
**CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
February 2, 2005**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: 1:16 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Commissioner Boll

PRESENT: Commissioner Timothy Brigham
Commissioner Garry Dokter
Commissioner Greg Boll
Vice-Chairman Charles Brewster
Chairman Thomas Beede

STAFF: Sandra Molina, Acting City Planner
David Martinez, Deputy City Manager
Marco Martinez, City Attorney
Phil Mosley, Chief Building Official
Sam Rodriguez, Acting City Engineer
Janice Etter, Associate Planner
Lynne Rayner, Administrative Secretary

The Planning Commission of the City of Big Bear Lake took the following actions at the February 2, 2005 meeting held in Hofert Hall, Civic and Performing Arts Center, 39707 Big Bear Boulevard, Big Bear Lake, California.

AGENDA APPROVAL

Moved by Commissioner Boll, seconded by Commissioner Dokter, to approve the agenda as presented. The agenda was approved unanimously.

PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Acting City Planner Sandra Molina announced that brochures for the League of California Cities 2005 Planners Institute had been distributed to the Commission. She requested that any Commissioner interested in attending please contact the Administrative Secretary.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one wished to speak.

REORGANIZATION

- a. Swearing in of new Planning Commissioner

At the hour of 1:19 p.m., City Clerk Kathy Jefferies conducted the swearing-in of Timothy Brigham.

At the hour of 1:23 p.m., Commissioner Brigham took his seat.

1. CONSENT CALENDAR

- 1.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of January 5, 2005.
- 1.2 Approval of the Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of January 19, 2005.

Moved by Commissioner Brewster, seconded by Commissioner Dokter, to approve the minutes for January 5th and January 19th, 2005 as presented. The minutes were unanimously approved by a vote of 4 in favor and 0 opposed. Commissioner Brigham abstained, as he was not in attendance for the meetings of January 5th and January 19th, 2005.

Due to potential conflict of interest in the remaining items on the agenda, Chairman Beede excused Commissioner Brigham from the remainder of the Planning Commission meeting, and at the hour of 1:25 p.m., Commissioner Brigham left the meeting room.

2. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

2.1 Plot Plan Review 2004-063

Applicant: Mr. Isaac Moshe
Representative: Mr. Robert Almeri
Location: 41814 Brownie Lane
APN: 2328-051-13

Associate Planner Janice Etter presented the staff report, reminding the Commission that the public hearing remained open from the December 15th, 2004 and January 5th, and January 19th, 2005 Planning Commission meetings. She stated that the applicant is not present at the meeting today but is requesting approval to construct a 4,302 square foot residential duplex on 8,600 square feet of property zoned Multiple-Family Residential (R-3). She further stated that staff recommends the Commission continue the public hearing, take public testimony, and adopt a resolution finding the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving Plot Plan Review 2004-063.

At the hour of 1:30 p.m., Chairman Beede reopened the public hearing and hearing no comment, closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Boll asked staff if the applicant had read and agreed with the conditions of approval in the resolution. Mrs. Etter stated that Mr. Moshe had received all four staff reports, that staff had been in contact with him prior to each Planning Commission meeting, and that at no time had comments been received regarding opposition to any condition of approval.

Moved by Commissioner Boll, seconded by Commissioner Brewster, to adopt Resolution No. PC2005-005 approving Plot Plan Review 2004-063, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. PC2005-005

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING PLOT PLAN REVIEW 2004-063 TO CONSTRUCT A 4,302 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENTIAL DUPLEX ON A 9,600 SQUARE FOOT PROPERTY LOCATED AT 41814 BROWNIE LANE (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 2328-051-13).

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: DOKTER, BOLL, BREWSTER, BEEDE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: BRIGHAM

2.2 General Plan Amendment 2003-102 and Zone Change 2003-103

Applicant: B & D Weber, LLC
Representative: Michael Rafferty, Managing Partner
Location: 42515 Big Bear Boulevard
APN: 0311-461-04

Mrs. Etter presented the staff report, stating that the applicants are requesting approval to amend the General Plan Land Use Map by changing the designation of a 2.9-acre property from Public Facilities (P) to Multiple Family Residential (MFR), and to amend the Zoning Map by changing the zoning of the property from Public/Open Space (P-OS) to Multiple Family Residential (R-3), allowing residential uses with densities ranging up to 12 units per acre. She stated that the applicant and his representative were present in the audience, and that staff recommends the Planning Commission hold a public hearing, take public testimony, and adopt a resolution recommending that the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration and approve General Plan Amendment 2003-102 and Zone Change 2003-103.

