MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 28, 2003


9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

A Motion was made by William Matchett and seconded by Richard McConaughy that the Planning Commission approves the Minutes of November 26, 2002. Vote: Aye: 7; Nay: 0; Abstain: 1 (Mahan not appointed to the Planning Commission at this time.) Motion carried.

9:10 A.M.

- Work Study to review additional information regarding the South Kitsap UGA: ULID #6 Subarea Plan with County staff.

Chair Lary Coppola noted a letter that was received from the South Kitsap School District, (copies were given to each of the members at this meeting) commenting on ULID #6. He suggested that the members keep this letter until the public hearing on ULID #6. The members agreed to hold the letter until the public hearing.

Darryl Piercy said the purpose of this study session was to review the latest development regulations for ULID #6. He said a portion of the plan was reviewed about a year ago by the Planning Commission and following that, the Board of County Commissioners approved the text for ULID #6 and remanded portions of the plan back to the Planning Commission for modifications. He recounted that the Board of Commissioners wanted to see a Village Center concept addressed, so there
could be a mixed-use development within the context of the commercial area. He said that this would provide vehicle access and mixed-use to include residential and commercial co-existing together with some affordable housing goals included in this plan. In short, he continued, the Board of Commissioners wanted a different subarea plan in Kitsap County than has been developed in the past. He reported that in the course of developing this plan, there were some development codes presented to the Planning Commission and now there is a second option that would address even further the goals and policies set forth by the County Commissioners. He explained that the difference between these two plans was subtle, but in Option 2 there was higher predictability with the development regulations and the policies. By using Option 2, he continued, there will be some assurance that the goals and policies will be met.

William Matchett said that the Planning Commission has not received this draft.

Laura Ditmer passed out copies of the latest draft.

Darryl Piercy noted that the Prosecutors Office has reviewed this and made comment to the staff. He asked that the Planning Commission review the second option and staff will provide the members with a matrix comparing the 2 approaches.

John Ahl said that one of the suggestions made at a previous meeting on this plan, was that these designations be used universally throughout the County, however this plan still states ULID #6 on the heading.

Darryl Piercy agreed, and explained that staff was making “baby steps” on that approach, which he outlined for the members. He said that he hoped that the ULID #6 plan will become part of the overall goal and included with the other subarea plans in the County.

John Ahl said that he did not realize that this would be such a tremendous undertaking for the staff.

Darryl Piercy explained that staff would like to work with the community groups to ensure that these designations meet all of the requirements of the community plans and goals before it is included countywide.

Monty Mahan asked if the county would have to wait to approve the ULID #6 plan until the zoning designations are accepted countywide?

Darryl Piercy said that staff would not anticipate holding up the process since they would like this plan approved by the end of the year.
Lary Coppola asked if this plan would reduce the timeframe for the permitting process, from the start of the process until completion?

Darryl Piercy said that this would be very helpful and should save considerable time for the process.

Tom Nevins noted in the Urban Village Center on page 23 draft 2: “The total gross floor area devoted to commercial use in any one structure within the UVC zone shall not exceed 25,000 square feet.” He felt that was about the size of a football field and questioned whether that size could be excessive.

Darryl Piercy said that staff used the Neighborhood Commercial zoning as a comparison. He explained that in today’s market, 25,000 square feet would be the size of a grocery store about 35 years ago and gave comparisons of the new grocery store square footages. He said that staff felt that stipulation fit the “neighborhood” range because the larger retail stores are at least 50,000 square feet to 85,000 or 90,000 square feet at the high end. He said that staff would encourage stacking of buildings, but would prefer to have the upper floors used for residential.

Mike Gustavson said if the data showed that this was an unsuccessful store size, why was the County pursuing this?

Darryl Piercy said that it was only unsuccessful for the largest stores.

Laura Ditmer reiterated that the plan calls for the County to allow and encourage buildings up to 25,000 square feet for that very reason.

Mike Gustavson felt that this was not a workable concept.

Richard Brown said as a member of the committee, that they felt this stipulation would only be successful if this square footages would be allowed, noting that it could be used for several smaller business under one roof such as a flower shop and so forth as long as it did not exceed 25,000 square feet total.

Mike Gustavson noted that in the past, there was the mall concept; and he did not have trouble with a village under a lot of little roofs but he would favor the mall concept instead.

