

Direction: CITY1524.DSS

Chairperson Erickson called the regular meeting of the Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 29, 2016, in the Council Chambers of the West Des Moines City Hall, located at 4200 Mills Civic Parkway, in West Des Moines.

Roll Call: Andersen, Costa, Crowley, Erickson, Hatfield.....Present
Brown, Southworth.....Absent

Item 1 - Consent Agenda

Item 1a - Minutes of the meeting of February 16, 2016

Chairperson Erickson asked for any comments or modifications to the February 16, 2016 minutes.

Moved by Commissioner Crowley, seconded by Commissioner Hatfield, the Plan and Zoning Commission approve the minutes of the February 16, 2016 meeting.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Crowley, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Southworth.....Absent

Motion carried.

Item 2 – Public Hearings

There were three Public Hearing items on the agenda.

Item 2a – Ordinance Amendment — Amend Title 4 (Health and Safety Regulations) and Title 9 (Zoning) to establish regulations pertaining to solar energy systems - City Initiated – AO-002916-2015

A memo from Staff was provided to the Commissioners noting that additional written public comment had been received on the proposed Solar Energy Systems ordinance.

Chairperson Erickson opened the public hearing and asked the Recording Secretary to state when the public notice was published. The Recording Secretary indicated that the notice was published in the Des Moines Register on November 27, 2015 and was continued from the December 7, 2015 meeting to the February 29, 2016 Plan and Zoning Commission meeting.

Chairperson Erickson asked for a motion to accept and make a part of the record all testimony and all other documents received at this public hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Hatfield, seconded by Commissioner Andersen, the Plan and Zoning Commission accept and make a part of the record all testimony and all other documents received at this public hearing.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Crowley, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Southworth.....Absent

Motion carried.

Development Coordinator Schemmel provided that solar systems are currently not allowed in the City as they are not addressed in City Code. The City recently received two separate applications for solar energy system installations, one ground and one roof mounted. A series of discussions took place at three subcommittee meetings and during a council workshop regarding solar systems at which time staff

was directed to draft a proposed ordinance.

Ms. Schemmel continued that in the workshop process there was not a strong consensus on how to regulate solar system life safety provisions. Staff has determined that the ordinance needs to consider basic life safety and has drafted language within the ordinance to address building regulation, fire access, electrical codes, and to deal with systems when their useful life had been reached.

Also, based on discussions from the workshop, the proposed ordinance is intended to be a framework to begin conversation and a starting point for regulations taking into consideration existing residences and development concerns. Ms. Schemmel stated that Staff is ready to craft the appropriate language after public comment and present the Commission's recommendation to City Council.

Ms. Schemmel continued by discussing the specifics of the two solar system categories: Building mounted and Ground Mounted systems. Both are intended to produce energy, thermal and electric, for the user of the property. Staff purposely left out addressing utility scale energy systems as it would be too confusing at this time, especially as the use would be regulated differently. Discussion continued on height, location, and how to mitigate appearance of the solar system while providing options for City residents.

Building Mounted Systems are defined as a system attached to a building and would only be allowed at the roof surface area. It was proposed that the building and fire codes be complied with including access pathways to ensure the fire department could have access to the roof surface. If possible, the mounted system would be integrated within the structure as much as possible and would be limited to one foot above the roof surface for sloped roofs and flat roofs would be limited to seven feet from the roof surface. Solar panels would need to be arranged in a consistent manner and the equipment and framework will need to be a color similar to the surrounding building materials.

Ground Mounted Systems – Ground mounted systems are defined as systems not mounted on a building. Ms. Schemmel stated that the bulk density requirements for accessory structure would be followed for ground mounted systems, except the size of the system would be limited to half the allotment allowed for accessory structures. The following options would be available for screening of visible systems: completely enclose the framework, install a screen wall, or staff noted an option in the staff report of the ability to the use plant materials to lessen the visual impact of the system.

Commissioner Hatfield inquired that since the City has no solar ordinance are the existing systems considered non-conforming. Ms. Schemmel responded that they would have proceeded without going through a City approval process. The City does have solar panels on the Historic City Hall building which was reviewed through a Site Plan review process as mechanical equipment.

