

Minutes
City of Newport Planning Commission Regular Session
Monday, September 26, 2011

Commissioners Present: Jim Patrick, Rod Croteau, Gary East, Mark Fisher, Melanie Sarazin, and Glen Small.

Commissioners Absent: Jim McIntyre.

City Staff Present: Community Development Director (CDD) Derrick Tokos and Executive Assistant Wanda Haney.

A. Roll Call. Chair Patrick called the meeting to order in the Council Chambers of Newport City Hall at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, Sarazin, East, Fisher, Patrick, Croteau, and Small were present. McIntyre was excused.

B. Approval of Minutes.

1. Approval of the Planning Commission regular session meeting minutes of August 22, 2011.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Fisher, seconded by Commissioner East, to approve the Planning Commission minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

C. Citizen/Public Comment. No comments regarding non-agenda items.

D. Consent Calendar. Nothing on the consent calendar.

E. Public Hearings. No public hearings on tonight's agenda.

F. Unfinished Business.

1. Remand from the City Council of the proposed ordinance codifying street renaming and addressing provisions and establishing criteria and procedures for the renaming of public streets and places (File No. 3-Z-11) for consideration of a language change. Patrick had a question about the age of ORS 227.120. There was some discussion regarding that. Tokos said that Portland's code has probably been tested. If there was a challenge, that is where we would have seen it. Tokos explained that on August 8th, the Planning Commission made a recommendation of a package of amendments to the City Council. The Council met on September 6th and had two things to change. One was eliminating the reference that an individual would have to be deceased for a time before a street could be renamed after them. The other was that the Council was not comfortable with the process that the Planning Commission could effectively stop the process by providing an unfavorable recommendation without some sort of appeal to the City Council, which is akin to the Portland example. So, the Council remanded the ordinance back to the Commission. They directed staff to put together language for what they were looking for. Tokos noted that in the packets, the Commissioners would see that this was vetted with legal counsel. He included that letter explaining what she did. She did the markup of the actual section (Exhibit 'A'), and Tokos did the markup of Exhibit 'B' to match. The city attorney talked to the City of Portland, and their interpretation of that ORS provision is that it applies from the city limits out six miles. Anything within the city limits is fair game. What the attorney calls kind of a donut-type view. The Council wanted language to work with that interpretation. In the package is language that gets there. If a street extends out six miles, it goes to the City Council irrespective of the Planning Commission's recommendation. Before, if it was within those six miles, the Council couldn't take it up unless the Planning Commission provided a favorable recommendation. Tokos noted that most streets are inside the city limits, but some extend beyond (such as SE 35th).

Commissioner Fisher said that after reading this and letting it digest, he wrote down his thoughts; which he shared. He does respect the learned members of the City Council, but at the same time the product of the Planning Commission in this regard was seriously considered and discussed; and the product was very well done. He said that personally he stands by what the Commission sent to the Council. He feels the City Council should feel free to alter the Commission's product to suit the end they desire. He said he would be willing to offer a motion that the Commission returns the original product to them. Commissioner Small questioned some of these changes, especially under Section 9.85.035 (D). The process speaks about "following adoption of a Council resolution, the Planning Commission will hold a hearing and decide." He thought that if the Council already made a resolution, it seems to be going back to a waste of time with a Planning Commission hearing that doesn't mean anything. Small said that he agrees with Fisher that if the City Council wants to alter that proposal, they have every right to do that. He doesn't want to get back to where we were several months ago. Sarazin seconded that. She had written "why" next to that provision. She said if the Council has already made a resolution, why come backward to go forward. Why would the Planning Commission even be involved in that process? Patrick agreed that it was bad procedure. Croteau agreed and raised a question about the change in the death provision. Small wanted to address that point. He said the thought was that if the person was really worthy of having a street named after them, they would still be worthy after three years. That would prevent