Richard Brown said the committee envisioned businesses that would serve the local neighborhood, not to attract customers from the whole County.

Mike Gustavson felt that this concept would not be workable.
Darryl Piercy said that staff has worked closely with the community committee to develop this plan and their preference was to create businesses for the local residents.

Mike Gustavson said he wanted to make sure that the developer could make a go of this concept.

Lary Coppola asked if the numbers pertaining to the square footage of buildings could be modified depending on the community?

Darryl Piercy said yes, this concept could be applied to “old town” Silverdale or Kingston for example.

Linda Niebanck asked if Darryl Piercy could give a brief review of this plan so that the members and those in the audience might understand this entire concept.

Deb Flynn said she would also like staff to review this plan for the members.

Laura Ditmer gave an overview of the plan explaining that on page 1 of the South Kitsap UGA/ULID #6 Sub-area Plan Draft 2, the parcel size would be reduced from 20 acres to 5 acres. She then explained the differences between Draft 4 and the latest plan Draft 2. She said staff has added new definitions that pertain to the new designations. When you get to the new land use designations, she continued, that would change the use table that refers to ULID #6 and the master planning requirement overlay. She reported that within ULID #6, master planning will be required for each individual zone but these zones would be appropriate countywide. She recounted that the committee expressed that they wanted maximum flexibility with predictability so that the community and developers will know where you will be in 5 and 10 years from now. She explained that staff was allowing just about everything that the committee suggested with the addition of a site plan review.

Tom Nevins asked if some of the terms that are used were necessary? He reported that the plan used terms such as: “in so far as is practicable” and so forth. On page 39, he continued, is it necessary to make that statement and is this appearing that there is more wiggle room that would be practicable with the CAO and so forth?

Laura Ditmer said that these would still need a review and analysis for CAO and wetlands and so forth. She said it would be more difficult to give specifics in a plan of this nature to make sure that every possible issue would be addressed.

Lary Coppola recounted that at a previous meeting, the members discussed the term “common open space worthy of preservation” and the Planning Commission struggled before on who determines that.
Laura Ditmer suggested that staff do some further research on this and get back to the Planning Commission at the next meeting.

Mike Gustavson said with predictably what is the term “reserved”?

Laura Ditmer said that staff was developing a town center concept. She said that a village would develop first, and then when the need becomes apparent, staff will build upon the village center concept to create the town center. She explained that until the additional population comes to this area these classifications that are marked as “reserve” would not be considered by staff. She said that at this time the population allotment would only be there for developing a village.

Lary Coppola asked when this Plan would go to public hearing?

John Ahl felt this has not be a very productive work session and he would like another work session before this Plan goes to a hearing.

William Matchett noted that there would be another work study session on this at the next meeting.

Laura Ditmer passed out the 2003 Planning Commission Work Plan.

Richard Brown felt that there should be a policy in the County that the Planning Commission receives information necessary for an upcoming meeting several days in advance of the meeting.

Richard McConaughy said that it appeared that McCormick Woods and the ULID #6 Plan is being put off by this latest Work Plan.

Linda Niebanck strongly expressed that the Kingston Plan is being moved way ahead of ULID #6, with a public hearing not scheduled until the March 25, 2003 Planning Commission meeting. She made it clear that the Findings of Fact should be presented at the meeting following this public hearing on April 1, 2003 and not extended until April 29, 2003.

Laura Ditmer attempted to explain that this process for ULID #6 needed to be included with the 2003 Comprehensive Plan process, following a determination by the County Prosecutor’s Office, so that was the reason that staff was adding the Kingston Plan in during February, 2003 in order to keep all of the subarea plans moving forward, so those could be gotten out of the way before the Comprehensive Plan amendment process began.

Linda Niebanck firmly disagreed with Laura Ditmer’s explanation.
Chair Lary Coppola brought a closure to the interaction and made it clear that these issues should be discussed outside of the meeting and suggested that staff and legal counsel work out a schedule for this process.

William Matchett said that he would like the ULID #6 Subarea Plan to come to the Planning Commission before the Kingston Plan.

Laura Ditmer felt that staff would not have the completed design guidelines before the date outlined in the Work Plan.

Lary Coppola felt that this Work Plan discussion should continue after the Public Hearing on the Short Plat Ordinance.