Commissioner Hatfield asked if existing systems would be grandfathered in. Ms. Schemmel stated that to be grandfathered and considered legal non-conforming, they would have needed to be allowed by the code of the governing jurisdiction when they were installed. Moving forward, it would depend on which regulations were adopted, these systems may comply and thus not be considered non-conforming. Without a solar ordinance, since these were installed without approval, they would be considered illegal. The City does not intend to take initiate action to remove systems installed prior to the ordinance.

Chairperson Erickson asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak to this item.

Claire Celsi, 4400 EP True Parkway, West Des Moines, specifically spoke to solar ground arrays stating that they represent a progressive community. She continued that we get use to “ugly” such as utility boxes, old swing sets, etc. and that people choose their community based on solar energy. It would make the City's housing market more competitive if the solar ground arrays were unimpeded by regulation. Also, the City needs to “think big” as solar energy increases in use and popularity across the

country. She commented on the environmental impacts of having a free and open solar market that reduces the carbon footprint which is extremely important.

Robert Bernard, 3920 Patricia Drive, Urbandale, stated that in 2014 he installed 15 solar panels on his roof. They were so helpful on his environmental footprint and energy costs that he added 9 more panels in 2015; thus, he now has 24 solar panels on his roof. The panels were designed and built in the United States as it was important to Mr. Bernard to support the local economy. He also commented that his panels do not match his roof, and that there are gaps between panels as installers had to work around roof vents. He has only received positive comment regarding his solar panels which are very visible. He wanted staff to understand that during his travels he has seen solar panels all over the country on the ground and on top of hotels/motels which were quite visual. After reading the proposed City ordinance, he stated that he found the details to be tremendously complex.

Thomas Rinehart, 214 S 83rd Street, West Des Moines, applauded staff for their progressive role in addressing solar panel systems. He commented that some cities have allowed solar systems without requiring permit fees, regulations, and paperwork, but have had an engineer review plans and waive the fee. The City should encourage mitigating citizen expense. He felt that the City's proposed ordinance was tremendously arduous to read through, and he could still not determine if screening was required for roof systems. In general, he felt that accessory structures should be allowed and the City should encourage a thoughtful design, as well as encourage conversations amongst neighbors rather than enforce screening. Solar systems should be treated as Direct TV or play structures that do not require screening. His last comment was that solar panels have an inherent value that should be respected.

Kathy Stalford, 2225 S 7th Drive, West Des Moines, stated that she was a tree hugger and a wild life rehabilitator, that she does not need solar power, but wants to invest in solar power as it is the right thing for the environment. She commented that the article in the Des Moines Register stated that West Des Moines would have the strictest regulations in the country. Development Coordinator Schemmel responded that this would not be the case. Ms. Stalford continued that she was in favor of solar energy as it has so much less impact on the wildlife, and also federal and state incentives would be available. She asked that the regulations be made as easy to comply with as possible.

Scott Whitney, 2491 Scenic Valley Drive, West Des Moines, stated that he and Nick Wiese with Ideal Energy were the petitioners to build an auxiliary structure ground mounted array which was mentioned in the Des Moines Register solar energy article. He stated that he was in favor of renewable energy and mentioned that 30% of the cost would be eligible for federal credits. Mr. Whitney stated that locating a system on his house roof was not an option. He continued that his property was unique as it backed up to woods and had a 1/3 acre lot where a system could be installed. He stated that the system he would install was supported by his neighbors. A key component in the ordinance was the seven foot height limitation. He provided that his system would only have panels and four legs with four braces on his proposed system and that the 7 foot height restriction would create the need for a design change and reduce energy in the winter. He felt that the City was putting aesthetics over production and did not understand why a system would be acceptable on a carport, but not located on poles. He added that evergreen shrubs would be an excellent option and should be considered.

Jacqueline Rickenaw, 811 Burr Oaks Drive, stated she read the article in the newspaper and has experience with solar panels. She specifically addressed ground mounted systems and indicated that seven feet does not work as it was not high enough. As long as the poles matched the building material and did not interfere with the intent purpose, she thought the height should not be limited to seven feet. She continued that this was a great opportunity for West Des Moines to set the pace for the rest of the state. It was suggested that only the basics be identified in the proposed ordinance.