the emotional burst of action of renaming a street after them. He said that is where point 8 in that same section comes into play. He thought the actual wording was "other circumstances that warrant special consideration". That was the out clause to say "this is a special case, and we can move ahead without waiting three years", or "we are looking at something extraordinary". He said that is why that was put in there. Fisher agreed that that clause gives them a door to open if a really special case comes along. Patrick said that he doesn't mind if the Commission holds a hearing, and it gets appealed. But, if the Council makes a resolution, why would they make that if they didn't want it done in the first place. He wondered why the Planning Commission should bother with a hearing if their decision gets overruled. He said why go through the charade. Patrick said you have to read the statute correctly. The Council only considers a renaming on Planning Commission approval. If the Commission turns it down, it dies there. There isn't an appeal process. That violates state statute. Sarazin agreed and noted that the attorney talked about the interpretation of the state statute. Tokos said that under the Portland interpretation, it only applies out six miles. He said you can read it that way. He noted that as it was originally drafted, the safest approach was to construe that as applying to the city plus land within six miles. Not all jurisdictions interpret the statute the same way. Tokos noted that the City Council is one approach to start the process, the other is by petition. The reason the City Council resolution option is there is that in the past when the City has done significant renaming, it has been done in mass in conjunction with annexation. That is why there is the option to be initiated by City Council resolution. We needed some way to initiate mass renaming, and City Council resolution was the only thing that made sense. Tokos said he can see the City Council saying they want to initiate street renaming for a big bunch of land and take it to the Planning Commission for a recommendation. The Council is just saying they want to rename twenty streets, for example, that were just brought into city limits. We need to engage the public and get Planning Commission input so it goes all the way up. Patrick agreed that in that case, that makes sense as a process. He said it doesn't make sense to pick a street within the city limits and rename it as a City Council resolution. Patrick said there is no language in here that says outside the city limits coming in. Tokos noted that this proposal does under Section 9.85.040 (Renaming Streets outside City Boundaries). He said that is essentially what was sent up to the City Council. The Planning Commission has to find that it is in the best interest of the City to move it along. Patrick noted that there is no appeal with that one. Tokos said that is consistent with statute. The only way to have appeal to the City Council is through an interpretation that the statute doesn't apply within the city limits, which is Portland's interpretation. Patrick said he felt like the other Commissioners that it's just bad procedure when a street is inside the city limits and the Council passes a resolution to rename the street and sends it to the Planning Commission for hearing. If it's an existing street, he suggested just leaving it at the City Council level and leaving the Planning Commission out of it. The other Commissioners agreed. Croteau said that the Commission wants to avoid what happened before. He thought this situation as it now lies is doing that all over again. Patrick noted that at least with this the Commission now has some criteria. Sarazin agreed that is what the Commission was hoping for. She said she likes this but doesn't know if it really needs the Commission's endorsement if the Council is going to do a resolution. Fisher said that he would recommend that if the Council chooses to, they can change it to suit their need; they don't need the Commission's agreement. Small concurred. Patrick said that is the general sense.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Fisher, seconded by Commissioner Patrick, that the Planning Commission return the ordinance they came up with on August 8, 2011, to the City Council with a respectable recommendation that the Council should alter it any way they choose to meet their desire because the Commission feels comfortable with what they did. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

2. Debrief on the 9/12/11 public workshop on updating city regulations for vacation rental and bed & breakfast establishments. Review comments received and set out a schedule for additional public outreach or hearings process. Tokos noted that included in the packets were a verbatim breakdown on the comments received at the workshop on September 12th along with a draft of the code amendments that were available at that meeting. Tokos said one option for the Commission to consider could be to ask the Ad hoc work group to reconvene to evaluate the comments and provide a recommendation of changes that should be made or should not be made. The Commission can then take a look at that at a work session. If, coming out of that, the Commission is comfortable with that package, you could move to the hearing stage. Tokos noted that we had fourteen people show up at the workshop even though we did a very large mailing. He is concerned that we don't have everybody's attention yet. He has received a number of phone calls from folks that couldn't make the meeting. Monday night was pretty tough for those that were out of the area. They are on our email contact list and will be tracking it. Tokos told the Commissioners that if they had particular issues that they would like the Ad hoc group to pay particular attention to, we can pass those along. Small asked of those fourteen in attendance, if we had any idea how many of those were neighbors of vacation rentals. Tokos thought the majority operated either one or more vacation rentals. Fisher said that he knew that at least four were realtors that operate vacation rentals and had a vested interest. Patrick said it goes back to the problem he saw could happen, and that was that we didn't get the other side although we did everything that we could to get notice out. Small wondered if it was an issue if there was no neighborhood representation. He said that if there was a lot of concern by neighbors, it seems like we would have neighbor representation. Fisher noted that every water bill had a notice in it. Croteau thought that most comments were directed to R-1 and R-2 as opposed to other zones. He said that he would like the Ad hoc group to address the issue of why we would include these in R-1 and R-2 if that is where the complaints come from. Sarazin thought it would be helpful to reconvene the group after listening to concerns. Patrick agreed that the procedure he would like to see is for the committee to go back through this. First, he thought that the Commissioners should go through and address areas that they see problems with.

