposed um we can we can take a

20:58

look look at it before the public hearing um so now we'll we'll go to

21:06

2.5g this is comment log number 26 in The Proposal here there were two

21:11

Alternatives proposed in the comment um either adding this qualifier at the end

21:17

of reduced parking uh in town center zones or just striking

21:22

2.5g alog together um and this was proposed by commissioner

21:34

So Adam do you want to speak to that um I mean let's I think I think

21:40

everyone's spoken to it so let's let's just see what what people

21:49

think so then sorry commissioner GS I see your

21:55

hand up yeah I guess I'm a little confused is are is there the potential to have this whole section is about

22:03

what's can you go scroll down to the beginning of 2.5 it's encourage construction of new

22:09

permanent income restricted housing through approaches so is there going to be permanent uh new permanent income

22:16

restricted housing other than in residential zones or other than in town center uh theoretically so this in in

22:24

implementing this we could look at the possibly reducing Park paring requirements in say like our multif

22:31

family zones where um they're currently a pretty high uh parking requirement or

22:37

we could look at other residential zones yeah yeah I don't see any reason to limit it I guess I you know I would just

22:44

you know leave it as it

22:52

was any other comments yeah I would I would tend to

22:59

agree with Chris on that do we have consensus on keeping the original

23:05

language and not accepting the change

23:11

no okay so we got five to

23:17

two Okay and then the final substantive

23:23

comment in the housing element here is on policy

23:29

5.1. D um and there were two comments on this one um comment log number 16 and 36

23:38

and comment log 16 is the um was Propel proposed by Chris uh commissioner GS and

23:45

it was um this conform with state law and do

23:53

not unnecessarily restrict multif family housing um that addition and then the

23:59

other the other comment was from uh commissioner Bozman proposing striking right sized so the as shown here it

24:07

would capture both

24:15

comments I guess just you know my yeah not sure really that different in

24:20

substance I guess I just want to make sure that you know I'm concerned that the parking is going to be used as a a

24:27

way to rest what the goal of this whole document is is really to open up housing opportunities across the island and I

24:34

just want to make it clear that yeah you you know it's not the only thing is to make it as easy as possible to build

24:39

low-income places but you know that I think that's a something that takes some care and you know so I like this

24:46

language better but that's why I made the

24:52

proposal Carolyn do you want to comment on your your um sure um as far as the

25:00

term right sized I just just don't think it's a term that is well-defined and it kind of

25:08

presumes there is a a right answer and we all know what it is so I I just feel

25:13

like um if you deleted the term entirely and just said ensure parking

25:19

requirements um adequately balance the need so that was that was my suggestion but I'm fine with

25:25

Chris's um proposal here as well because term is gone okay any other

25:33

thoughts do we have consensus on these two changes to 5.1

25:46

D sorry I didn't see a thumb from commissioner bazo or commissioner

25:53

accuse is that is that an extension

25:59

no I'm just I'm having a hard I am having a little bit of a hard time deciding

26:10

um go ahead Kate I I guess it's an extension in a

26:16

sense because I don't see that it's a changes the meaning um but

26:23

I'm I'm trying to really understand if it does change the meaning somehow

26:28

so if it doesn't change the meaning is it necessary um is it is it word smithing

26:34

for the sake of you know does it really clarify things

26:39

because really this is a this is an aspirational goal that is going to be

26:45

clarified in um the change to design standards and that is a later process

26:50

that's going to be really where the rubber hits the road pun intended here

26:55

and um and so I I don't know how important it is um but I I'm reticent to thumbs up

27:02

or thumbs down because I can't tell if it changes something substantial like the whole thing is kind of aspirational

27:08

and wishy-washy to start with and and that's intentional I I believe because the the real place that the changes will

27:14

be made is the design standards uh

27:21

Angie um you know this particular edit was listed under substantive so staff is

27:28

suggesting that this is a substantive edit um I think maybe what I'll just

27:33

share with my Commissioners so you all understand how I'm processing this as we move forward uh I consider the product

27:40

we got as something that uh accounted for some pretty complex State County

27:48

city and other laws about housing pressing on Mercer Island to make some adjustments to our housing needs and

27:55

that the mayor council members and members of this commission participated in the initial draft which made me very

28:04

um reluctant to actually change things that I think went through some pretty rigorous uh review in the first place

28:11

even if it was fast and felt hurried um so to the extent that things like if

28:18

they're sub changing substantive I'm reluctant without a really strong

28:24

compelling case so for the with that I'll say I'm a

28:29

thumbs down on this one uh just to be clear Angie do you

28:36

thumbs down on both of those or the or one of them

28:42

or I just I I think the rest of us voted on everything we didn't have two vote we

28:49

didn't have two votes on this yeah that's true I agree with that yeah there

28:54

was just one vote yeah Carolyn so have we voted already and if

29:01

so how did the vote turn out well we're just trying we had some

29:09

extensions there so I think it was unclear well I mean did we have five in

29:15

favor or I thought we did but no if we don't what what's happening to our

29:23

vote yeah can can we just ask staff because I think Angie and I had very similar comments
can we ask St why did

29:30

you highlight this as substantial sure so the part of it was

29:36

that there were there were two comments on on the wording here and there was uh

29:41

more of a change than just a couple of words um in effect the implementation of

29:47

this policy is probably not significantly different than what the implementation would look like of theal

29:54

policy um you know it's still saying that we're going to balance those those parking requirements

30:01

um but and balance the cost and uh the need for parking um so there's probably

30:08

not a significant change um to the end result

30:18

um well I think I think the main thrust here of the additional

30:24

language is to make make it clear that the policy

30:30

should not be abused to um undo what's required by state law

30:38

um and I think that's the thrust of Chris's added language

30:45

um so that's that's how I saw that addition um Carolyn's comments about

30:51

right sizing I think that's well taken because I don't know what right sized is either

31:00

um so that's kind of a clal term that's may not may not be appropriate here um

31:08

so those those were my thoughts on Adam I I move that we take a a vote on

31:15

the right siiz comment

31:20

only we have a second for that

31:26

second okay moved in second

31:34

in and and the motion is as I understand it to

31:39

delete the the wording our right

31:46

sized correct are right size

31:51

two yeah right size too okay okay all in favor of the motion

31:59

I I've had my hand up for quite a while I'm sorry Caroline it's okay I know my hand is hard to see with the background

32:05

color sorry yeah um I've gotten a little lost here um I thought we did already

32:11

take a vote and I thought that that vote passed and I do think you know that the

32:16

the the proposed Language by Chris does improve it in ways that I would agree with Mike but you know um I do think we

32:23

already had a vote so that's one of my problems here and then if if we have a

32:30

motion that we're now taking a vote on part of it and that's been seconded is

32:36

there not discussion about that before we actually vote uh that's true okay but but speaking to your first

32:44

point yeah we were not officially voting on anything we're trying to achieve

32:50

consensus the only vote that's been proposed is on the language that you

32:56

have proposed oh okay well I guess I thought we had a vote but that's okay yeah

33:01

it I'll put thumbs up thumbs down for consensus purposes but not but there was

33:08

obviously confusion uh Victor Deb do you want to comment on

33:15

something just before we get too far along I would like uh to know who made the motion who

33:24

seconded Vice chair ragab made the motion and Comm Rish uh seconded okay

33:30

and it was a motion to delete quote our right size two unquote yes thank you

33:42

correct oh my hand is still up I'm not quite done yet if I may finish go ahead

33:48

I was waiting for you I'm sorry yeah no it's okay thanks um little confusing here but so if we are discussing whether

33:54

to include or delete that I think I guess I probably already explained my

33:59

reason previously in the discussion so uh I guess I'll I'll I'll withhold at

34:06

this point okay any further discussion on

34:14

that okay seeing none let's take a vote on

34:22

it commissioner bazo hi

34:29

commissioner Gils I commissioner

34:37

accuse hi commissioner rashis

34:43

I Vice chair ragab hi commissioner Bozman

34:50

hi and vice chair Murphy excuse me chair Murphy hi okay so we do have consensus

34:57

on that um so then uh

35:03

Victor I was going to let you finish so go ahead and finish okay I'm just saying the motion passes unanimously and that

35:11

language is deleted okay so now having

35:17

made that change do we have a motion since we're we did not

35:25

achieve consensus do we have a motion to insert the language proposed by

35:32

commissioner GS uh that's underlined in the

35:40

draft did you just ask for a motion I'm sorry I wasn't listening sufficient yes

35:45

uh so moved okay second did you second Chris I did

35:52

okay moved and seconded is it do we want to discuss that issue

35:58

further Victor I do so I guess my comment is is

36:05

in the form of a question do we ever do we ever have parking requirements that are intentionally not conforming with

36:13

state law no if that was a question for staff

36:20

um and it's a question for staff and

36:26

commission

36:36

you know based on my experience uh Victor the state does not tend to

36:43

micromanage parking too much uh Adam can comment on that further but

36:50

um you know I'd say that's not something that is is a a major issue

36:58

but there are requirements now or becoming uh in force so but but

37:06

presumably when they become en force will comply because it's state

37:12

law and so putting it here argues for do do we do we need to

37:20

call out other places where we're going to follow state laws good question

37:31

this is more aspirational and not necessarily strict Appliance as I read

37:36

that uh Carolyn well I think Victor makes a good point we probably don't need to say we're conforming with state

37:42

law but the rest of the way Chris uh words it I think is is good it's

37:48

instructional to us it's it tells us to think about

37:54

something which there are a number of arguments about parking that is think

38:00

about it and act in in a way that um doesn't unnecessarily restrict

38:07

multifamily housing because parking is sometimes a tool that you know is used

38:14

to P pursue a um a Viewpoint so I like

38:19

the way Chris has worded and I think it's an improvement minus the conform to stay

38:26

law uh and I am not clear what this policy would

38:33

state after the motion that we just made and passed so there's still a lot of

38:39

strikeout and I'm trying to figure out what I'm reading that makes any sense so

38:44

I'm wondering if maybe Adam Zach can either read now that we've made one

38:50

change we've agreed on and we're debating another I would really like to see what we're debating

38:56

on yes let me get that in

39:03

here the end result the policy would read

39:09

this um or sorry um that's after the motion so let

39:16

me uh let me get the rest of the text in here I'll just do it without I'll do it

39:26

clean

39:52

so that's that's how the policy would read without the strikeout and under

40:09

line okay can I just can maybe commissioner gells

40:15

explain again why he thinks this makes it more clear or I'd like to understand

40:23

why he's proposing that change a little better

40:33

so I guess I mean one thing just the state law thing wasn't me that was in the original just for just a note the

40:42

um I guess for me between the language you I like the fact that Carolyn

40:47

suggested taking out the right size but it read to me as though the focus was going to be on you know on um on the

40:56

parking side as a opposed to on the trying to create housing side and I just wanted to create language that sort of

41:03

emphasized that uh that um people should take a hard look at parking before

41:10

imposing a cost to providing low-income housing um so I mean I don't think it's

41:16

hugely different um and you know to the extent that it is um then there's

41:22

something I'm not understanding uh Kate

41:29

um I'm going to raise again that um parking is uh one of the many things

41:36

that developers bulk about so this this was intended to be about parking in discussions um because it's a concession