Roy Chambers, 7126 Orton Avenue, Urbandale, requested that awnings and other structures over decks be considered and included in the ordinance. He stated that solar panels can allow light to filter through

and collect energy from the top and the bottom.

Chairperson Erickson asked if anyone else from the audience wanted to speak, seeing none, declared the public hearing closed, and asked if there was continued discussion or a motion.

Commissioner Hatfield commended staff for their efforts on a potential ordinance. He commented that the letter from Jim Miller, Valley Junction Foundation Executive Director, touched upon key points regarding the establishment guidelines with flexibility. The information provided at the dais tonight from the Iowa Environmental Council raised a number of excellent points, some of which were addressed, but many were not. Commissioner Hatfield indicated that the background on how the regulations were determined may want to be addressed in the draft ordinance.

Development Coordinator Schemmel commented that the seven foot height was arrived by assuming a three feet of clearance for snow. There are basically two different panel heights, using the taller panel and the optimum angle based on latitude for West Des Moines determined the 7 foot height for the system based on a single row array. Mr. Whitney proposed a double stacked array and had two rows of panels which resulted in the change in his proposed system to meet the height requirement. Staff is open to discussing modifications to the regulations as the Commission feels is appropriate.

Commissioner Hatfield stated that it would be helpful if pages in the ordinance were numbered for quick reference purposes. He stated that the first page dealing with solar energy systems referred to solar access and a property owners' right to have sunlight shine on their land. He asked for an elaboration and how would an ordinance address a situation when landscaping after a few years may inhibit a solar system from functioning.

Ms. Schemmel provided that state law enables cities to establish ordinances to protect solar access, but this is not a requirement. Within this proposed ordinance, it states that it would be the property owner's obligation to protect their solar rights, and that the City would not institute any kind of protection. If when installing an array, there was concern with future landscaping or building interference, a private agreement would need to be pursued with the adjacent property owner to obtain a no-build easement agreement to protect their rights.

Commissioner Hatfield stated that the 50% of the allowed area for accessory structures on a specific property requirement is concerning. Ms. Schemmel stated that the 50% does not refer to the allowed area on a roof, but to ground mounted systems which is stated as the percentage of the allowed accessory structure size and is proportional to the lot size. If it was determined that the 50% was not appropriate, staff could recommend a change, but Staff would not recommend an increase over what is already allowed for an accessory structure based on the necessity that the solar system be ancillary to the primary use for the property.

Ms. Schemmel went through questions that surfaced based on public comments. One concern was having to match the house. The screening materials would not have to match the house just be compatible with the material on the primary structure. The ordinance is requiring for roof mounted systems, that the frame, not the equipment, be similar to the color of the adjacent building materials. There has been concern with achieving consistent layout on the roof which minimizes the visual impact of the system. As of now, there is no screening requirement for the roof mounted systems but there is a requirement on slope roof systems to be no more than a foot off of the roof surface to help integrate their appearance with the roof surface. Ground mounted systems will only require screening of those portions visible from the street or adjacent property. Thus, if you cannot see the system from the surrounding property or street, no screening is required. Staff is open to discussing changes in either the height or appearance of the solar energy system. Ms. Schemmel mentioned that screening regulations for satellite systems contained in City Code are different as these systems are governed under FCC requirements.

Commissioner Erickson stated that there are many issues, and he realized that staff would like to work through a process to craft an ordinance for City Council. He asked the Commission if it was resolvable and could it be accomplished at this meeting tonight so a recommendation could be conveyed to City Council.

Commissioner Hatfield thought the letter received from Cindy Lane, Energy Policy Specialist, had merit and suggested that staff meet with her to go over a number of issues which could then be brought back to the next Plan and Zoning meeting. Commissioner Hatfield specifically noted the concern with aesthetics which would significantly impact the ordinance.

Commissioner Crowley commented that this was a complicated issue and wanted the opportunity to research and learn more for discussion at the next meeting.

Development Coordinator Schemmel will follow-up with Ms. Lane regarding the noted the need for balancing the concerns, i.e., screening of ground mounted systems, aesthetics, as well as height and size restrictions while being respectful of those who have already developed in the City.

Chairperson Erickson stated that staff is charged with a difficult task as far as continuity. He continued that some of the examples he has seen feel more like a billboard and that sometimes utility structures are accepted as such in the landscaping.