In the first area, the issue of R-1 and R-2 should be addressed. Sarazin added particularly with B&Bs. Under occupancy, Small said that he heard comments that vacation rentals that are now legally established and approved wouldn't meet these criteria.

Part of that proposal was that there is no grandfathering. The most recent rules would apply when they came in to apply. He said that there was a real concern if their existing vacation rental would be allowed. One woman said that hers wouldn't fit under this. That needs to be discussed either in this section or in the approval section. Patrick said that he heard the same because some existing vacation rentals would have issues with the parking, landscaping, and waste management requirements. Patrick noted a comment under occupancy about having three houses side by side that are rented together. He saw the same thing happening in hotel rooms.

Under parking/landscaping/waste management, Patrick said a lot of people with existing rentals didn't have any room. Croteau said that there has to be some provision to allow existing historical B&Bs, for example, that couldn't meet these standards. Patrick added also for off-street parking in Nye Beach and the Bay Front. He said there was a question about off-street parking enforcement and how we can tell. How will we enforce that? The others agreed how do we tell if a car parked on the street is at the vacation rental or visiting someone in the neighborhood. Patrick noted that trying to hide garbage cans gets to be a problem. Sarazin noted complaints about trash cans being left out. When a big wind comes along, no one is responsible. It is a burden to the neighbors because they have someone's trash can in their yard or have to pick up the trash. She said some of the people having those places don't want that responsibility, and the neighbor has to deal with it. She said there has to be some provision where that isn't occurring. If a person lets someone use their property, they have to have someone to take in the garbage and get it off the street. Patrick noted that some people have house cleaners, some have dumpsters. The code says no dumpsters. He said dumpsters work for him. Croteau said that sometimes trash stays in dumpsters month after month. That can be a problem if they are not cycled out before they are full. Patrick thought they were emptied at least weekly. Sarazin said whether it's a dumpster or a trash can, some provision needs to be made for the handling of trash. Patrick said that some people were talking about existing places in Nye Beach that have no off-street parking, and they are vacation rentals right now. Patrick said another comment he found interesting was why do handicapped spaces have to be provided if the unit is not handicapped accessible. Croteau took that to mean physically accessible; not handicapped accessible.

Under safety issues, Small said he found the first comment to be something interesting to consider. He said you could argue that you favor having the property occupied rather than unoccupied. Patrick said he heard questions about what kind of standards and who is doing the enforcement.

Fisher noted that he and Lee Hardy manned the area discussing issues and enforcement. He noted that five issues came up. One was fairness and equity across the board. Another one was, when there are problems, in the end they decided that the owner of the vacation rental is responsible for that rental. Whoever is using it needs to have their contact by phone or in person. Also, the person that owns the property is responsible to decide whether to call the police or handle it themselves. They felt the City shouldn't be involved in when it's time to call the police. Another comment was if a vacation rental is on the internet, and the person decides they are not going to use it for the rest of the year, are they still obligated to meet all requirements. In the end, it was decided that anything that is listed as a rental unit should meet all requirements even though it may be taken off the market for a while. If it has a license to operate as a vacation rental, it needs to meet those requirements. He said another issue was requiring higher standards for vacation rentals than we do for long-term rentals. He said that he is sure that is true. Fisher said there was one really big issue on enforcement, and that was that if there are going to be rules, there should be a method of enforcement. If that is a punitive method, there needs to be some system of hearings. Can't have penalty unless there is a way to appeal. Sarazin thought it would be through the municipal court, and Tokos confirmed that. Fisher said there should be a stated way that everybody understands. He said that in the end, there is a real need to bring all of these vacation rentals into the fold so that everybody knows who and where they are and that the City is able to verify that they meet the standards. He said that one person came up with an idea how that might be done. The City on its website could have a link for vacation rentals, and anyone who goes to the trouble of getting licensed in the City would be able to have their information there (i.e. contact information and what it is). It was thought that maybe that could be an inducement or a lure to bring these people in. He said maybe the Chamber of Commerce could find a way to do that. He added that if we are going to do this, we should try to bring every one of these rentals into the fold. The other Commissioners thought that wasn't a bad idea. Fisher said that they thought that having one license was another incentive to bring them in. Tokos said there would be one license. For the initial endorsement, there would be an initial fee there that would cover inspection expense and the expense of administering the program. It would be a one-time fee they would have when they pulled their permit and the inspection was done. Fisher asked if from then it would just be an annual license fee, and Tokos confirmed that. Fisher said that keeping costs low; maybe even free; could draw in these rentals. He said that getting the knowledge of who they are, where they are, and what they are doing is really important. Going back to the question about the designated person, Sarazin said she understands the owner is responsible; but if that owner contracts with a rental company, in her eyes that is who would be the designee. She noted that some people, like those contacting Tokos, are out of town; and they need to have someone designated. She said they can't rent from afar and not have someone here to deal with problems that happen over here. Fisher agreed that the owner or rental company is the contact person. The person that owns or operates the rental is the responsible party. Sarazin noted that it seems like the only ones complaining are the designated people. They seem to have a concern that the City wants them to be responsible for this unit. She wondered who the City would go to if we can't go to them. Fisher said one of the punitive actions might be suspension of their permit for the year. The City shouldn't have to determine who is going to be the contact. Whoever owns or operates the unit is responsible. The City will hold them responsible and make sure they are aware of it. He said it is their obligation. Sarazin said that it seems like the people designated to do this are pointing in the other direction. Patrick said that the City needs to enforce the regulations on the unit itself; not the designee. He said their point is not to make them have to be careful. The City is not