Mrs. Etter continued, stating that the draft Resolution for this application contains findings that the Planning Commission must determine to be true in order to recommend approval of these applications. The City Attorney recommends that the following changes be made to Findings 3 and 4, as they relate to conformance with the General Plan:

3. Based on substantial evidence presented to the Planning Commission during the public hearings, including public testimony, and written and oral staff report, the Planning Commission specifically finds as follows with regard to General Plan Amendment 2003-102:

The General Plan and elements and plans thereof comprised and integrated, are internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the following reasons:

- a. The proposed amendment conforms to Land Use Element Goal L 1 to provide for orderly and functional patterns of land uses, Goal L 3 to provide for development of housing opportunities to meet the long-term needs of permanent and part-time residents as well as visitors, and all demographic and economic segments of the population, while preserving the character and integrity of the residential neighborhood; Program L 1.6.1 to designate land uses on the Land Use Map which are compatible with adjacent land uses, and Policy L 1.7 to ensure compatibility between land uses which have different functions, requirements and impacts. The proposed amendment is consistent with Housing Element Policies P3.8 and P3.9 to facilitate affordable housing opportunities, and providing sites for the development of affordable housing. The proposed amendment correlates consistent with the Circulation Element because the property is located adjacent to Big Bear Boulevard/State Route 18, which is designated as a Primary Arterial in Exhibit C-1 of the Circulation Plan. This Primary Arterial will ultimately have a right-of-way width of 80 feet, which is adequate to accommodate the Multiple Family Residential designation. The amendment is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1.7 and Circulation Element Program C 1.7.1 requiring that the traffic impacts of all new development are adequately evaluated and mitigated, and Policy C1.9 in that the City will participate in multi-jurisdictional efforts to upgrade and expand the Highway 18.
4. Based on substantial evidence presented to the Planning Commission during the February 2, 2005, public hearing, including public testimony, and written and oral staff report, the Planning Commission specifically finds as follows with regard to Zone Change 2003-103:
 - a. The proposed zone change to the Multiple Family Residential (R-3) is consistent with the General Plan designation of Multiple Family Residential (MFR) being requested under General Plan Amendment application 2003-102 which has been filed concurrently. The proposed rezoning of the property conforms to Land Use Element Goal L 1 to provide for orderly and functional patterns of land uses, Goal L 3 to provide for development of housing opportunities to meet the long-term needs of permanent and part-time residents as well as visitors, and all demographic and economic segments of the population, while preserving the character and integrity of the residential neighborhood; Program L 1.6.1 to designate land uses on the Land Use Map which are compatible with adjacent land uses, and Policy L 1.7 to ensure compatibility between land uses which have different functions, requirements and impacts. The proposed rezoning is consistent with Housing Element Policies P3.8 and P3.9 to facilitate affordable housing opportunities, and providing sites for the development of affordable housing. The proposed zone change correlates with the Circulation Element because the property is located adjacent to Big Bear Boulevard/State Route 18, which is designated as a Primary Arterial in Exhibit C-1 of the Circulation Plan. This Primary Arterial will ultimately have a right-of-way width of 80 feet, which is adequate to accommodate the Multiple Family Residential designation. The amendment is consistent with Circulation Element Policy C1.7 and Circulation Element

Program C 1.7.1 requiring that the traffic impacts of all new development are adequately evaluated and mitigated, and Policy C1.9 in that the City will participate in multi-jurisdictional efforts to upgrade and expand the Highway 18.

Vice-Chair Commissioner Brewster asked if these applications were to be approved, would senior housing be locked in to that location. Mrs. Etter informed the Commission that any uses listed in the R-3 zone would be permitted if the General Plan Amendment was approved and the zoning changed.

Commissioner Boll inquired why the applicants had not request the zoning be changed in 1999 when the General Plan Land Use Map was amended. Mrs. Etter informed the Commission that Citywide advertisements had been published and posted in three public places stating that the General Plan Land Use Map was being changed, but that individual property owners were not notified of each pending change. She stated that at the public meetings in 1999 the designation of the parcel was changed from Single Family Residential (R-1) to Public/Open Spaces (P-OS), because it was believed the property was part of the adjacent senior center.

At the hour of 1:55 p.m., Chairman Beede opened the public hearing.

J. P. Montero, resident of Big Bear Lake and adjoining property owner, expressed his support for the zoning amendment.

Brian Weber, applicant, stated that without knowing if the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change applications would be approved, performing the studies listed at the Development Review Committee meeting would not be prudent due to the costs involved. He stated that it was his belief that a Conditional Use Permit required all the same documents and studies to be submitted as a Development Agreement and could be administered by staff, whereas a Development Agreement would require approval by City Council and annual review. He stated that he would be willing to draft either document stipulating that senior housing is what would be built on that location.

Vice Chair Brewster inquired if the documentation required for a Conditional Use Permit was the same as for a Development Agreement?