Chairperson Erickson commented that there was consensus that the Commissioners be allowed to gather additional information and details. His sense was that the aesthetic issue was out weighting the functional issues of making viable solar energy systems. He understands the need to safe guard investments in existing properties, but feels there needs to be a balance. Development Coordinator Schemmel stated that she would assemble follow up information for the Commission noting decision points along with a summary of tonight’s discussion.

Moved by Commissioner Costa, seconded by Commissioner Crowley, the Plan and Zoning Commission move to defer this item to the March 14, 2016 Plan and Zoning meeting to allow the Commission additional time to review solar panel options.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Crowley, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Southworth.....Absent
Motion carried.

Item 2b - Ordinance Amendment – Amend Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 2, (Zoning Rules and Definitions), Section 2-2 (Definitions), Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 16 (Temporary Use Permits), Section 5 (Uses Permitted with Temporary Use Permit) and Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 16 (Temporary Use Permits), Section 7 (Specific Requirements) – to establish regulations pertaining to Office and Commercial Snow Maintenance Facilities - City Initiated - AO-002993-2016.

Chairperson Erickson asked for a motion and a second to defer Item 2b, an ordinance to establish regulations pertaining to Office and Commercial Snow Maintenance Facilities, to allow staff additional time to review and refine the proposed ordinance language.

Moved by Commissioner Costa, seconded by Commissioner Andersen, the Plan and Zoning Commission defer Item 2b to a date uncertain.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Crowley, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Southworth.....Absent
Motion carried.

Item 2c - Ordinance Amendment – Amend Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 5 (Agricultural/Open Space and Residential Zoning Districts), Section 8 (Open Space/Agricultural and Residential Use Regulations), Subsection C, Use Matrices Table 5.3 (Agricultural Uses/Animal Keeping) to allow SIC 0279-9901: Apiary (bee and honey farm/Beekeeping) as a Permitted Use in all single family residential and manufactured housing zoning districts; and Amend Title 9 (Zoning), Chapter 10 (Performance Standards), Section 4 (Specific Use Regulations), Subsection A, to add language to City Code identifying specific regulations and requirements for Beekeeping operating under SIC 0279-9901 – City Initiated – AO-002631-2015

A memo from Staff was provided to the Commissioners noting that additional written public comment had been received on the proposed Beekeeping ordinance.

Chairperson Erickson opened the public hearing and asked the Recording Secretary to state when the public notice was published. The Recording Secretary indicated that the notice was published in the Des Moines Register on February 18, 2016.

Chairperson Erickson asked for a motion to accept and make a part of the record all testimony and all other documents received at this public hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Hatfield, seconded by Commissioner Andersen, the Plan and Zoning Commission accept and make a part of the record all testimony and all other documents received at this public hearing.

Planner Portz provided that approval of this amendment request would allow beekeeping within residential and manufactured home districts within the City. Previously, beekeeping was only allowed in Open Space and in Residential Estate districts with a Permitted Conditional Use permit. Residents have come forward wanting to have beekeeping in their backyards. This code amendment to allow beekeeping would have certain parameters and requirements. For a property less than an acre, two hives would be allowed; for larger than one acre, up to ten hives would be allowed on a property. It was reasoned that two hives on a lot less than 1 acre would be best management practices for beekeeping as a hobby. More than 10 hives on a property would be considered more of a commercial operation. The ordinance specifies that hives cannot be in the front or side yard, a source of water has to be made available for the bees, and there has to be a flyway barrier. If a hive is located closer than 25 ft to a property line, a six foot fence, building, or vegetation screen would be required to provide the flyway barrier.

Commissioner Crowley asked if bees would be allowed without a fenced yard. Planner Portz replied that the property does not have to be fenced in, but that if the hive was located within 25 ft from a property line, a flyway barrier would be required.

Commissioner Andersen inquired how the term hive was defined. Planner Portz stated that he did not have a specific definition of a hive, but that research found that a hive is generally a manmade structure that houses a colony of bees. Commissioner Anderson also asked about a maximum height for a hive. Portz stated that with the Ordinance as proposed, there would be no limit on how high the two allowed hives could be constructed.

Chairperson Erickson asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak to this item.