- Public Hearing to receive oral and written testimony regarding a proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Short Plat Ordinance, thereby allowing up to 9 lots.

Kelly Robinson said that there are three different versions of this staff report; the most current is dated January 28, 2003. He explained that what was before the Planning Commission was an ordinance amendment to take advantage of the state law. He said that currently there are very few applications for long subdivisions in this County and 2 to 3 hundred lots are created every year by this short plat process. He reported that this proposal has the approval of the Board of Commissioners and they have asked that this go forward to the Planning Commission for review, public hearing and recommendation. He noted that March 10, 2003 is the date that has been set for a public hearing before the Board of Commissioners on this ordinance amendment, so next week the staff would like the Planning Commission to make its decision on this matter. He explained that first of all the legislation that changed this law, stated that these short plats will occur only inside the Urban Growth Area (UGA), which makes a profound difference on how this process will occur. He defined the 2 different types of UGAs in this County; those that surround the cities of Port Orchard and Bremerton, and in Poulsbo, where, since there is an agreement between them and Kitsap County, the County will process these applications and review them with the city’s rules. If that same example were used in the future with Bremerton and Port Orchard, then these same rules would apply. He said that Silverdale and Kingston are unincorporated but are in a UGA. The second issue is the road standards, because for decades there has been the difference between short plats and different standards for the streets. One has to do with the access for fire district vehicles; but the code exempts short subdivisions up to 4 lots from this standard. He said that the County Public Works Department does not have a road standard for a short plat. Currently, he explained, in the short plat ordinance there is no standard, so if this ordinance is amended to allow 9 lots, the road standard should be the same as that of a Performance Based Development.

(PBD). He said that the same standard would apply to stormwater requirements with no changes. He further explained that there is a pre-planning requirement in the code that specifies that an acre when divided must accommodate at least 5 dwelling units in a UGA, which would continue apply. He said there would also be no change to the 5-year restriction to develop a short plat to the maximum, even though the applicant would increase the size of the plat. He explained that as the restrictions currently read, the 5-year restriction would be applied differently to short subdivisions – depending on whether they were originally created with four or more lots. He said that a short subdivision recorded with fewer than four lots could be further divided within the five-year period, but only up to four lots and not the 9 allowed in the code. He said the difference would be that if a short subdivision was recorded with four or more lots, they could not be further subdivided with five years.

John Ahl asked if the state law, which has generated this action, was aimed at UGAs that were next to a city?

Kelly Robinson said no, that was determined because of the way that Kitsap County developed.

John Ahl recounted that in the agreement with the City of Poulsbo, we used Poulsbo’s rules. He felt that Kitsap County was dodging the intent by using this just in certain areas.

Kelly Robinson said that will be different in the Findings of Fact which will be used to correct that.

Mike Gustavson said he had an issue on the fire requirements and suggested that fire flow be reviewed by the distance from the fire hydrant and not the amount of lots to the main road.

Kelly Robinson agreed and said that some developers would also put in sprinkler systems in the homes that were furthest from the fire hydrant.

Deb Flynn noted that the same road standards are required, but the only change would be that the 9 lots could go through review by staff without the public hearing process.

Kelly Robinson agreed and said that in exchange this is now reviewed by staff and then the roads would need not come up to the county road standards so it saves on the costs to the developer.

Deb Flynn asked how much public interest did the large-lot subdivisions receive?
Kelly Robinson said that few large-lot subdivisions are as small as 9 lots. He said that it would be up to the Planning Commission to determine whether the road standards should be approved or stricter standards with this change in the ordinance.

Tom Nevins expressed concern that this type of development would not meet the minimum density requirements that it should and questioned whether this would move the County in the direction of urban densities as required by the Growth Management Act. Also, he said that he would prefer the hammerhead turnaround for the lots as opposed to a cul-de-sac design.

Kelly Robinson reported that the pre-planning requirement was difficult for staff, which required that any building permit on a lot that could support more than 1 house go through pre-planning. He said if sewer is available it would work, but if it is not then a developer would not be allowed to develop all 9 lots in a short plat, which he gave examples of. He said he would like to work with the cities to make the sewers available to all the parcels in the UGAs, so that pre-planning would not be required. With connectivity with 9 lots in a cul-de-sac there would not be the road standards requirement, but with 9 lots this could eventually become a main street and he would hope that the cities would provide a shadow plan so that the County would know where this connectivity would be required. He said that the Public Works Department does not want more county roads that they would have to maintain and they would prefer that these within short subdivisions become private roads with a road maintenance agreement between the homeowners. He suggested that the road be built to county standards with a private maintenance agreement, so that in the future when this area was annexed to the city then the city could maintain it.