punishing the designee. The license needs to go with the unit. The designee has to be responsible for their actions. Patrick said that the code says a 30-minute turn-around when it's 24 hours for police or at least the next day. He asked if the police can't respond in that amount of time, why does the property manager have to? Fisher said he heard to keep going on with the plan, but a system needs to be easily understood and followed if it will be effective. Patrick said sometimes it is a designee problem. Sarazin said there is common sense that needs to be put into play. The designee is not the one to respond if the issue is that there are shots fired. Fisher said that his next door neighbor could be the designated person, but the City will go to the owner/operator because they are the ones obligated to be the responsible person to see something gets done. Croteau said that his sense was that the owner should be the responsible party; but for absentee owners, there needs to be someone local to deal with problems with the property (like shingles missing and water flowing inside). He said that those owners would have a designee that would be closer to take care of those sorts of problems; close enough to do what is necessary. Fisher said that isn't the City's business. That is the responsibility of the owner/operator. Patrick noted that there are a lot of owners that operate from out of state.

Under permit terms and process, Croteau noted that were a number of comments raised as to whether the permit should go with the property owner. After some discussion, it was decided that so much of the responsibility was on the owner and to issue the permit to the property wasn't a workable thing. He said that if the property sells, you have to re-up as a vacation rental; it's not automatic. He said most questions were around that issue; whether you call it a permit or a license. The other was the issue of grandfathering. Pre-existing rentals want to be grandfathered. The assumption would be that if they had a B&B or VRBO and had permission to do so, they could continue with the existing permit unless there was a gross violation. Tokos said that the thought was that there needs to be a level playing field. Patrick said one question was whether it's a one-time inspection or a renewing inspection. Tokos said the inspection would be every time a license is pulled; it was not envisioned to be every time a business license is renewed. Patrick said that he thought language should be put in there that if there is a problem with the rental, we have the ability to re-inspect. He said there needs to be some sort of trigger in there for that.