41:43

it's a it's an incentive and I don't see a sub substantial difference between the

41:50

two but I just want to make sure that we're not like um the the point is that you could have

41:57

less parking than currently prior to multifamily that that was the aspirational goal of this so backing

42:04

away from that if the intent of this language is to back away from that um then it's changing uh the meaning and

42:10

purpose of it um and then I'd also like to propose a friendly Amendment um to

42:19

strike uh conform with state law and that

42:33

uh and add so and maybe they too needs to

42:39

go

42:44

oh I'll second

42:49

that now the question is up to Chris fine with me I mean the form of

42:57

state law was in the original it's actually throughout the document there's a number of places where we say that and

43:02

but I think Victor's point that you know that's an ex you know I guess it's a reminder to whoever is working that hey there might be some State Vol here we

43:08

have to pay attention to but if uh people are confident people don't need that I'm pretty happy to get rid of it

43:15

um and in terms of Kate's point you know I think this is actually pushing in the other direction Kate I think it's trying to make it clear that giving up on

43:21

parking is uh is something that people should look at seriously okay that helps thanks that

43:28

was certainly the intent of it uh

43:35

Adam I'm sorry uh

43:40

Victor I'm gonna go back to uh commissioner bazo's comment on another

43:47

item um and I'll say that it seems to apply here as well uh the

43:55

housing subgroup spent time working this I don't see a significant difference

44:01

between the language of the the two things uh of the of the I'm sorry of the

44:07

two um two versions of 550 5.1 pointd uh and

44:14

so I support the original language minus the right size as well as minus the

44:22

state law I will I'll I'll allow this to play out

44:28

and and then if necessary I can make a motion to remove the state law depending on how the how we how we decide on

44:42

this any other comments so I believe there was a

44:48

friendly Amendment and Chris was not clear to me from your last

44:56

comments that you were fine with Kate's friendly

45:02

Amendment I'm fine with picking out the state law Court okay that that that that that Amendment okay okay okay so now I

45:12

believe unless Deb tells me otherwise we're voting

45:18

on The Language proposed by commissioner

45:24

GS minus the conform with state law uh

45:30

language I believe that's the motion so um Sheriff I may we have we need to vote

45:37

on the amendment because we have a motion in a second on the amendment and the amendment was to strike conform with

45:43

state law and that they oh you're right you're right so we need to take a vote

45:48

on that and then we can vote on the main motion as amended got it

45:55

okay the amendment on the amendment um commissioner

46:02

Bozman hi commissioner rashis hi chair Murphy

46:09

hi commissioner accuse

46:15

hi commissioner GS I Vice chair RAB I and commissioner bazo

46:24

hi thank you okay the motion unanimously now we vote on the the main language

46:33

yeah and that was made by commissioner Bozman and seconded by Gils correct

46:40

okay uh commissioner bazo

46:47

nay Vice chair RAB nay commissioner Bozman

46:54

I commissioner accuse hi commissioner

47:00

rashis n chair Murphy I and commissioner Gils

47:07

hi he we have one two three we have four yeah so it passes y okay Adam back to

47:17

you okay well so that concludes the substantive amendments in proposed for

47:24

the housing element now I'll switch over to the land use element

47:30

consistency um amendments here um got about 12 documents

47:40

op um all right so uh the first substantive change here let me

47:47

um make sure for those of you with following along with the table so the first substantive change um I just

47:55

cleaned them up there was a like strikethrough an underline everywhere and so I thought this might be a little easier

48:00

to read um the first substantive change

48:05

was proposed to policy uh we we'll just do them in numerical order here uh

48:12

15.1 um so that's highlighted here this was comment log number

48:17

29 um and so here the proposal is to um

48:26

basically undo the change that was proposed in the draft so revert back to the original single family instead of

48:34

all residential zones um so that was proposed by uh Vice chair

48:42

ragab um and we can start discussion

48:50

there okay Adam you're up um I guess yeah in light of it being marked as a

48:56

substance I didn't mean that um I'm happy to change it to you know away from

49:01

zones to say neighborhoods um but my my thinking here is kind of like you know

49:08

if you say preserve neighborhood character everywhere I mean that that doesn't that

49:15

that's just too diluted um I think identify hey what what where where's the

49:21

character that primarily wants to be save be preserved um you know it it can't all be

49:27

preserved it's kind of like you know if you say ex lives matter and all lives matter all lives matter is you know kind

49:34

of a empty statement but the first one is a very you know it's a it's a firm

49:42

statement um so I my thinking is let's let's firm that up and as I said I'm happy to change zones away to

49:50

neighborhoods since you know we're probably not going to be having single family zones anymore so

49:57

um that that's the thinking that's the rationale behind it uh

50:02

Carolyn um I like the change that Adam has proposed presuming that's the one

50:09

that says all residential zones versus striking out single family

50:14

correct so the change that's this was what was in the H the the strikeout and

50:21

underline is what was in the housing work group recommended draft okay uh Vice chair ragab has proposed returning

50:28

it to the original single family or possibly changing zones to neighborhoods

50:34

so the all is from the housing work group draft and the single family would

50:39

be returning to the original and what heading is this 15.1 under are you able

50:45

to scroll up and show scroll up and and show us what this is under yeah this is

50:50

under the goal 15 um okay so we're mostly talking about

50:56

single family residential community in this go 15 is that right yes so let's go

51:01

back down again now that I have that in my head so I can look at it again well I think it should say single

51:09

family if it's about single family um residential zones so I guess I think

51:16

we might have got confused on this one at the housing work group I mean we're talking about single family so um I

51:25

think I would prefer what Adam has um it is going to be

51:31

important and other cities are struggling with this already as you begin to implement this policy in

51:39

regulations and start to decide what is this new middle housing

51:44

going to look like in our residential zones is it going to be that we're going

51:50

to take the size of the Box allowed now which is already a big box and allow

51:56

that box to be 1.5 times what it is now twice as big so that we can allow there

52:02

to be you know uh Triplex there or uh something like that

52:09

so if we if we have a policy that says to

52:15

preserve the character in single family zones then I think we're looking at it

52:20

more from the standpoint of trying to keep the uh existing scale and bulk of

52:30

construction somewhat comparable to what we have now so that multifam would

52:36

be um there there it's already a very large structure that's allowed so you can you can fit in um you know more than

52:44

one unit in in that big box so anyway that's that's what's behind my thinking

52:50

on this policy okay Angie um I I just want to get some

52:59

clarification um the purpose of the change was to

53:05

broaden the city's ability to implement

53:10

multifam in other ways in other zones is that an accurate understanding or

53:17

interpretation yeah I mean this was partially proposed as a way to fit in

53:22

that we're going to have to do some some moderate density um that middle housing

53:27

in our in our in all of our residential zones and then also this this does

53:33

broaden out that we're going to preserve the neighborhood character in in all residential zones so it's either really

53:40

the choice is whether we're aiming to or a policy is to preserve neighborhood

53:46

character in all residential zones or preserve neighborhood character in single family residential zones that's

53:52

the decision Point here okay and then also because this is

53:59

housing related land use policies in our comprehensive plan the use of the word

54:05

zone is consistent with our language and therefore we probably don't want to get

54:11

um creative by implementing other terms that maybe we don't use in our Landes

54:17

policies so I don't I don't know for example if neighborhoods suddenly confuses the

54:24

issue because what we are actually trying to talk about is how we're looking at land use zones is that an

54:31

accurate clarification I I think that's fair using zones here has it's a defined

54:37

term that we know what it means whereas neighborhoods is not not defined and we wouldn't have that clarity thank

54:45

you yeah note that that introducing the word neighborhood there makes the

54:50

statement circular preserve the neighborhood character of neighborhoods

54:57

you know just from a linguistic standpoint it's a little oddd

55:02

Kate yeah I think I might have been the person that proposed this in the housing work group and the reason I did is for

55:09

the reason that Adam said that we're talking about adding moderate density housing which does change the character

55:15

somewhat um but but you we want to Aspire to not change it excessively and

55:23

so it just points to the residential design standard which is going to get a makeover to say you know when you're

55:30

looking at the housing types to choose from and um making making new rules um

55:36

think about neighborhood character and try not to mess it up um and then the other purpose for adding this was that

55:43

um uh uh resident Robin Russell uh years

55:49

ago said when we were talking about housing density um they owned a condo in

55:55

downtown mercar Island and they said you know why do the people who have the

56:01

lowest cost housing have to bear all the burden of this you're not going to do

56:06

anything in single family but you're going to build like 10 story houses 10 story apartment buildings all around me

56:11

you know and I think she made a really good point that um you know if you increase and increase and increase

56:17

density in town center without pushing any of it out into moderate density in single family um then you're really

56:24

burdening one group of people over another in terms of um absorbing uh the

56:30

impacts of that density so um you know she brought the point she brought up was an equity point and I thought it was

56:37

interesting because I didn't agree with that Resident on many things politically but I I wanted to bring that

56:42

point to Bear because there are a lot of um seniors and others that live in Tom Center and um they probably wouldn't

56:49

mind if it was more of a 5050 split instead of everything going

56:54

downtown Carolyn um I want to ask staff do we th this

57:00

policy comes under a heading of single family residential zones so I guess I would ask staff two questions one does

57:08

having a policy that directs us what to do in all

57:13

zones under a c under a heading that has to do with single family is there any

57:20

inconsistency there or and that's one question and the second would be do we

57:25

have policy under other zones like Town Center or uh you know that already say this for

57:34

those zones in which case we don't need to say it here so on the first question um what

57:42

what could end up coming out of this so we're here we're specifically calling out single family residential zones

57:49

depending on where we go when we're implementing House Bill 1110 in

57:54

2025 um it could be that the nomenclature around those residential zones is no longer single family

58:01

residential zones so all residential zones would be a lot more um I I don't

58:07

want to say future proof but at least 2025 proof okay um that's that's the

58:13

piece of this that that fits in there thank

58:20

you yeah Carolyn I I'd make a note I don't think that goal 15 is

58:28

limited just to that because it includes low to moderate

58:34

density single family residential communities so okay it covers a little

58:41

broader than just single family homes

58:48

Angie uh two points the first one just I guess following up on what you both are saying

58:55

um the goal 15 is telling us that Mercer

59:01

Island as a whole should remain principally a low to moderate density single family residential community and

59:09

all subsequent language underneath that is supposed to support that primary like

59:14

this is how we as a community are going to be so it's interesting to listen to you guys talk about is it single family

59:20

or multiple I'm like that I don't know it it's a bit bigger in concept I think

59:26

than just what zone we're talking about that said I want to understand the process moving forward are we making

59:33

motions and voting now or are we back to our thumbs up thumbs down process on this kind of

59:38

stuff uh well we're gonna thumbs up thumbs down unless we need a

59:46

vote so if we have consensus there's no reason to have a formal

59:54

vote but that's not how we've done previous uh we did the first couple with

1:00:00

consensus and then we did a few with votes because we had differences of opinion on the