Tom Nevins asked in the short subdivision ordinance is there a way to prevent the creation of lots that are unbuildable?

Kelly Robinson said yes, if they were on septic then they would have to get a letter of approval from the Health District before the plat was recorded.

Mike Gustavson noted that in the past the developer would be required to build the road to county standards and then the county could take it over after it was completed.

Kelly Robinson said that would be good if they were building to the appropriate urban density, then it should be developed to county standards.

Mike Gustavson felt that there should be uniform standards between the County and the cities, because these are targeted for annexation in the future.
Kelly Robinson agreed.

Lary Coppola opened the floor for public testimony. He noted that there was a sign-up sheet available by the front doors for those who wished to give testimony and asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to speak and had not signed up? He then explained that each speaker would be given 5 minutes to speak and their names would be called in the order that they signed the form.

Ron Ross said this issue was very complex and as a developer he has not been platting property for many years because of the difficulty with the new laws required for short platting. He reported that he has begged the County for a number of years for the creation of a 9-lot subdivision, to direct more development within the UGAs and maintain the rural areas from build-out. He said that the developer would not go in and develop property into lots if it is too costly. He requested that the Planning Commission keep in mind that Poulsbo has an Interlocal Agreement with the County and their minimum density requirement is 4 units per acre; in the County it is 5 units per acre. He said that the other cities have no minimum density requirement, which makes the individual governments work against each other. He said that he has reviewed the latest edition of the road standards from the County Public Works Department, which may be from a state guideline. He felt this was an opportunity to do this in a productive way. He noted how to use the shoulders of the road in a low-impact development as an example. He felt that there should not be so many regulations.

Deb Flynn asked Ron Ross if he supported this ordinance amendment?

Ron Ross said the County should adopt the short plat ordinance without the additional regulations.

Kelly Robinson said that staff agreed with Mr. Ross and that this would apply to all UGAs.

John Ahl asked Ron Ross if the proposed ordinance amendment should be silent with regard to roads?

Ron Ross agreed.

John Taylor said that he has been working on a short plat for many years and it is nearly complete and he supported the 9-lot short subdivision amendment. He said he was constructing 2 adjacent 4-lot short plats to create 8 lots. He explained that in order to accommodate the short plats, he has brought in the sewer, water and cable TV from a location about 900 feet from the plat. He said that there would be a fire truck turnaround and a new fire hydrant. He was pleased with the assistance
provided from staff at the County. He felt that the most expensive part of doing this
plat was the stormwater control and he has tried to anticipate the needs of this plat 25
years down the road. He said he built a covered vault for the stormwater, which now
looks like a tennis court instead of a detention pond with a high fence around it. He
said that his road is private with maintenance agreements and monthly dues, making
this a self-contained private community.

William Matchett asked Mr. Taylor if this short plat would have been easier to build
and less costly with the amended short-plat process?

John Taylor felt that the cost would not change, but he could build another 3 lots after 5
years even though the entire infrastructure is in place now to develop these extra 3 lots.
He would like the law to be retroactive.

John Ahl asked if this ordinance amendment could be retroactive on this process?

Kelly Robinson said that there is no plan for this to be retroactive.

Richard Brown asked if there was a platting amendment to allow Mr. Taylor to build
the other lots without a public hearing process? He recommended staff investigate this
issue. He explained that the problem in Kitsap County was that there is no vacant
property within the UGA to short plat to 9 lots. He felt this issue is going to be more
complicated as time goes on. He felt certain that until the UGA is increased and the
County gets rid of the 5,000 square foot minimum lot size, this process would not work
to get development into the city. With roads, he continued, in order to finance a house,
there needs to be a road maintenance agreement in place. He said there is no
predictability with platting property in Kitsap County. He felt that this County was
sinking and the prices in the County are increasing rapidly. He said we need to come to
the real world; GMA is not working and affordable housing in this area has gone from
$110,000 to $170,000 and higher. He felt that the numbers would not pencil out.