Doyle Kinsey, 7304 Monroe Court, Urbandale, Board Member of the Iowa Honey Producers Association, thanked the Commission for considering a recommendation to change the code to allow beekeeping. As the representative for many honey producers, Mr. Kinsey commented on the advantages of having bees other than just producing honey. He continued to discuss the plight of the

pollinators as foraging areas for which to obtain nectar keeps decreasing. Mr. Kinsey also mentioned the continued growth in bee hobbyists and those taking beekeeping classes. He commented that typically a standard deep box was only about 9 inches high.

Chairperson Erickson asked if Mr. Kinsey had any concerns with the ordinance language not being more definitive on what constitutes a hive. Mr. Kinsey responded no he did not. He did not think that bees could be kept outside of the standard equipment that has been around since the early 1850s and which is still being used today.

David Croll, 4316 64th Street, Urbandale, representing the backyard beekeepers, an informal club that has several members in West Des Moines that would like to keep bees. He thanked staff for developing a comprehensive ordinance that will benefit the residents. Mr. Croll keeps four hives in northwest Urbandale and is also a steward of two downtown hives. He provided pictures showing the proximity to the residences of his hives. He has not had problems with residents and neighbors and provided them education on the bees when there have been inquiries or opportunity. He showed a picture of a bee enclosure with doors which protects the bees and allows them to fly up and out. Mr. Croll commented that interest is definitely ramping up for beekeeping.

Commissioner Costa asked if there was any danger to animals or people from the bee population. Mr. Croll stated that there has to be water available on site to the bees so they won't go to swimming pools, as they like chlorine. He noted without a water source an animal chained up may get stung if the bees go for the animal's water bowl. He did not believe there was any danger to people and that a person would have to force a bee to sting. He noted that bees instinctively do not like to sting as they would then die if it did sting. The honeybee is much different from a wasp that would continue to sting.

Commissioner Costa asked if a honeybee would attack an unsuspecting animal. Mr. Croll stated that this likely would not happen.

It was noted that Commissioner Crowley left the meeting at 6:45 pm.

Grace St. Clair, 2510 Kenway Drive, Des Moines, provided pictures of her backyard bee hives. Ms. St. Clair maintains two hives which are located five to six feet from her six foot fence. Prior to installing the bees, Ms. St. Clair spoke to her neighbors. She commented that at first she had the bee hives located very close to her fence. Her neighbors commented to her that they were unaware of the bees until she informed them. Chair Erickson inquired as to the average number of bees per hive and was there a practical limit to the number of bees to be housed. Ms. St. Clair stated that she believed it could be thousands.

Thomas Rinehart, 214 S. 83rd Street, Des Moines, commented that it could be 15,000 to 50,000 bees over the course of a year, and that there are fewer bees in the winter and more bees in the summer. He continued that his hives have been well received by his neighbors. He stated that Portland, Oregon, a very metropolitan area, allows residential beekeeping. He suggested that neighbors be informed when there are bees, and also to limit the liability of the City, the ordinance might include that beekeepers obtain liability insurance. He invited anyone who wanted to join him to look at his beehive activities next Sunday.

Jennie Burton, 620 31st Street, West Des Moines, stated that she was a citizen that loves bees and currently keeps bees in Cumming. She has spoken at schools, the State Fair, and educated families on bees, especially noting the value that bees bring to the environment with their pollination. She continued that there is misinformation about honey bees, and that they are fun to work with as they are gentle, unlike wasps.

Chairperson Erickson stated that the Commission has heard overwhelming support for beekeeping

through email, letters, and testimony. He asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in opposition to having bees. Hearing none, Chairperson Erickson asked that in the interest of time if there was any new information to be shared on the subject.

Chairperson Erickson again asked if anyone else would like to speak to this item and seeing none, closed the public hearing and asked for continued discussion or a motion.

Moved by Commissioner Hatfield, seconded by Commissioner Andersen, the Plan and Zoning Commission approve a resolution recommending City Council approval of the ordinance amendment.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Crowley, Southworth.....Absent
Motion carried.

Item 3 – Old Business

There were no Old Business items on the agenda.