1:00:17

issues um so I at this point maybe we can look for is there consensus

1:00:24

to um to go with the to revert back to the

1:00:31

original text um not striking single family and

1:00:38

getting rid of all so then the let me just the which one is the housing work

1:00:46

group at this point I'm the the one that is shown here is the housing work group

1:00:52

draft as proposed in the in the comment and this let

1:00:58

me let me do this this will help the version as proposed in the

1:01:05

comment would be what's highlighted here in

1:01:11

yellow so this is the housing work group draft this top one with the strikeout

1:01:16

underline this one is what's Pro proposed in the

1:01:24

comment and so I think we can look for consensus on making the change as proposed in the comment we'll keep it

1:01:30

affirmative

1:01:40

um I see I see five thumbs Victor and Kate I

1:01:46

don't I need a little clarification on what I lost the thread okay are we voting to keep the housing work group

1:01:53

one or we voting to keep the new one we're we're voting to keep the new one so to go with single family instead of

1:02:06

all okay I see five thumbs down um so we'll we'll go with the housing work

1:02:13

group draft this all uh using all hey uh Kate to your point do you

1:02:20

want to have a formal vote on that or is that sufficient that's for

1:02:27

me Angie it's fine with me

1:02:34

okay um all right the next comment uh

1:02:40

proposed this one's a little tricky so 15.4 um this is the housing work group

1:02:47

draft here um cleaned up and then this is the version proposed in the comment um there

1:02:55

were it it was getting really hard to track um one to one so and this was proposed

1:03:02

under comment log number 30 by uh commissioner ragab um it's partially a re revert

1:03:09

reverting back to the original text um but then also making some changes and as I mentioned this is um I'll note this

1:03:16

here this is the housing work group

1:03:24

graft

1:03:47

Adam do you want to comment since that's your proposal uh no I I think it it it speaks

1:03:55

for itself won't I won't Bel her the point uh

1:04:00

Carolyn I prefer the language of the housing work group because I think it's just very

1:04:06

clear and um see and again we are talking

1:04:13

about a residential an area of the city a Zone a residential area whatever you want that's probably not going to be

1:04:21

very accur accurately referred to um

1:04:26

as single family in a very strict sense in the future so I think we're better off just

1:04:32

having this under a heading we're talking about what is now called the single family residential areas and then

1:04:39

this is a policy without belaboring and going over again this statement of it's

1:04:46

single family it's single family so that would be my reason for preferring what the housing work group has very clean

1:04:52

very simple okay any further

1:05:06

comments Victor just a quick question for Adam

1:05:12

Zack this is marked as sub substantive because it refers to

1:05:20

single family and single family may not exist in the future is that right okay yeah and it would add would bring back

1:05:26

this text at the beginning of the of the

1:05:32

policy but that's not I mean and I again maybe I have to go back and look at these definitions again but that's not

1:05:39

really a heavy lift right I mean it just it's more words but correct yeah it's

1:05:45

not like a it's not or ordering something completely 180 degrees opposite

1:05:52

yeah okay uh okay

1:05:58

um I I want to make a quick correction if I may my understanding from Jeff Thompson

1:06:04

was uh Thompson Thomas am I doing that wrong uh Thomas Thomas

1:06:12

sorry was that we are not eliminating single family housing but we are

1:06:17

expanding the allowed uses so the single family zone is not going away there's not going to be any requirement that

1:06:24

thou shalt build moderate density housing everywhere um so my my understanding from housing work

1:06:31

group was single family zoning the zoning no zoning is changing um it's

1:06:37

allowed uses within those zones um so just wanted to offer that

1:06:45

correction thank you for making that clarification I think the that's a really good point um it's yeah there's

1:06:53

there won't be like a minimum density or something like that that so um yeah good

1:06:58

good clarification helpful Carolyn yeah I just want to say also

1:07:04

Kate makes a good point there it kind of helps us with this little tangle of discussion we've been having about you

1:07:09

know what term to use for this place so yeah good

1:07:16

clarification okay do we have

1:07:22

consensus with respect to adopting the housing work group language which is the

1:07:32

for one of a better term a shorter

1:07:43

version okay looks like six thumbs up Adam do you need a vote or is that

1:07:51

sufficient okay okay right

1:07:56

yeah we'll keep rolling here um the next one

1:08:02

is 15.5 um so there were a couple of of

1:08:08

comments on 15.5 um which is a would be a new policy

1:08:14

um added to the land use element that gets at managing the impacts to um or

1:08:21

the impacts that may result from new development in our residential zones

1:08:26

um the comment the substantive comment comes from uh commissioner Bozman and

1:08:32

she proposed essentially eliminating these first three a b and

1:08:37

c um and then incorporating it essentially into one um into one policy

1:08:45

and if um she she might have a some explanation for that yeah

1:08:52

sure um so we at asking for things here or we're we're recommending that we do

1:08:59

things but we already have regulations for 15.5 pointa regulating on and off

1:09:07

street parking we already have regulations encouraging both the establishment and retention of

1:09:13

landscaped areas and the retention uh of trees planting of trees um yeah we have

1:09:19

that as well so those are already in the city code the establishment of incentives and

1:09:26

anti-displacement measures consistent with the housing element I was wondering if we needed to have that under this

1:09:34

section of our um comp plan but I do see that in

1:09:41

the alternative proposed by staff let me see

1:09:46

here no you don't have that in there yeah so I I was I I didn't see necessarily why we needed to have those

1:09:53

incentives and um in the residential Zone but maybe we do I'd like to ask

1:09:59

Adam about that yeah I mean I think that this was the original Pro uh proposal here

1:10:07

would create some linkage with the housing element um and just is a a

1:10:13

stronger Bond but I don't know that it would be problematic if we didn't have that um that language here because it is

1:10:20

throughout the housing element okay so we already have it there yeah okay so give given that we already have it in

1:10:27

code we already have it in the housing element I think the essence of this policy should be what's in 15.5 D and I

1:10:36

think the staff has Rewritten it very

1:10:46

well um I I guess my question is for

1:10:52

staff um and it's a clarifying question I I'm not I can't tell whether this is a

1:10:58

typo or I'm just unfamiliar with the terminology but the last part of that last sentence reads consistent

1:11:05

consistent with the existing built form in residential zones what is built form

1:11:12

that would be like the the scale intensity the way that um built the

1:11:18

built environment is shaped in in that area can we put that in human

1:11:24

language I could I could revise it yeah um I think we have um I mean this compatible with

1:11:32

surrounding neighborhoods is probably a little bit more plain English

1:11:39

um so instead of consistent with um what we could do is to

1:11:46

be compatible with surrounding

1:11:54

neighborhoods that's a little more plain

1:12:02

spoken uh Adam um I like what the housing work group had here um you know I understand

1:12:10

yeah definitely built form is one one of those impacts but I think it's good to

1:12:17

point to the fact that um you know anti-is I I I just like more information

1:12:24

so I I I would I I'll give a thumbs up for keeping it as

1:12:30

is um because built form doesn't to me I understand yeah we have all those other

1:12:36

a b and c articulated somewhere else but if I'm going to section 15 it's good to know that um those impacts go beyond

1:12:46

just how the physical structure looks um so yeah I like what the housing work group had

1:12:53

here Carolyn do you have a new comment or is that yeah I wanted to ask Adam uh

1:12:59

R when you say you like what the housing work group and you mentioned um about the anti displacement are you referring

1:13:06

to liking to include C along with what

1:13:11

is expressed in the staff version or are you talking about including AB C and

1:13:17

D the latter yeah I I I I prefer this the the original version to to yours

1:13:24

respectfully MH

1:13:33

sure okay so let's uh see if we have can oh

1:13:40

Victor sorry I I just uh Carolyn's question triggered a question for

1:13:46

me uh so commissioner Bosman can you just explain why you eliminated I

1:13:52

understand A and B why did you eliminate C in your

1:13:57

um because it's already appears in Spades in the housing

1:14:03

element and this part of our work is updating the land use element to be

1:14:10

consistent with the housing element where need be but this is not need be

1:14:18

because the housing displacement part of it is already addressed very well in the housing
El so that's why thank you

1:14:29

uhhuh okay any more comments so let's see if there's

1:14:35

consensus on the language in

1:14:44

15.5 original as proposed by the housing work group Murphy y go ahead uh I just

1:14:52

want to pose one quick clarifying question to staff

1:14:58

um what is the purpose of updating the land use policies to be consistent with

1:15:04

housing because one of the points I've heard Commissioners bring up is that well it's already in housing so we don't

1:15:09

have to do it here but we have also discussed uh about how we have to make

1:15:16

some things consistent between comp plan sections and policies and I have some concerns that we're actually supposed to

1:15:24

be making sure updating land use policies to be consistent with not rely not necessarily entirely rely on other

1:15:31

sections to host the change or the modification so can you just help me understand what's important or what's

1:15:38

necessary there sure so the the purpose of this exercise is to make sure that uh

1:15:45

in those points where the two elements overlap because there is a lot of overlap between the two of them that

1:15:52

they're well one that they're not conflicting because that would be bad but then also to make sure that we're

1:15:59

that the policies in the land use element are supportive of the policies that we have in the housing element and

1:16:06

so there's quite a bit of we we have quite a bit of um there there's a lot of like leeway

1:16:13

within that we have to make sure that they don't explicitly conflict um and

1:16:18

that they uh where we where the city finds necessary to find

1:16:25

places where they can support each other um so um if as originally proposed this

1:16:34

155c is a good example um yes it probably doesn't need

1:16:39

to be in the H in the land use element because we do discuss it at length and the housing element isn't more or less

1:16:46

important than what's in the land use element like they're even uh Partners in the plan um but this is just creating

1:16:53

some of that linkage and this is a stronger connection between the two but it wouldn't be a problem if we didn't

1:17:00

have that in there so some of it is just a style um choice on our

1:17:05

part thank

1:17:10

you okay so I think first we'll address whether there's consensus around

1:17:19

keeping 15.5 has proposed uh in by the staff

1:17:28

here so thumbs up on that I'm sorry chair that's not clear to me as proposed

1:17:34

by the staff or the original housing work group uh sorry as proposed by the

1:17:39

staff and has presented in in the exhibit that we're looking at so the the

1:17:45

alternative here I've highlighted it on the screen we're voting yes or no to that no we're saying yes or no to 15.5 5

1:17:55

a through D oh as proposed by the housing work group well there's some

1:18:02

there's some verbage changes to that there are some minor changes that are um

1:18:08

H that were housekeeping edits um okay and I I would have I would have an issue

1:18:13

with minor number four I didn't think it was minor so um we could come back to

1:18:19

that perhaps but um just want to let you know that now okay

1:18:27

may it would be easier to take a vote I think on the alternate alternate and then see if that you know where that