Mike Gustavson asked how many parcels are available in the UGAs to do a 9-lot short
plat?

Richard Brown said that the County and cities do not know that amount.

Mike Gustavson noted the County map and questioned how many vacant lots were left.

Richard Brown said that there is only about 30% available land and 50% of that belongs
to the government and some large landowners.
John Taylor reviewed some of the problems he had getting the water, sewer and stormwater to the properties for the members.

Tom Donnelly said he was opposed to the 9-lot short subdivision and gave a handout to each of the members. He said that historically, the short plat began as a simple process to subdivide a parcel to facilitate the transfer of ownership to as many as four heirs in the succeeding generation. He said that traditionally, a 640-acre section could be split into four 160-acre parcels; the 160-acre parcel subdivided into four 40-acre plots and the 40-acre plots into two 20 or four 10 acre sites. He said that most recently these lots have been divided from 20 acres to 4 ½-acre sites; the 10 acres into four 2 ½ acre sites. He said that times have changed, the GMA requires that rural be rural and urban be urban. He reported the County urban low residential zoning requires at least five dwelling units and permits no more than nine on every acre. Because there are so few large parcels left in rural areas that can be divided into five-acre lots, the existing four-lot short subdivision statute has little remaining utility and the new nine-lot authority even less if rural zoning is observed. He felt the 9-lot subdivision has no applicability at all in Urban Medium or Urban High zones and should only be considered in unincorporated Urban Low zones. He said that in that zoning 9 dwelling units per acre are already permitted and services such as water, sewer, roads, sidewalks and other public facilities have standards already established. He felt that the actual outcome of this proposal would only: 1) Reduce density below the minimum 5 DU per acre making population allocation and public facility planning a farce; 2) Reduce the level of various public services; 3) Obviate applicable zoning; 4) Raise the price of housing; and 5) Reduce public scrutiny.

Mike Gustavson felt that if that short plat ordinance amendment created more land and more buyers, it would depress the price of housing.

Tom Donnelly said if there were 18 developable acres, under this proposal there might be 1 nine-lot subdivision of 2 acres each instead of 90 dwelling units. He suggested that if the landowner builds a house costing $500,000 on two acres he will not subdivide that property and that would bring up the price of the housing.

Art Castle of the Homebuilders Association said that they were in favor of the 9-lot subdivision and suggested low impact development should be encouraged with these subdivisions. He felt that this amendment would allow for some creativity for the builder. He said that the Homebuilders Association had conducted a study a few years back and the outcome of that study ascertained that the average price of a new home in unincorporated Kitsap County was $224,000 in 1999 and he felt that it would be closer to $250,000 in the current market.
John Ahl asked Mr. Castle if he was in favor of the inclusion of the road standards in the ordinance amendment?

Art Castle felt that private road standards were acceptable. He said with subdivisions, there are wide roads and streetscape but if you allow for more human oriented streetscape this may reduce the costs to the buyer. He felt if there were road standards and fire standards that this new provision for the 9-lot short subdivision will not be used often because it would be so expensive to construct.

Tom Nevins said he was struggling with the subdivision concept.

Art Castle explained that there are certain set costs for development and while the GMA encourages urban style growth there is a need to facilitate this short-subdivision process in order for this to happen. He felt that shortplatting 10 to 20 acres will not occur; it will likely be used only on the smaller acreages.

Mike Gustavson asked if there would be a limit on size so that the density level is achieved?

Art Castle said that there are multiple issues to answer that question.

John Ahl expressed that the Planning Commission was posing a lot of “what ifs”. He felt that the Planning Commission was facilitating what the County can do already and the members should focus on what could be done easier.

Art Castle said that developing the short plat was a very lengthy process that will take a minimum to 2 to 3 years to obtain a salable product.

Kelly Robinson noted that an administrative 9-lot short subdivision would be a much shorter process than the public hearing process that was currently in process in this County.

Ron Ross said that annexation process whereby the city can annex properties formerly a part of the County has been brought to a halt recently due to a court decision. He said that currently there is no opportunity to annex.

No further discussion being heard, Chair Lary Coppola closed the public hearing at 11:15 a.m.