Item 4 – New Business

Item 4a – Sleep Inn, 885 S. 51st Street - Construct a 67 room hotel – Woodside Business Park, LLC – SP-002873-2015

Doug Mandernach, Civil Design Advantage, 3405 SE Crossroads, Grimes, representing the applicant requested site plan approval to construct a 67 room hotel to be located at 885 S. 51st Street. Mr. Mandernach provided a location map noting the entrance to the hotel, the private drives, detention pond, public sanitary sewer, and water line.

Mr. Mandernach expressed agreement with staff recommendations and conditions of approval.

Chairperson Erickson asked if anyone else would like to speak to this item; seeing none, asked for continued discussion or a motion.

Moved by Commissioner Costa, seconded by Commissioner Andersen, the Plan and Zoning Commission adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve the Site Plan to construct a 67 room hotel at 885 S. 51st Street, subject to the applicant meeting all City Code requirements and the following:

- 1. That the required storm water facility maintenance agreement and easement, the ingress/egress easement, and the sanitary sewer easement be executed and submitted to the City prior to receiving a building permit or prior to any public improvements being made to the site, to include public utility construction and footing and foundation permits.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Crowley, Southworth.....Absent
Motion carried.

Item 4b – Alluvion DSM08, 550 SE White Crane Road – Approval of site plan for Phase 3 data center construction – Microsoft Corp - SP-002987-2016

Since both parcels are identical, Chairperson Erickson asked that Item 4b and 4c be discussed as one item, but voted on separately.

Jeff Fromm, Microsoft, 550 SE White Crane Road, requested approval for the 3rd and 4th phases for the data center project. These two projects will complete the project and will break ground this construction season.

Chairperson Erickson asked if anyone else would like to speak to this item; seeing none, asked for continued discussion or a motion.

Moved by Commissioner Hatfield, seconded by Commissioner Costa, the Plan and Zoning Commission adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve the Alluvion DSM08 Site Plan to allow construction of four data server buildings within the phase three area, subject to the applicant meeting all City Code requirements and the following:

1. The applicant acknowledging that all phases collectively will need to abide at all times by the regulations stated in the City’s Noise Ordinance;
2. The applicant taking the necessary measures within the limits of what Microsoft security measures will allow to minimize light pollution on surrounding properties and the area in general;
3. The applicant installing site landscaping identified for this phase in conjunction with construction of this phase, with said landscaping installed prior to issuance of a final occupancy permit; and,
4. The applicant acknowledging and agreeing that any intended modifications to the site which differ from that shown on the final approval stamped site plan drawing packet shall require the review and approval of the City prior to implementation. Said changes may require the submittal and approval of a Minor or Major Modification Permit application, whichever is deemed applicable by staff which shall be reviewed and approved prior to implementation of any changes.

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Crowley, Southworth.....Absent
Motion carried.

Item 4c – Alluvion DSM07, 550 SE White Crane Road – Approval of site plan for Phase 4 data center construction – Microsoft Corp - SP-002987-2016

Moved by Commissioner Andersen, seconded by Commissioner Costa, the Plan and Zoning Commission adopt a resolution recommending the City Council approve the Alluvion DSM07 Site Plan to allow construction of four data server buildings within the phase four area, subject to the applicant meeting all City Code requirements and the following:

1. The applicant acknowledging that all phases collectively will need to abide at all times by the regulations stated in the City’s Noise Ordinance;
2. The applicant taking the necessary measures within the limits of what Microsoft security measures will allow to minimize light pollution on surrounding properties and the area in general;
3. The applicant installing site landscaping identified for this phase in conjunction with construction of this phase, with said landscaping installed prior to issuance of a final occupancy permit; and,
4. The applicant acknowledging and agreeing that any intended modifications to the site which differ from that shown on the final approval stamped site plan drawing packet shall require the review and approval of the City prior to implementation. Said changes may require the submittal and approval of a Minor or Major Modification Permit application, whichever is deemed applicable by staff which shall be reviewed and approved prior to implementation of any changes.

PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

February 29, 2016

Vote: Andersen, Costa, Erickson, Hatfield.....Yes
Brown, Crowley, Southworth.....Absent
Motion carried.

Item 5 – Staff Reports

There were no staff reports.

Item 6 - Adjournment

Chairperson Christianson asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Moved by Commissioner Hatfield, seconded by Commissioner Andersen, to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Erik Christianson, Chairperson

Kimberly Taylor, Recording Secretary