1:18:34

takes us and then go from there okay and the alternate is as drafted

1:18:42

by I guess uh that was staff or Carolyn that was you and with some changes by

1:18:48

staff no it was by staff okay okay in in response to comment log number 39 okay

1:18:55

okay highlighted on the screen here is there a consensus on

1:19:07

that I see five thumbs

1:19:13

down okay drop that out of

1:19:19

here so then we would go back to 155 as as drafted here

1:19:28

um with the minor amendments made and Carolyn do you have

1:19:34

uh an issue with one or more minor amendments yeah I'm looking at comment log three right now just a

1:19:50

moment I don't have any problem with comment log three but uh um I do have a concern about comment log number

1:20:00

four so let's see here let's see

1:20:11

here so Chris were you suggesting that that be changed in your comment number

1:20:21

four I'm not clear I think Adam may be clear where we are I

1:20:28

think the draft we have up there oh wait a minute I just pulled in the strikeout

1:20:35

underline so you can see what the the change was here so this is what that what struck

1:20:42

here is what the housing work group proposed and then this additional text

1:20:47

is from from comment number

1:20:52

four yeah guess I'm not clear why I said

1:20:58

that that's the language from 16 I guess I just took in the language from

1:21:03

16.5 just to be consistent with

1:21:08

that um but I'm not sure it makes that much difference yeah

1:21:15

the U Adam you have comment um yeah I support comment log

1:21:22

three um the change in comment log four I would not support because compatible

1:21:27

is a very objective word scale and intensity and built form you know put

1:21:33

some more specificity um so yeah I like I like the first change I I don't like

1:21:39

the second one and I think part of my concern was built form I felt a little bit like uh Victor that uh was a term I

1:21:48

wasn't completely familiar with but you know I feel better about it now so if other people feel that way I don't feel

1:21:53

strongly about uh Victor I move that we revert back to the

1:22:02

housing work groups language with with hang on hang on you

1:22:11

may not like it with with with a change to with a change to built form that is

1:22:17

consistent with the previous built form change

1:22:23

MH and what is that change I I don't have the exact language I'm sure Adam

1:22:28

know yeah um I I can find it I I don't have it was

1:22:34

comp I think it was compatible so it actually may turn out to be redundant um because I think

1:22:42

that's consistent with existing

1:22:49

compa uh compatible with yeah here I can t let me type it up real quick EAS than

1:22:55

trying to say it out loud just to clarify Victor are you rejecting comment log number three no comment log number

1:23:03

four right but I'm asking about three you said it went back to the housing group language but the language on the

1:23:09

screen's a little different because it has comment log three incorporated into it I'm just I'm talking specifically

1:23:14

about 15.5 pointd okay I'm I'm fine with 15.5 pointb

1:23:27

it's a little different than what your motion was but it's good to clarify so what is that that you just

1:23:33

typed in is that um who proposed that I'm not sure I did that's proposed by

1:23:39

Chris is that right no that's me oh Victor excuse me but Chris and I apparently share a voice

1:23:48

okay okay so um all right okay um so

1:23:54

Victor one of my questions and I think I need a I think I need a second oh okay

1:24:00

sure I think we need Clarity on what the motion is so the motion is to revert

1:24:06

back to the original 15.5 D from the housing work group that re that reads

1:24:12

control the scale and intensity of new development to be consistent with losing built form and saying with

1:24:20

the existing surrounding neighborhoods

1:24:31

second okay discussion point of clar shair Murphy

1:24:36

pardon me point of clarification please

1:24:45

yes and forgive me um perhaps I'm just not understanding wouldn't it just be

1:24:51

simpler to for the motion to be to amend or 15.5 Point D to read as Adam has

1:25:00

written it versus the motion that uh commissioner

1:25:08

ri's if that's easier all all the only the only thing that I have an issue with

1:25:16

with the the what was proposed by the housing work

1:25:21

group was built for so my uh and sorry if sorry if sorry if

1:25:30

this is making things too complicated yes I am I mean I'm happy to record the

1:25:35

motion however you would like I I do I will say that if if I would need you to

1:25:42

restate it for me um because I'm looking at what Adam's

1:25:48

written as an outcome of your motion and trying to connect the from

1:25:55

a scribe perspective let let me ask let me ask

1:26:02

this would it be easier if we took a vote on Chris's motion first and then

1:26:09

simply went back to the housing work group proposal and I propose striking the word built form and replacing it

1:26:15

would that make things easier I think I think it's easier to

1:26:23

just propose your motion and read it as Adam has drafted it there

1:26:33

okay Deb does that work for you okay so um communication's a wonderful thing

1:26:43

um then I read the motion as a motion was made by Rashid seconded by who made

1:26:50

second Vice chair rag thank you

1:26:55

to amend 15.5 pointd to read as Adam has it written

1:27:03

there correct Whi which which one are we voting on Adam could you highlight it please
yeah let me highlight it thank

1:27:16

you and Adam if you'll just cut and paste that send that to me so it I'll just drop it in and that
just makes it

1:27:22

faster on my end yeah I'm not wasting anyone's time okay thank you for the clarity

1:27:28

everyone I apologize for the interruption but I want to make sure I'm capturing any of our
actions

1:27:38

correctly okay so now that we have a motion it's been seconded discussion um

1:27:45

I'm not sure who was up first Kate go ahead um I I have a problem with the

1:27:53

edit because making scale and intensity consistent

1:27:58

with existing um if you're talking scaling intensity that conflicts with all of the

1:28:05

amend all of the new language in the housing element which said you're going to add middle housing and that's why uh

1:28:11

15.5 pointd is written as is it's meant to direct staff when looking at

1:28:17

residential design standards to look at um character style design height things

1:28:23

like like that um have that be consistent but intensity um the the

1:28:31

housing element says you're adding uh you're adding density you're adding middle housing so I don't see how we

1:28:37

could pass this motion um with the this alternate highlighted 15.5

1:28:45

pointd because it conflicts the purpose of this update is to be consistent with the housing element and this is

1:28:50

inconsistent with the housing element Carolyn

1:28:57

um I I would favor the way the housing work group worded it to start with

1:29:03

because you know they were we were talking about controlling the scale and

1:29:09

in terms of intensity we weren't talking about density we were talking about

1:29:14

intensity in other words how much Hardscape are you going to have in the neighborhood and so this was intended to

1:29:23

say that when it comes time to writing the regulations controlling the scale and the intensity of the development to

1:29:30

be consistent with the existing built form built form okay it might be a little bit of a wonky term but it is

1:29:37

indeed what we were talking about we were talking about the structures themselves and if

1:29:44

you just change the language and say compatible with surrounding neighborhoods that doesn't get us

1:29:50

talking about structures it could be roads it could be driveways it could be

1:29:56

um uh um you know any number of neighborhood concerns but this was meant

1:30:03

to relate to the buildings themselves and I think this is going to end up being extremely important policy when it

1:30:10

comes time to prepare the to write the regulations because we're going to have to decide how big are those buildings

1:30:17

going to be how intense is the structures in our all in our you know

1:30:23

residential area is what's that going to look like so I would recommend kind of swallowing the wonky term of built form

1:30:30

and leaving it just the way that the housing work group wrote

1:30:35

it uh Victor so um to address the last two

1:30:41

comments so number one with the exception of built form this is exactly what the housing work group um

1:30:48

recommended and number two uh you'll recall that I have no idea what built form means and I think most of the

1:30:54

people on this island don't understand what that means either and so I asked for an equivalent in human language and

1:31:02

this is what I was given and and again I don't know what that definition is so I'm going to accept uh what we've been

1:31:09

given here on on good faith um and so if there's a better term I'm simply saying

1:31:16

put this into language that people can actually read and understand and aside from just putting

1:31:23

it into human language I'm I am absolutely arguing for what the housing

1:31:29

work group proposed that was in my

1:31:34

motion uh Kate um I'm I'm thinking maybe this is

1:31:40

an argument I lost in the housing work group so sorry for wasting your time uh Carolyn and then U I have some

1:31:49

thoughts on this language because there are some problems with it and and um

1:31:54

Victor you know getting back to you about the term built form and I I realize you're what you've proposed

1:31:59

otherwise is what the the housing work group had proposed as well but um I'm

1:32:06

I'm afraid that the replacement you know um consistent with the neighborhood

1:32:12

there's there's the problem that I would have that it's too vague because it's this is meant to be referring to the

1:32:19

actual structures them so what I would suggest is Adam maybe we could come up Adam Zach um maybe we could come up with

1:32:27

a better term than buil form how about bulk and scale we tend to use that a lot in our policies could something like

1:32:33

that explain what this gets at bu bulken scale uh would work I mean

1:32:40

we already talk about scale and intensity up here I mean I I think that this for policy direction is probably at

1:32:48

a roughly the right altitude um because when we're when we're developing

1:32:54

development standards things like n like well you mentioned roads and driveways

1:33:00

th those kinds of standards are also included in those development standards and so the kind of

1:33:06

broader uh built uh scale and intensity of those

1:33:12

surrounding neighborhoods that that really gets at what we're what we're

1:33:17

directing with those development standards or what we're regulating okay thanks okay so I have a few thoughts on

1:33:25

this one first of all the word consistent is a problem uh consistent means acting or

1:33:33

done in the same way compatible which is actually the statutory term used for

1:33:39

Middle housing is able to exist or work with so it's a somewhat lower standard

1:33:46

and the definition of middle housing ESB 1110 says middle housing means buildings

1:33:53

that compatible in scale form and character sceptor with the basically

1:33:59

with the neighborhood with the structures and the neighborhood so I think that the safest route for us is to

1:34:06

lift the language right out of the statute and say compatible in scale form

1:34:12

and character which I believe captures what we're saying and which is not only

1:34:18

very defensible but right in line with what the definition is in the statute

1:34:24

uh and I think it' be foolish to to use a word like consistent with because

1:34:30

people could then point to that and say well the yeah this isn't too bad but it's not exactly like what's been built

1:34:37

here before and that is I think completely inconsistent with esp1 1110

1:34:45

and with this policy so I I think we we need to make those changes um I'm

1:34:51

concerned about the use of the term intensity because intensity sounds like

1:34:59

density and could be interpreted to mean some of the same same things which again

1:35:06

is incompatible with what this policy change is being uh what is being

1:35:12

required of us by state law so I think that we need to work with the language

1:35:18

in the law we need to avoid words that create a problem for us uh and if the

1:35:25

word scale uh form and character are all in there and I think they would be safe

1:35:31

to use and appropriate and at the same altitude um with u in terms of

1:35:41

evaluation Victor so just a a clarifying question

1:35:47

on your comment which is the lower standard consistent or compatible

1:35:54

consistent is the lower standard no I I think compatible is more flexible than

1:36:01

consistent consistent by definition if you believe the OED is acting or done in

1:36:07

the same way unchanging in nature um

1:36:12

so and whereas compatible is able to exist with or coexist with in other

1:36:18

words it's not too far off um but consistency

1:36:24

is I'd say a tougher standard to meet and could be used to block um housing

1:36:31

that is not exactly consistent with the existing structures that are there that is the single family homes and I think