Darryl Piercy reminded the members that the minimum densities are still in effect with a 4-lot short plat or a 9-lot short plat and gave some examples of this for the members. He explained that what this short plat process was directed at was those 1 to 1-1/2 acre parcels that have sewer and water and can be developed to the minimum
density requirements. He reported that those parcels larger than that size will still 
need to go through a planning process. He said that this amendment would not have a 
large impact on the Urban Growth Areas.

William Matchett asked if there were no sewer available to a site, would the 
applicant/developer still need to go through the pre-planning process?

Darryl Piercy said yes, preplanning would still be required. He said that to solve Mr. 
Donnelly’s concern would require that no development be allowed until sewer serves 
the property, but that was not a proposal for the Planning Commission to consider at 
this point. He reiterated that this amendment would only apply to a small amount of 
the lots.

Deb Flynn said that she understood the minimum density requirement with sewers, but 
if sewer was not available the lots could be clustered and use a community drainfield 
with open space.

Darryl Piercy agreed and explained that would be addressed with the applicant during 
the pre-planning process to create urban size lots.

Deb Flynn asked if the point about the clustering of homesites with the use of a 
community drainfield could be added to the short plat amendment?

Kelly Robinson noted the Performance Based Development (PBD) standard that would 
allow for lot clustering where the development may have half of the land in wetlands 
and so forth. With the PBD standard, he continued, that wetland area could be 
segregated off and be designated as open space. He said that the lots could also be sold 
in 2-lot plats with the home on 1 lot and the sewer on the other. He then gave examples 
of how those 1-acre lots were developed at this time.

Tom Nevins said that if this is used for 1- to 1 ½-acre lot subdivisions he does not see 
that written in this amendment process and he would like clustering requirements 
included limiting the lot size.

Kelly Robinson said that could be added to the ordinance.

Monty Mahan asked if there were minimum standards for roads could that be required 
in the ordinance amendment?

Kelly Robinson said that there is a county standard now for private roads.

Jim Barnard if the County Public Works Department said that the road standards are 
for rural areas and these were UGAs.
Tom Donnelly said that he would like the County to require urban level density in urban areas.

Kelly Robinson said he would get the ordinance drafted and to the Planning Commission members on Thursday, January 30, 2003.

John Ahl said he would like to retain the option of allowing the Planning Commission to approve or revise the proposed ordinance at the next meeting or on February 25, 2003.

- Review the **2003 Planning Commission Work Plan** with County staff.

Laura Ditmer explained that what staff was attempting to do was to complete the Kingston Plan, SKIA and ULID #6 to get them finished up prior to the 2003 Comprehensive Plan amendment process and each of these plans were driven by various internal forces. She explained that the issue that came up earlier with Linda Niebanck and ULID #6 was that it was neck and neck with the legislative decisions and whether this subarea plan needed to go through the Comprehensive Plan process, which ULID #6 will need to do. Our legal counsel and McCormick’s have discussed this. She felt that this has been made very clear to McCormick Land Company. She then explained when the Comprehensive Plan process would begin for this year, noting there was a gap between April and mid-May for time for a bit of a review by staff and Interim Rural Forest and the Buildable Lands may come forward during that time.

Lary Coppola reported that the Buildable Lands Study addresses Kitsap County properties up to the year 1999 and asked if there was way to fast forward that process so that the Planning Commission would have the numbers from the current year to work with?

Laura Ditmer said that staff was working on additional information on the Buildable Lands Study, which should be brought forward in the spring.

Lary Coppola suggested that staff jump forward to 2002 and skip the years 2000 and 2001.

Laura Ditmer explained that the Study could skip years 2000 and 2001, however that shows the trends in the County so it may be useful for the deliberation process that the Planning Commission will be going through.

Mike Gustavson said he would like to see a map of what land would be available to build on now.
Laura Ditmer reported that staff is working with a citizens group on the Buildable Lands Study and hopefully within the month staff would get back to the Planning Commission for an update on this. She said the capacity analysis would address the current buildable lands available.

The members then discussed what would be included in the next Buildable Lands Study.

Laura Ditmer said that under South Kitsap Industrial Area there is a process to move forward with the overall planning process. She explained some of the information that will be presented at the next meeting on ULID #6. She noted that at the present time there were no items scheduled for discussion at the May 6 meeting, so there might be room to bump a meeting to a later date, if necessary.

No further discussion, the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

DOCUMENTS DISCUSSION AT MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Copy of the tandem short plats for John Taylor and Rampart Ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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