Under other issues, Small raised the last question on page 4 about whether unattached homes have the same classification as hotels. Tokos said his sense is what we can do is take a look at hotel/motel definition and bring that through the process. He said that wasn't discussed at the Ad hoc level originally. Fisher said he thinks the houses in front of the Whaler Motel are rented more like a motel. Tokos said there is interplay with the commercial code. If they are treated as a hotel, they are subject to the commercial building code, which doesn't work well on old homes. With three units or more on a parcel, you are into hotel/motel use for building code purposes. Tokos said we can work through that. Patrick thought it was interesting to see the comment about why not regulate apartment buildings as well. Sarazin said that goes along with the concern that we are holding vacation rentals to higher standards than the rest of the city. Patrick said we may need to look at nuisance standards again. Sarazin said that on page 5 she didn't see the concern about the sale of the property and now this would make it harder to sell if the owner doesn't meet the requirements. She said it is the property not the owner that is meeting the requirements. Patrick said on the flip side of that a large part of sales is going on the value of property. If they think they can rent it as a vacation rental, they may think they can come out ahead. The economic conditions are driving down house prices regardless. If we are taking away part of the economic reason for buying a house, it will affect the value of the house. Sarazin said these people are concerned that if they can't sell the permit with the house, their value will be going down. If they are renting the house now, they qualify for everything. That property will qualify for the next owner. Fisher asked that unless they are grandfathered in, the new owners have to meet the standards; and Tokos confirmed that. Tokos said he could ask the Ad hoc group to take a look at that, but that was their intention. It was intentionally done so that we don't end up with three or four different sets of rules applying to those out in the community. Fisher said that to him it made sense that an exception would be if the property were inherited from parents. Then he would assume that wouldn't apply because they haven't purchased it; it would just be a deed change. Patrick said that if the license went with the property, it would just be a change of designee. Fisher said they wouldn't even have to notify the City, the title goes to the County. Patrick asked Tokos to ask the Ad hoc committee to discuss whether the license or permit goes with the property; also what we have in just changing hands or just changing form (into a trust). Croteau said that is a legal change of ownership and how would we deal with those. Tokos said that can be addressed. There is a lot of language out there about what constitutes an ownership change and what doesn't. Patrick said the other thing he thought of was where someone owns shares of a vacation rental home; like brothers and sisters. What happens if one in that joint ownership sells their share? Patrick said that he likes the whole process a lot better than immediately going into the hearing process. By then, hopefully, we will have a lot of this worked out. Small agreed it was a good process to hear other points of view, and doing it in this setting rather than a hearing was more comfortable. Patrick said he thinks we are still getting only one side of it, and he added that it looks like that one side is in disagreement with each other. Sarazin said someone had raised the possibility of limited tenancy; maybe moving in once a week. They wanted them to be able to only move in and move out every so often. She doesn't know how we would be able to monitor something like that.

The question was asked if the Commission and the Ad hoc people should meet together to discuss this. Tokos thought we should allow the Ad hoc group to meet separately rather than be together. They can come up with a set of recommendations to consider based on the observations the Commissioners have shared tonight.

MOTION was made by Commissioner Sarazin, seconded by Commissioner Croteau, to send this ordinance back to the Ad hoc work group to reconvene and look over these comments and suggestions and come back with some recommendations. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Croteau asked what would be the next step. Tokos said the Commission can take a look at the recommendation and decide whether they are comfortable to initiate a public hearing process or if there is need for additional outreach and what that might look like. He is unsure how to get the attention of folks that may be concerned; how to get the homeowners engaged. The mailing we did was one of the most effective. We had ads in the paper and on the radio. He expected folks who live in town to show up, but we really didn't get that. Small said his concern is the homeowner that lives next door to a vacation rental and protecting their peace and pursuit of happiness. He said maybe the fact that we didn't have any of those local residents show up is an indication that there is not the problem he thought there was. Fisher said that if they were really bothered, they probably would have shown up. Patrick said he thought there would at least have been some of those folks that have shown up when we have had hearings on vacation rentals. Tokos said the process will be that the Ad hoc group will hold one or two meetings to put recommendations together, and he will bring it back in work session for the Commission to take a look and provide direction whether you are comfortable going to hearings. Croteau said that maybe neighbors went to the website and looked at the materials there and thought it was much better than what it is now and were happy with what they saw. Sarazin said we had those comments mostly from owners. Patrick said we will keep trying to bring in the other side. He noted that if it passes and is not working, we can change it. Fisher said he thought the Ad hoc committee did a really good job in what they came up with. He said that was very valuable.