1:36:39

that's a problem I think then we're walking ourselves into a violation of the uh

1:36:47

statute or let me put this way we're giving people who don't like the statue

1:36:54

and who don't like to see the change a tool to fight what we are supposed to be

1:37:04

allowing Carolyn well I just think you make some very good points and I support what

1:37:10

you're saying there so I think we could use some more changing here but I don't

1:37:16

know where we're at on a motion

1:37:22

so the the main motion is still on the floor if there's a desire to amend the main motion oh

1:37:29

okay or or Deb correct me if I'm wrong but the motion could be withdrawn and we

1:37:35

could make a new Mo that's that's correct you could as long as both the uh motion and the second

1:37:41

withdrew I I'm happy to withdraw the motion by sh okay sure

1:37:50

yeah and I took the liberty of uh typing up

1:37:57

Mike's uh chair Murphy's uh or trying to capture what what I

1:38:05

heard there um so here let me yeah should be scale

1:38:13

form and

1:38:22

character me an

1:38:29

end what was that Chris should be compatible in scale form in character oh no the end comes after compatible scale

1:38:36

form in existing no I think you're right I think it's compatible in form scale in

1:38:42

form scale and character with existing yeah

1:38:47

yeah correct

1:38:56

let see if we have consensus on that I

1:39:09

think yeah we can we can do consensus or we can take a vote um but we would need

1:39:14

a motion to take the vote now let's see if we have consensus

1:39:22

first

1:39:28

oh I guess we need a vote okay I move that uh 15.5 pointd be

1:39:37

amended to read control new development to be compatible in scale form and

1:39:43

character with existing surrounding neighborhoods do I have a second second

1:39:50

second p okay any further discussion Adam I'm

1:39:56

gonna trust our housing work group on this one um I like their original words

1:40:01

and it's got three city council members who know more than me yeah but there's no no guarantee that

1:40:09

they read the statute okay any further

1:40:18

discussion seeing none let's take a boat Deb

1:40:26

and just to confirm it was seconded by rashis or gails

1:40:33

gails sorry y'all okay uh commissioner Bozman

1:40:41

I commissioner rashis I chair Murphy I commissioner

1:40:50

bazo I commissioner hi commissioner GS hi and vice chair reg

1:40:59

n 61 okay the record I don't think we

1:41:04

sound anything alike probably not in person but right

1:41:13

here okay um we've got one more substantive comment um can we can we go

1:41:20

back a sec sure yeah know I I mean I I would propose I just make this motion then we

1:41:27

decide and get it over with I would like to strike 15.5 a and make a motion to do

1:41:33

that the parking you know Carol makes a good point that it's already covered I'm you know got my concerns about you know

1:41:40

over focus on parking in context of development in Middle housing and I

1:41:46

don't see any reason to add it here second

1:41:52

that okay motion's been made and seconded

1:41:59

further discussion Kate I understood when this was

1:42:05

developed um for Angie's or sorry H commissioner bazo's earlier comment that

1:42:12

some uh repetition or some repetition was necessary among the different among

1:42:19

the housing element and the land use um oh my God I'm just losing the thread here we needed the same thing said in

1:42:27

different documents for consistency um so I'm opposed to the

1:42:34

motion Adam I agree with with what Kate said

1:42:39

okay uh Caroline you know I seconded this but I'm beginning to look at this

1:42:45

and going we shouldn't be spending our time on I'm probably worrying about that it doesn't hurt if there was some reason

1:42:51

the housing work group wanted that to be there if there's some reason it benefits

1:42:56

these two elements working together I guess I figure we've probably messed with this one enough but I know I

1:43:02

seconded it so I did I did second it thank sure I agree with Kate and Adam

1:43:11

we've got climate action all over this thing why not

1:43:17

parking okay any further

1:43:22

discussion okay a motion's been made and seconded to delete 15.5

1:43:30

pointa or de do you want to call the role Vice chair

1:43:37

regab motion to delete so uh nay commissioner

1:43:44

bazo nay commissioner GS

1:43:50

I commissioner qes n commissioner

1:43:56

Bosman am I voting to delete or am I voting to leave it the way it is you're

1:44:02

voting to delete nay commissioner rashes nay and vice

1:44:10

chair Murphy n motion fails Adam you've been elevated

1:44:18

again um did we do a consensus on comment log three uh 155

1:44:26

Bravo we did not um that was within the the the memo that was

1:44:35

categorized as a minor change um we can take a look at it though if there's something if there's

1:44:41

discussion that would be useful there I I was just yeah I'll give it a thumbs

1:44:52

up okay A a thumbs up to the the proposed

1:44:57

change or okay um yeah so Adam you your concept here

1:45:05

Adam's act your concept here was to deal with the minor

1:45:12

changes um or what were classified as minor changes kind of and

1:45:18

mass um unless yeah unless there was something thing that uh planning

1:45:24

commissioner wanted to discuss um we can we can pull anything out of that minor bucket um but if otherwise we can just

1:45:33

treat him as a as a block um at least that was The Proposal

1:45:41

okay um so I'll keep going we've got one more substantive comment

1:45:48

um and this one gets a little complicated because there were a couple of

1:45:53

um there were a couple of comments about the same policy so this was land use

1:45:59

policy 16.5 um and this relates to Comet logs

1:46:04

528 and 32 um and so um comment log number five

1:46:11

was The Proposal from uh commissioner gells to

1:46:17

um um to drop the on vacant or underutilized sites um

1:46:23

which would kind of generalize where this middle housing would be encouraged under this

1:46:29

policy um so it's a a slight a slight change in in policy Direction here um

1:46:36

but this is the clean version uh without the strikeout or

1:46:42

underline and then there's also this this staff alternative I proposed at the

1:46:48

end here adding this high capacity Transit component um to get it some of

1:46:53

the comments from logs 28 and 31 from uh commissioner RAB um regarding the

1:47:02

high-capacity Transit um component so this last Clause of the policy was in

1:47:08

response uh to those two comments

1:47:14

there here on uh I'm just trying to figure out what

1:47:21

the housing work group pad and how this differs from it I'm looking at the screen and it would be helpful if I

1:47:28

could see it right there instead of looking all my papers yeah let me get let me get that for you thank

1:47:36

you yeah I guess I can comment on my suggestion that be limited not be

1:47:42

limited to you know these um vacant or under utilized site I mean

1:47:48

I guess for me middle housing is an alternative for people and I maybe

1:48:53

density available on that site but if we want to cover the tear down situation I'm talking about then we'd have to

1:48:58

strike that language right it may not that may not sweep up like underutilized might not

1:49:05

sweep up a tear down rebuild situation that's so that's that's the reason I I

1:49:11

feel like that's a really important place and I'm a big middle housing fan I mean I really think there's

1:49:16

opportunities to give people options and you know people to age on the island and
downsize people to have their kids move

1:49:23

in you know firefighters and teachers living here I mean I'm I'm I'm all in favor so I don't want
to see it limited

1:49:29

this way and and it's worth noting too that the the parameter that comes from uh

1:49:37

House Bill 1110 the middle housing is this critical area's piece so wherever

1:49:43

we go with it we do want to make sure that we're saying that it's outside of those critical
areas because that's one of the limitations there but do vacant

1:49:51

or underutilized that's a local thing it's not um required So when you say that's a local

1:49:59

Choice thing um is there something in the statute that says that or is are you

1:50:07

saying that well that's something we just are choosing to do it's something that we are
choosing

1:50:14

to do okay there's no there there's no language in the statute for

1:50:20

that correct yeah yeah so what I'm saying is that the the alternative as

1:50:26

proposed would not run a foul of 1110 right I mean wouldn't it be more

1:50:31

consistent with 1110 yeah that's that's kind of the question is if there is no statutory

1:50:38

basis for limiting middle housing to vacant or underutilized sites I think we

1:50:45

run run the risk of having something that's not compatible with with the

1:50:51

law Adam I believe commissioner batsman's

1:50:57

hand was uh ahead of me oh okay Carolyn sure I'm still having trouble with um

1:51:03

versions that I'm looking at here so the one that is highlighted yellow that's the housing work

1:51:09

group yeah well it's a strikeout underlined version that incorporates the comments let me see I can in a minute

1:51:17

here let me get the original I didn't I didn't think we had that preference for Transit thing in the housing work group

1:51:23

but right we we didn't let me get the let me get that one

1:51:43

sorry okay here's the housing work group version okay and

1:51:50

I would like to advocate for for that for a moment

1:51:56

um I think it's a really good policy I think if we add with um preference to areas near

1:52:05

high-capacity Transit I I think we're kind of violating the state law because

1:52:10

we're supposed to allow this kind of development anywhere in the residential

1:52:15

Zone um that the law requires us to allow it I don't think we can make

1:52:20

preferences to saying well it's a little closer to the transit so we'll we'll do that so I would say that that phrase I

1:52:27

don't think should be in the policy

1:52:34

um the word compatible I think is the right word um I'll leave it at

1:52:40

that Adam um I mean I I agree with what commissioner Bozman said the law says we

1:52:46

need to allow it um this is saying encourage it near high-capacity trans

1:52:52

we've just been talking about how we're trying to deprioritize Vehicles so let's

1:52:58

not make it harder on um the people living in that middle housing we yeah

1:53:03

the law says it's allowed everywhere but let's encourage it where it's actually more functional near the high-capacity

1:53:10

Transit so that was the reason behind my uh comments to that

1:53:17

one Victor uh my comment's the same comment uh but I think it not only applies to

1:53:23

commissioner Ban's comment it also applies to your comment chair Murphy it

1:53:28

it would be different if we said require but here we're saying this is where we are encouraging and because this is an

1:53:35

aspirational document um I think we can certainly encourage things wherever we

1:53:40

want without running a foul of the law yeah there a fine fine line between

1:53:47

encouraging and and encouraging tends to lead to creating incentives and

1:53:54

that can be a problem I think I agree with you in principle Victor uh with

1:54:00

what you're saying but I think that's a slippery slope from from a policy of

1:54:07

encouraging and then incentives Etc and

1:54:12

um does I think does raise an issue I I think the slope slips both ways though

1:54:18

right because you know without without the incentive of course we're going to follow the law

1:54:25

so why even talk about it so I in short I I support the original housing work

1:54:33

group language

1:54:39

okay yeah I definitely uh am in alignment with this idea that we want to

1:54:45

support um or encourage housing near Transit um for a variety of reasons however I just wanted to share that in

1:54:51

the housing work group we talked about um some more regulations coming from the

1:54:59

state discussions of Transit oriented development um those have not

1:55:05

successfully passed or been negotiated there's something coming and so we avoided intentionally and this was led

1:55:12

by the mayor we intentionally avoided talking about um at least this is my re recollection I don't want to speak for

1:55:18

anyone else I believe we avoided um getting specific about Transit um

1:55:25

because we're going to be getting some guidance and some model ordinances from the state in the future on that topic um

1:55:32

so as much as I I agree with commissioner agab that having denser housing near Transit makes

1:55:40

sense um I I think the thought of the housing work group was let's address that after we have clear guidance um

1:55:48

those new regulations have passed at the state level and we have clear guidance from Commerce and perhaps model ordinance to help us with that language

1:55:54

so we don't run a foul of any new

1:55:59

regulations uh Carolyn yeah um in regards to to um whether or not we're

1:56:09

encouraging um higher density near Transit housing Bill h111 basically

1:56:17

already does that you know the the requirement is that you allow middle

1:56:23

housing in residential zones but within a quarter mile of

1:56:28

Transit um the standard is higher I think it's four plexes for our our um

1:56:37

population is that correct Adam Zach yes yeah it's up to up to four dwellings per

1:56:44

lot within that quarter mile okay so it's already built into h110 and then

1:56:49

within the um multif Family area area duplexes are allowed anywhere and

1:56:55

triplexes and fourplexes if there is at least one affordable unit is that correct Adam Zach yes there's an

1:57:03

affordable housing bonus in there okay so I just wanted to add that you

1:57:09

know higher density near Transit is already in h110 and I was thinking about

1:57:14

about that when I saw Mike Murphy's questions uh asking about whether the

1:57:20

housing work group had considered um a higher density near Transit it's already baked in and it might come in

1:57:27

the future in the form of a Transit oriented development bill um so um so

1:57:34

then one other thing moving beyond Transit I would just say Adam Zach I

1:57:39

thought that the housing work group deleted the phrase on vacant or underutilized

1:57:46

sites um it did not that was proposed by Comet log number five

1:57:55

uh right but I I I'm saying something else I thought the housing work group

1:58:00

deleted that phrase um so I just wanted to bring that up and double

1:58:07

check yeah I don't I don't have that that wasn't one of my track changes

1:58:12

from Kate I I think think we discussed feeling like we shouldn't be emphasizing

1:58:18

that we're only encouraging it on vacant and underutilized land so I I thought we deleted that but any but you're saying

1:58:24

number five proposes the same thing right correct so I think that there's there's kind of two proposals here and

1:58:30

maybe we should take them at one one at a time okay and and so the the first is

1:58:36

as proposed by commissioner gals in Comet log number five that would be to

1:58:42

drop the on vacant or underutilized sites

1:58:47

phras um so that would be dropping what's highlighted here yeah are we kind of voting okay

1:58:56

yeah let's we're trying to see if there's a consensus on

1:59:04

that four to three four to three four to three to drop to to delete

1:59:11

the language yes okay yeah thanks okay does anyone want to have a formal Vote

1:59:16

or is that sufficient okay okay okay let's go the

1:59:21

next next one and then the next one would be to add this final Clause with

1:59:27

preference to given to areas near high capacity

1:59:34

Transit um bar okay if we're voting on that one

1:59:40

now I would like to say something about that particular phrase um in order to

1:59:46

give preference to multif family or multi middle house

1:59:52

housing um I I when you're in in an

1:59:57

existing Zone you know if we say tried

2:00:02

to get developers in say you know closer to

2:00:08

transit in the residential Zone to build middle housing somehow but if they were

2:00:14

two miles away we didn't but the thing is they're still in the exact same Zone I I don't really see how we

2:00:23

can put additional pressure on a property owner who happens to be a little closer to the transit and they're

2:00:31

all in the same Zone yeah I just I just don't see that being feasible at all so anyway that's my reason for not voting

2:00:37

for it uh Adam did you have your hand up

2:00:44

isn't that allowing of quad plexes already putting increased pressure on

2:00:50

property owners near high capacity Transit because if you're far enough away it only um it only gives allows for

2:00:58

a duplex but that's the law That's the Law this is policy so that's the law is

2:01:04

required but you know once you're beyond that quarter mile you know I think we're

2:01:11

messing around with some pretty vague um I don't see how we can even do it at all I don't see how you can write

2:01:17

a regulation within the residential area with without changing the zoning

2:01:25

so yeah I think Carolyn is getting in a interesting point and the point is

2:01:33

what's the meaning of preference given um I don't know what that means um and

2:01:41

so if this is a policy how does that policy get implemented um so that would

2:01:49

be my one of my concerns about that language Adam in the interest of time I'm happy

2:01:56

to withdraw uh this 28 and 32

2:02:05

comments okay okay so done okay let me just for my notes here

2:02:13

I'll strike that um okay so that concludes the

2:02:20

substantive amendments um and then returning to um the comment

2:02:27

log um there were some minor comments um

2:02:32

there were several of them before you go on can I just clarify the the final thing we ended up with doesn't have that

2:02:38

mandated by state law part either right I was just confused by the text because I don't think the workgroup language

2:02:45

initially included that language correct yeah okay all right I just want to make sure that's not in there okay

2:02:52

okay actually before we move on uh Adam uh we've been going for over two hours

2:02:59

so let's take a 10-minute break and resume at um

2:03:08

8:20 okay

2:03:20

okay

2:03:50

e

2:04:20

e

2:04:50

e

2:05:20

e

2:05:50

e

2:06:20

e

2:06:50

e

2:07:20

e

2:07:50

e

2:08:20

e

2:08:50

e

2:09:20

e

2:09:50

e

2:10:20

e

2:10:50

e

2:11:20

e

2:11:50

e

2:12:20

e

2:12:50

e

2:14:20

e

2:14:32

okay soon as Kate's back online we can forge ahead

2:14:40

M sounds

2:14:47

good and Victor oh yeah Victor off

2:15:15

yeah all right looks like everybody's here

2:15:22

um so the last piece of um the last

2:15:27

piece that we had to look at were the minor comments um so these if you're

2:15:33

looking at the Planning Commission Bill 246 uh page four the minor comments are

2:15:40

listed there these are primarily things that didn't necessarily change the direction of policies but just proposed

2:15:48

some some minor amendments um some housekeeping edits um we can agree to

2:15:54

those by by consensus unless we unless uh planning commissioner wants to

2:15:59

discuss uh one of those or any of those uh minor comments listed

2:16:10

there uh

2:16:16

Chris Po you're mute I have a couple I thought 23 and 31

2:16:22

were actually pretty substantive and that they limit the uh provision to what's required by law as opposed to you

2:16:29

know having to be something that's in our discretion but sort of puts us on a situation we trying to do the minimum

2:16:35

amount possible and I had a little bit of a um I think a friendly Amendment for 34 that instead of saying single family

2:16:42

we'd say residential so those are the three that I'd be interested in talking about 2331 and

2:16:49

34 okay um let me get let me get that pulled up

2:16:59

here like I said I've got one too many documents open here so it'll take just a

2:17:05

second um we'll start with 23 so that was a proposed change to policy

2:17:11

2.4 um and let me pull that up

2:17:19

here

2:17:25

um and so the proposed change here would add where mandated by state law at the end of

2:17:32

2.4 here I'll highlight

2:17:42

it this was proposed by commissioner ragab um I don't know if uh commissioner

2:17:48

GS or vice chair ragab who would like to start here but I guess a clarification

2:17:54

is does a does duplex which would be everywhere does that count

2:18:00

as um moderate density or are we only talking about the for

2:18:08

plexes uh moderate density would be anything uh here we're using that as a

2:18:14

stand in for duplex Triplex quadplex okay so by law then it's it is

2:18:20

a everywhere yeah okay so I'm I'm happy to withdraw that comment then

2:18:27

um

2:18:33

okay um strike that okay and then I'm sorry commissioner GS what was the the

2:18:39

next one that you wanted to talk

2:18:49

about

2:18:56

he's muted yeah thought it was 34 all right it was 31

2:19:02

31 okay so that is in

2:19:07

P switch documents here real

2:19:19

quick

2:19:27

and 31 was a proposed change to

2:19:34

um well let me see pass here land juice elephant 161

2:19:40

insert before on where mandated by

2:19:47

law yeah maybe I see it Incorporated in here yeah I

2:19:54

maybe I don't I was working pretty quick to get this together for you guys um so

2:20:01

uh yeah chair Raga or vice chair ragab I know this was from your comment so maybe

2:20:07

I got it in the wrong spot yeah that that insert before on was for 165 which

2:20:13

I believe we've already discussed and talked about as a as a commission okay

2:20:19

and that's fine and that's where we didn't we didn't include it there I think okay and then

2:20:26

the last one I the last one I raised was

2:20:31

34 okay so that's on 173 here right and

2:20:38

and I I'm okay with the change but it says especially single family zones and I thought we might want to say

2:20:44

residential zones instead there but you know I'm I'm still a little confused by the whole

2:20:49

thing

2:20:56

that's here in this last sentence right that was more of a friendly suggestion I

2:21:11

mean so then instead of so your proposal is this here let

2:21:19

me adding residential here right just as we sort of move away

2:21:25

from you know we use the broader

2:21:32

term I think the section what's 17 I think may be about maybe titled

2:21:39

residential yeah 17 is uh here the allow uses in commercial and mixed use zones

2:21:46

balance the city's Economic Development and housing needs

2:21:52

and then um and this is one of

2:22:05

the so residential if we generalize it to residential that shouldn't

2:22:10

necessarily be a problem um that's part of the council's direction here dealing

2:22:16

with commercial office zone is that um to include some

2:22:22

um buffering from the neighboring residential zones or single family zones so either way um kind of the

2:22:34

same Adam uh that was directed at your comment do you have any problem with

2:22:42

that no problems there okay um

2:22:49

Angie I'm going to withdraw my hand okay okay you had your hand up should we did you

2:22:57

withdraw it I yeah I well I just want to make

2:23:03

this change to the multi family language because I know that was really important

2:23:09

um to the commercial office Zone it doesn't change that multif family is a

2:23:15

being added to commercial it looks like it's just word smithing

2:23:21

yes it's it's say where we're going to minimize those po potential

2:23:30

impacts so all we've added here is especially residential zones is that

2:23:37

correct correct and that's all that surrounds the co anyway right

2:23:46

correct so is there is there a consensus on this uh um the change as Pro presented

2:24:05

here all right I have five or six thumbs up and one thumbs down on the consensus

2:24:14

there are you okay without a formal vote Angie

2:24:19

yes okay

2:24:25

any uham is that an old hand uh no that's a new hand okay I

2:24:32

think yours was up before Carolyn's um anticipating the next question I would like to revisit or look at um log item

2:24:41

number two revisions to 52 and

2:24:47

53 okay

2:24:57

[Music] so these are changes

2:25:05

here 52 and

2:25:16

53 and the um the proposed amendment is to change the word allow to

2:25:25

encourage in both

2:25:35

policies um Vice chair RAB do you w to yeah I mean I I believe we ought to

2:25:43

stick with allow that that meets the law that's what the housing work group said encourages a policy deviation um so I I

2:25:51

believe that's not a minor change so I'll advocate for rejecting uh log item

2:25:57

number tw's changes uh Carolyn well I appreciate the

2:26:03

spirit of the amendment um I think you know uh trying to how somehow put some

2:26:11

regulations together that encourage the duplex of the triplex the town

2:26:16

homes um is kind of difficult for the city to accomplish and I think the point

2:26:24

is that these regulations are allowing something in a new place if somebody wants to build it they can so I guess I