G. New Business.

1. Review scope of work for Newport Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA). Tokos said it does appear that we are going to be receiving a grant for funds to help us with an economic opportunity analysis. He had mentioned this to the Commissioners previously in work session. It is something that the Council supported doing. The project would update the City's economic data to be factual based, develop a cohesive economic strategy and vision for the community, and better define the City's role in achieving that vision. Tokos said that there is the Yaquina Bay Ocean Observing Initiative (YBOOI) trying to get momentum. We have the Chamber of Commerce and the Mayor who are looking to do a broader business outreach in the community. Tokos noted that statewide planning requires the City to have a plan for the economic vitality of the community. He had included a copy of the economic section of the Comprehensive Plan in the packet. He said it is kind of vague and doesn't provide a whole lot of direction. We have to provide for a twenty year land supply. What we find in the Comprehensive Plan is that we don't quite have that and probably won't. We are partnering with the Chamber of Commerce, the Port of Newport, the Economic Alliance of Lincoln County, and different Nye Beach, Bay Front, and City Center merchants' associations to bring this initiative into place to have a comprehensive economic vision. Tokos said this is similar to what we went through with the housing study. This will involve \$30,000; half in grants, and the other half the City Council budgeted for. He noted that the employment forecast and the siting needs and analysis would need to be done before the end of the fiscal year. The broader items could go on beyond that. The end of August to get it wrapped up is what he drafted into this. The proposed scope of work shown in the RFP is what he has shared with Lorna of the Chamber of Commerce. He hasn't heard from Carolyn Bowman or Don Mann. He said the grant should come through any day. His hope is to get the RFP out for thirty days to give the consultants reasonable time to get something prepared and to us. He said we will want to look very carefully that who is selected has good facilitation skills. The consultant will need to do broader outreach than what we did with the housing study. The emphasis on this selection is to try to get someone with strong facilitation skills. Tokos said that if the Commissioners have ideas, he is open to them. Small asked when the RFP is going out, and Tokos said he hopes by the first week of October so that the consultants have close to thirty days. Patrick asked if the selection will be similar to what we did for the housing element with a couple of Commissioners and an Ad hoc committee member. Tokos said that he has pulled Lorna from the Chamber, and he would like to have a couple of Planning Commissioners. Fisher recommended, and Sarazin agreed, that Croteau and McIntyre should be on the selection committee. Croteau said his schedule should work for that. He asked if this is working into downtown revitalization. Tokos said it can help clear our thoughts, but that is just part of the puzzle. Patrick said that in reading the old section, NOAA was on the list, but was way down in priority. He said we need to keep our options open because things come up that make sense that we may not foresee. Croteau agreed that we need to be prepared for the unexpected. He said he knows that the downtown is in need of revitalization. Fisher said that Newport isn't alone in that. Some communities have solved those problems, but what they have done won't work in all towns. Tokos said there is the larger 101 corridor. He said that if you look at the broader 101 corridor, other things come up than if you just look at the downtown. Patrick said it should be interesting. We already know we are short on commercial property. Tokos agreed that the City needs to look at how we can supplement our commercial lands. Fisher wondered if the Holiday Inn Express had been able to build on one whole block, if that would have helped downtown. Tokos say that speaks to what the community wants the downtown to be; a walking downtown area or a more conventional modern development. He said it is a train of thought. There have been a lot of things done in the past about what would happen. He said that these issues have been studied to death and nothing has happened. If we don't do engagement to figure out what to do next, it will blow up. Sarazin wondered if we were limited because the City doesn't own the properties, and there are a lot of businesses. Tokos said it gets back to having the property owners engaged. Maybe there is the potential for community development block grant funds for a façade improvement program. Maybe it will be to clean up the 101 corridor. If federal funds ever become available again, maybe we can figure a match. He said that if we don't have our ducks lined up, we won't be able to pull it off. Croteau asked about the previous studies. Tokos mentioned the Glick study, there was discussion about couplets so that we don't have 101 basically running through the middle of downtown, there have been discussions about whether on-street parking should go, whether we should tear down block by block for redevelopment and give up on a traditional downtown, and talk about taking out asphalt and putting in plantings and cleaning up the center strips along 101. Tokos said that

even though he hasn't gone through all the previous studies, he gets that there is still disagreement on what should be done. Tokos asked if the RFP scope of work looked okay, and the consensus was that it does.

H. Director's Comments.

Tokos said that the SIC code passed at the last City Council meeting and in less than thirty days, that will go.


The City Council did pass a motion on what it takes to become a Tree City designated community. Tokos will bring that to the next work session.

Also at the next work session, the Commission will have a draft of the South Beach trip budget (trip cap) overlay. He doesn't know that we will have a regular agenda.

Tokos wanted to give the Commissioners a heads up that City Recorder Peggy Hawker will work on codification of the zoning code into the municipal code. This is the last major code element not in the municipal code. This will be brought to the Planning Commission at some point as legislative. There are a few minor things that get corrected; nothing major.

I. Adjournment. Sarazin noted that she will not be available for a meeting on December 27th; but Tokos noted that we most likely won't have a Planning Commission meeting on that day. Fisher asked to be excused on October 10th. There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Wanda Haney
Executive Assistant