2:26:33

I think allow is a better language to work with on these things Victor agree with the previous

2:26:41

two comments I don't think there's a huge compelling reason to make the

2:26:49

change any further

2:26:55

comments so do we have a consensus to delete or to retain the original

2:27:03

language of allow and delete the insert of encourage on those two

2:27:18

items okay okay

2:27:23

511 anyone feel like we need a formal vote I do

2:27:28

not you're saying we're it is very confusing to understand what's actually being voted on here

2:27:35

we're changing this to encourage no we were not we were keeping okay I think

2:27:42

there's a double negative or something that had me confused I'm not an abstention I am an

2:27:47

allow okay so it's 61

2:27:55

great okay any other specific uh minor items

2:28:01

that are worthy of

2:28:11

discussion okay so with that

2:28:17

um what we'll do this point we're working towards getting or

2:28:24

we want to get this these documents to a public review draft uh phase so that

2:28:30

they can go to the the public can consider the proposal at the community

2:28:36

Workshop that we're planning for in May um and so unless there are other um

2:28:43

unless the Planning Commission needs to have another look at this we can move this this draft forward to that

2:28:50

public review um stage um without coming back we don't necessarily need to come

2:28:57

back unless um there's desire for more discussion at this

2:29:02

point Victor does that mean that the April 10th meeting would be potentially

2:29:09

canceled is that right am I understanding that properly uh there would probably we still have some other

2:29:16

items that would be on the agenda um but this would not come back on the April

2:29:22

10th meeting the next touch on this the Planning Commission would have on the housing element stuff um both the

2:29:28

housing element and the land use consistency amendments that would be in May when we come back from the community

2:29:36

Workshop but April 10th would still probably be

2:29:49

scheduled so it sounds like I I'm not seeing anybody clamoring for more discussion on April 10th

2:29:57

um a motion Adam uh we don't need a motion but if you wanted to make one

2:30:02

it'd be great um but we're we're gonna move so we can just move forward with

2:30:07

this as the public review draft um I'll get it cleaned up and and ready for public consumption and then um and then

2:30:16

like I said after that Community Workshop we can come back to the um we'll come back to the overall comp plan

2:30:22

update um and respond to those comments we might get so we still we still have a little bit more process but for the next

2:30:30

meeting we get a pass on housing yeah so will you show will you circulate the

2:30:35

draft before you send it out to the public so we can just make sure all the changes have been Incorporated yeah I can I can share that

2:30:42

with the group um offline just to make sure that everything's in there yeah

2:30:47

that'd be a good good idea mhm

2:30:53

okay great thanks thank you very much ad that was a uh a quick turnaround on all

2:30:59

the comments uh I thought the the questions were all answered quite well

2:31:05

and you did a great job and we appreciate your efforts I assume there were a few long nights in

2:31:11

there just a few yeah all right thanks everyone yeah thank

2:31:17

you okay other business Allison do you have a report yeah just a

2:31:24

brief one um so kind of following up on what Victor was just asking about for April 10th um what we're planning for

2:31:31

April 10th and 17th the next two meetings is to bring back some of the

2:31:37

remaining pieces of a land use element that need further review um namely that's the climate action stuff that we

2:31:43

talked about a couple meetings back as well as there's some parks and open

2:31:49

space policies in in there that we're going to be pulling into um a new parks element along with a reference to the

2:31:55

pros plan it's a lot of PS um so we'll be putting together some

2:32:03

initial drafts to give you that first briefing on those on the 10th and then

2:32:10

give you a chance to make comments and come back on the 17th for any amendments

2:32:15

and changes to that um I also wanted to update you remember how much I said

2:32:20

about this last week um The Parks and Recreation Commission and the open space

2:32:27

trust have been hard at work on the park zone discussion they've actually

2:32:32

bifurcated that into two separate things they're now talking about doing an open space Zone which would cover the open

2:32:39

space properties the ones that are exclusively open space and then later

2:32:44

they will come back to do a park zone that would cover the more active use

2:32:51

Parks as well as the ones that are a combination of active use and open space um so they're trying to take what's

2:32:57

hopefully the easier piece first with open space um there seems to be a little more consensus about what kind of

2:33:04

regulations are appropriate for that um and they're hoping to kind of home in on

2:33:11

their draft by well before May 8th and they would be bringing that recommendation to the Planning

2:33:17

Commission on May 8th um for incorporation into the comprehensive Plan update and then that other piece

2:33:25

the park zone that covers the active parks would be dealt with later I think

2:33:30

the commission the PRC would continue to work on that through this year their

2:33:36

recommendation might not be ready until the end of the year or next year depending on how long that takes so that

2:33:42

would have to be dealt with on a separate track from the comp plan so that' probably be wrapped in to work in

2:33:50

2025 it it may or may not need an additional comprehensive plan Amendment

2:33:55

so if it does that would be included in the 2025 annual update to the comp

2:34:01

plan um so I mean I think there's this is still a little fluid things could change but that's the direction that

2:34:07

things are going with the PRC right now and I just wanted to give you an update um so you know what to expect in terms

2:34:15

of what's coming back um the final thing on that is they did determine that a

2:34:20

land use map Amendment will be needed um there's currently land use designations

2:34:26

for open space and Parks which we want to maintain but they've shuffled around

2:34:31

some of the a few properties that need to flip-flop from one or the other so

2:34:37

I'm meeting with folks from the parks team and our GIS team tomorrow actually to start going through the mapping and

2:34:43

getting that all nailed down um I'm not sure yet if we'll bring that land use map Amendment in April along with the

2:34:51

other land use element issues that we need to deal with or if we'll just hold that for when things come back from the

2:34:56

pr PRC in May but either way um that that little piece with the Landy map

2:35:02

will be coming as well so that's kind of what's on the horizon um like Adam mentioned we're

2:35:08

also working hard to plan the May 1st um open house we have a consultant on board

2:35:14

to help us prepare materials and boards that Summarize each element and have

2:35:19

some interactive components for the community members attending um we're also going to have an

2:35:24

online survey launch in parallel with that event so people can either complete the survey while

2:35:32

they're there or if they're unable to attend they could do the survey as a standalone thing

2:35:38

um yeah so there's a lot in the works right now it's very busy but that's kind

2:35:43

of brief summary of what's coming up in the next couple months any questions uh yes yeah so should we be

2:35:52

looking for meetings on the 10th 17th and 24th uh at this point we're not planning

2:35:57

on having a meeting on the 24th we're planning to cancel that one um to give staff some time to prepare for the May 1

2:36:03

event so I can take that off the calendar uh

2:36:11

Andy um just for clarification the land use map changes when you talked about

2:36:16

the parks and the open space swap if you will um is that just kind of a clerical

2:36:23

update or are you actually potentially reassigning properties to different it

2:36:28

would reassign a handful of properties like for example I don't know which

2:36:36

actual Park names will be moving but there's some that are currently designated as Park that will need to

2:36:41

move to open space and there's some that are currently designated as open space that will need to move to park and what

2:36:47

they're trying to do there is only include the ones that are exclusively open space in that open space

2:36:53

designation and Zone and then anything that's mixed or has active uses will be in the park

2:37:03

zone so it sounds sounds like the thought of there being a highly

2:37:10

compressed schedule to deal with the park stuff is a thing in the past yeah I

2:37:16

think the PRC pretty quickly realized that

2:37:21

that they were going to need more time to figure out what kind of development

2:37:26

regulations would be appropriate for the more active parks and that there's a pretty big range in terms of what's

2:37:33

going on in those parks and it wasn't going to be easy to draft something and they they asked for more time on that

2:37:39

and so that's how the strategy of kind of separating the two out came about

2:37:46

yeah makes sense okay any other

2:37:53

questions okay the next meeting will be a special

2:37:58

meeting and is scheduled for Wednesday April 10 at 6: PM there being no other

2:38:04

business to come before the Planning Commission time is now 8:44 pm and the

2:38:10

meeting is adjourned don't we have a don't we have

2:38:15

some amendments that are being chair we have planned absences we need

2:38:21

to discuss uh oh that's right we do I'm sorry I missed that uh let's do planned

2:38:28

absences and then let's deal I believe um Carolyn has something to

2:38:35

propose uh I will be absent on April

2:38:41

10th anyone else I think as I told you guys before

2:38:47

I'm going to be gone from the 28th of April through

2:38:53

the 23rd of May I had no idea how many things I was going to miss

2:38:59

so B I am out of town on April 10th if you

2:39:07

are lacking a quorum I could be made available but I am on vacation with my

2:39:15

family sound like we'll have one

2:39:20

okay Carolyn I saw spring break isn't that week spring break it is

2:39:30

yeah I'm just gonna be absent thanks okay uh Carolyn I saw late today that

2:39:37

there was an email from you I was not able to look at it thoroughly uh but um

2:39:44

yes I understand you have something to discuss yes have a couple motions uh

2:39:51

that I'd like to make um this is in regard to the council's recent vote to

2:39:59

request a proposal from the city manager for reconstituting the Planning

2:40:05

Commission to four hired and paid Commissioners who would not necessarily

2:40:12

be Mercer and citizens and three volunteer planning

2:40:17

Commissioners um and so this is something that's being um worked on now

2:40:23

and will be considered by the council going forward possibly as soon as April

2:40:29

2nd um so I listened to the council's

2:40:34

presentation or or discussion of this matter and there were two reasons

2:40:40

provided by the council as to why this was proposed one was the ability of the

2:40:47

Planning Commission to Pro process the work before them uh fast

2:40:53

enough okay and the other one was uh a question as to the quality of our

2:40:59

work so um the the this proposal is being

2:41:07

considered in on the basis of this commission right now occupied by us

2:41:14

Commissioners and so I think that it would be a good idea we have not been asked about any of

2:41:20

these things that I'm aware of you know or there's I don't believe there's been discussion in regards to how could

2:41:28

things be faster or or or how could things be of a higher quality and and

2:41:33

what quality is it that's being determine what does that term mean so um I am want to make a couple motions

2:41:41

to try to um investigate our speed and whether

2:41:48

we can do things faster and exactly what is meant by a question of as to the

2:41:54

quality of our work so I will make the first motion um I move that the

2:42:01

commission form a subcommittee to examine commission processes for the

2:42:07

purpose of making recommendations to the commission and staff ways to process our work more

2:42:15

efficiently the subcommittee would provide recommendations to the commission

2:42:20

at our special hybrid meeting on April 10th 2024 when the topic would be placed

2:42:25

on our agenda following review of the topic the commission would make recommendations if

2:42:32

any to staff to improve commission productivity so that's the

2:42:40

motion I'll second it

2:42:47

okay shall I speak the motion any further or um well if you have more to

2:42:53

more to say go ahead Ken okay so just I've explained the context for making

2:42:59

the mo motion and the specific language of it is just to um get a smaller group

2:43:06

to discuss um our processes and kind of

2:43:13

independent from the staff just kind of amongst ourselves as to what is there anything we could do to be faster we

2:43:20

have a huge workload this is not our fault and you know and but is there anything we can do

2:43:27

we've never been asked you know and I don't believe we've ever had a serious

2:43:32

discussion about it so let's let's brainstorm and

2:43:38

um do this rather promptly and um see if there's anything

2:43:44

we want to offer so um that's the reason for the motion

2:43:50

uh Chris yeah you I like the idea you know of you know having a examination of

2:43:56

how we do things and try to do things better I guess for me it's the cart before the horse a little bit I think I'd want to find out what the council's

2:44:02

up to and whether or not uh I mean if they're going to rechange this anyway I'm not sure I want to put a lot of time

2:44:08

into a new process for a commission that doesn't exist anymore so you know I think uh I'm sort of more inclined along

2:44:15

the lines of your second motion Carolyn that uh tries to figure out uh you know

2:44:21

are there things we can do to to to if there is some dissatisfaction on the council side to address their concerns

2:44:31

um uh Kate yeah I've been thinking about this

2:44:38

uh a lot and um I I appreciate the idea for sure I agree with commissioner GS

2:44:45

that um it's preemptive and it could really in my opinion uh based on regular

2:44:51

work with elected officials it could really backfire um uh from a political standpoint um you

2:45:00

know trying to get out ahead of their process could um could be considered uh

2:45:07

I don't know if uh what's the word ordinance

2:45:12

something what's the word when you in politic well in politic for sure

2:45:19

impolitic but also um subversive or I don't know something along those lines there a word that I can't find

2:45:25

insubordinate insubordinate exactly I think it could be considered insubordinate considering we are

2:45:31

um voted in by the council you know getting ahead of them and I in my

2:45:36

opinion um you know it might be better to just

2:45:42

reach out to electeds uh informally and and I

2:45:49

don't know that's just my opinion and um the other thing I want to say is that I do think I do think we have been given

2:45:56

some guidance um so I don't think that's totally fair um we got a big training on Robert's Rules and we are not following

2:46:02

it and and one of the things that we are definitely not following is um and Deb

2:46:09

took a lot of time to explain some of these things to us and other trainers took a lot of time to explain these

2:46:14

things to us that this is not supposed to be a discussion forum person in the way that we are running it um we have

2:46:21

some flexibility um but if we if we were following Robert's Rules there'd be a lot less um cross talk you'd State your

2:46:28

opinion and if someone else stated a different opinion you wouldn't revisit and reiterate your opinion I think we do

2:46:34

a lot of um repetition of our statements um after someone said something

2:46:40

different so um I think just generally and and I am 100% including myself as

2:46:47

part of the problem there um um but but I think we were given a training at

2:46:52

expense to the city and we're not following it so I think to be fair um we've got to acknowledge that so I I'm

2:46:59

in in favor of seeing what the um council members come up with

2:47:05

and that's my opinion yeah Carolyn one thought I had

2:47:13

um in listening to your motion is that if the Council was interested in us

2:47:21

giving them suggestions on how we could improve they would have asked

2:47:30

us and as far as I know they didn't um

2:47:35

so I think I agree with Kate that that a better approach would be if you're

2:47:42

curious um to reach out in informally um

2:47:48

and in what the background is for this and maybe what the facts are I myself have a

2:47:54

lot of questions about how the the new or a reconstituted Planning Commission

2:48:00

would operate given the the general outline that was given um and I think

2:48:09

it's be very difficult to implement that Vision um but um but it may be that the

2:48:18

council is um you know if they're interested in a more professional analytical look at

2:48:27

planning issues um the approach is has some Merit

2:48:34

frankly um if they're looking for citizen input um you know

2:48:40

they're um they're cutting that back substantially um but that's that could

2:48:47

be a model that that might serve them um it would sort of duplicate staff effort

2:48:53

to a degree um but they'll have to sort through that if they decide to do

2:49:00

that so I would I would not be in favor of your first

2:49:08

motion any other comments Carolyn um no I appreciate the

2:49:14

feedback that that everyone provides um I don't know when or if the council will

2:49:20

make a decision on this and whether anything that we would um you know

2:49:25

figure out amongst ourselves to express uh would occur before or after but I I

2:49:30

take all of your your input and I think it's a good discussion I appreciate

2:49:36

it do we vote on the motion or do you want to withdraw I'd take a vote

2:49:45

sure de uh commissioner

2:49:51

Gils

2:49:56

May commissioner accuse n commissioner rashis

2:50:05

n Vice chair rigb

2:50:10

stain commissioner bazo

2:50:15

nay uh commissioner Bozman yeah and Sher Murphy

2:50:25

n okay the motion fails um

2:50:34

511 you have a second one Carolyn I do have a second motion

2:50:39

okay I move that the commission direct the chair to request dialogue with the council for the purpose of ascertaining

2:50:46

what the council considers good or poor quality products in the course of Performing our assigned

2:50:53

tasks the chair would report the discussion providing it has occurred to the commission at our special hybrid

2:50:59

meeting on April 10th 2024 when the topic would be on our agenda for

2:51:04

information purposes second

2:51:10

discussion sure um I propose this

2:51:15

because it has been um asserted by council members

2:51:23

that the products that we come up with are are not of the quality that

2:51:29

they would like but I don't believe we've ever heard from the council as to what

2:51:39

considers good quality work are they looking for us to simply try to ascertain what they want and give them

2:51:45

something they would agree with would that be good quality or what what is what is the complaint about our work and

2:51:53

this is something that I think

2:51:59

is something that regardless of their

2:52:04

decision would be a very worthwhile discussion for us to have and you know

2:52:12

um and I don't mean to put you on the spot in particular chair you just happen to be the chair but I I think it's a

2:52:19

discussion that if the council is not reaching out to us but is yet declaring

2:52:25

in a public meeting that our work is of not the quality that they want and they

2:52:31

did not call it you know said it was not good um boy wow I'd really like to know

2:52:37

what that's about because um like all of you I have dedicated

2:52:42

incredible numbers of hours to this and I don't even know what that complaint is about it's sure like to know so anyway

2:52:50

that's the reason for proposing this I think it would be a positive discussion for us for the community and I think it

2:52:58

would be helpful to the council too it's a big thing that they're proposing a

2:53:04

very big thing uh Chris yeah I think it'd be good

2:53:09

to get some input from the council I guess the question is how best to do it and I guess Mike if you felt like be

2:53:15

helpful for you to have a mandate from us to go forward and chat with him then know I might be inclined to go with the motion on the other hand you know the

2:53:23

alternative to reach out to people informally I just actually sent a note to a couple councilmen said what the

2:53:28

hell's going on um you know it's another way to do it but I think it's something to try to figure out and I guess I'd

2:53:35

be interested to hear from you uh chair if if you you know would relish the

2:53:41

opportunity to go forward with chat with them with our backing or just as least have you know other means for us toy to

2:53:48

gather intelligence

2:53:53

Adam um yeah I'm in support of this motion um I think yeah it it would be

2:54:00

good to know what where that um why why it's being labeled as bad um and I think

2:54:07

it would help us as a commission to give a deliver a better work product if no change is made it would help the

2:54:14

commission or sorry the the city council if a change is made to to well that you

2:54:20

know justify that change as you mentioned as I think it was chair Murphy who mentioned that's

2:54:26

removing um you know a public input majority from the Planning Commission

2:54:32

which is a big change so you know at least they could document the reason why

2:54:37

that was done so I think yeah I think it's a win-win and I think yeah it's I think it's preferable to having both

2:54:45

meet together because that's a huge cost of everyone's time and I think it's a little more I think because they've you

2:54:52

know there is that formal direction to investigate it I think there's ought to be some formal documentation on how we

2:54:59

can improve um even if the structure does not change so I'll I'll vote for this

2:55:06

one okay any other comments Carolyn is that an old hand oh yes I'm sorry

2:55:14

yeah yeah I just um I I I feel like that process is going to

2:55:20

happen anyway and and I really appreciate the spirit of this um but my

2:55:26

preference just based on my experience dealing with elected officials um I

2:55:33

think this too could backfire but that's just my experience and my perspective I do really appreciate the spirit of this

2:55:38

one um and I I kind of want to vote for it but I think I'm going to have to say no

2:55:43

because of I think the risk of doing it that way as opposed to um

2:55:49

plus formally um I think it could be pretty high because um people run for office

2:55:57

and uh there's some prison elist streats associated with that and I'll leave it

2:56:02

at that yeah I think what you're getting at Kate is that it with a uh mandate as it

2:56:11

were to speak to them it looks more like a power struggle than an inquiry

2:56:21

Angie yeah I think I would well you know I want to acknowledge I I think bringing

2:56:27

it up especially in a public forum where this is being recorded and everyone can go back and watch I mean I think it

2:56:32

takes a lot of courage to ask for the feedback and try and formalize the

2:56:38

request um I've appreciated everybody's comments here because I could sit down in any number of chairs um and one of

2:56:45

the things I'm really learning in life I being a 47y old person who just keeps

2:56:51

learning new lessons um some of these situations tend like I've gotten better

2:56:59

information uh when I start one-on-one and I start more informally uh people

2:57:05

are a little more willing to tell me probably what they don't want to say in public if there's some important things

2:57:10

that they need to tell me which I've appreciated I've also stuck my foot in my mouth by saying some things publicly

2:57:16

I wish I hadn't um so so I would love to give our elected officials who are

2:57:23

leading us an opportunity to talk to us maybe a little bit less formally if that

2:57:29

is of interest you know I also appreciate there's probably some other things going on that aren't necessarily captured in this discussion so uh I

2:57:36

think all of it is important um but I'm not inclined to like formally kind of

2:57:42

put a stake in the ground about it I'm more inclined to make a few phone calls and say hey what's up

2:57:49

I hear you Victor uh so I really have two minds here one is

2:57:57

feedback is always good um and regard regardless of the change the wheels grind slowly and so it

2:58:06

would always be good to hear how we can improve with that said I think um

2:58:11

commissioner bazo and commissioner accuse said both said something very uh important which is the word formal

2:58:19

um there is nothing chair Murphy that has prevented you from going and talking to the council and getting feedback

2:58:25

informally there's nothing that has prevented any of these Commissioners uh on this Council from

2:58:31

getting feedback informally as well and I think a formal request

2:58:37

um has has a different uh has a different vibe so I am not supportive of

2:58:45

this any further comments

2:58:56

okay D let's take a vote thank you

2:59:01

sir uh commissioner Bozman yes commissioner

2:59:08

Ries name commissioner GS nay chair

2:59:15

Murphy nay Miss bazo

2:59:20

nay Vice chair RAB yes and commissioner

2:59:26

accus n okay motion fails 5-

2:59:32

two um but that will not necessarily defer de uh detract me from uh talking

2:59:40

to appropriate people thank you so much everyone for your discussion about this appreciate it

2:59:47

very much and thank you Mike okay okay any further

2:59:56

business okay the next meeting is April 10 at 6 there are being no further business to come before the Planning

3:00:02

Commission the time is now 9:06 p.m and the meeting is adjourned uh please stay

3:00:09

in on screen until the Staff has terminated the broadcast good evening and thank you all for attending and