Chairman Beede stated he believed that a Conditional Use Permit was not required in Multi-Family Residential Zones and asked the City Attorney for clarification.

Mr. Martinez stated that according to a provision of the Government Code, Section 65589.4, a multi-family residential housing project shall be a permitted use not subject to a Conditional Use Permit on any parcel zoned for multi-family housing if it satisfies the requirements of Subdivision (b), although it shall go through a discretionary review process. He stated that this prevents the City from imposing a Conditional Use Permit requirement for a multi-family housing project when that housing project is consistent with the underlying zoning. He stated he did not believe that a Development Agreement would be looked upon in the same way, but that more research would need to be done in that area. He stated that if a developer wanted to enter into a

Development Agreement, that Development Agreements are voluntary contracts between two parties to guarantee construction of a particular project with an expiration date. At the end of that expiration date if the project is not built, now the zoning has been changed and at that point any multi-family development consistent with the underlying zone could be approved. He reminded the Commission that a Development Agreement will need to be filed and fees paid.

Vice-Chair Brewster asked if the City were to write a letter to the applicant listing certain parameters which, if the applicant were to follow, the City would rezone the subject property for senior housing, stating that the applicant could then proceed to pay for all the studies needed. He inquired if something like that would work?

Mr. Martinez stated we do not have a mechanism to do that.

Vice-Chair Brewster stated that he thought senior housing was much needed and would be great for Big Bear, but that he could not justify supporting the zone change without knowing for sure what type of project would be built on the property.

Commissioner Boll asked the applicant what would happen if the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change applications were approved, and then the preliminary traffic study and an environmental study were done and did not support the project?

Mr. Weber stated that he would be willing to take the risk, that he believed he would be able to mitigate environmental and/or traffic study requirements, and would like to proceed by agreeing in writing, whether in letter agreement form or contract form that if the General Plan Amendment were approved they would comply.

Ms. Molina, referring to Vice-Chair Brewster's suggestion that a letter be drafted stating what the types of uses were going to occur on the property, stated that such a letter would be a contract, which would be the same as a Development Agreement, and she suggested that due to the Commissioner's concerns that the Commission may wish to direct the applicant to revisit a Development Agreement or some other such mechanism, which in itself would be a mini zoning ordinance, laying out which uses would be established and that could be valid for five to fifteen years or even extended beyond that time period.

Vice-Chair Brewster asked if the Planning Commission had any powers to relax the requirements of a Development Agreement, which might drive the expenses?

Mr. Martinez stated that the Commission could relax certain development standards, that there was some authority in the law to allow for that, but not the environmental studies needed. He stated that some Development Agreements merely lay out the parameters of what the future development is going to be, without actually having the development in place within the Development Agreement.

Mr. Martinez offered a suggestion to continue the public hearing in order to allow the applicant to work with staff to draft some basic deal points toward a Development Agreement and report back to the Commission in one month.

Moved by Commissioner Brewster, seconded by Commissioner Boll, to continue General Plan Amendment 2003-102 and Zone Change 2003-103 to the meeting of March 2, 2005.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: DOKTER, BOLL, BREWSTER, BEEDE
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: BRIGHAM

2.3 Planning Appeal 2005-003

Applicant: Jim Conklin
Representative: Same
Location: 40367 Big Bear Boulevard
APN: 0308-083-12

Chairman Beede informed the Commission that due to a conflict of interest he would not be able to participate in the discussion of this appeal. At the hour of 2:15 p.m., Chairman Beede turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Brewster and left the meeting room.

Ms. Molina presented the staff report, stating that the applicant is appealing the City Planner's decision that a dragster affixed to a building constitutes a sign, as defined by Section 17.12.020 of the Development Code. She stated that staff recommends the Commission conduct a public hearing, take public testimony, and deny Planning Appeal 2005-003, based on the findings contained in the resolution.

Staff answered the Commission's questions about whether a Variance application would allow the dragster to remain on the front of the building, stating that certain findings would need to be met for a Variance approval and noting the price of a Variance application is about \$1800.00.

At the hour of 2:35 p.m., Vice-Chair Brewster opened the public hearing.

Art Tomchik, resident of Big Bear Lake, stated his support for the dragster to remain on the building.

Jim Conklin, the applicant, stated that it was his intent to enhance the front of his building with the unique dragster but would be willing to work with the City in any way to make the dragster fit into regulated sign parameters.

Hearing no further comment, at the hour of 2:43 p.m., Vice-Chair Brewster closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Dokter stated that the dragster was indeed unique and that he would like to try to find a way to preserve it.

Commissioner Boll inquired if a Temporary Sign Permit would be a viable option. Ms. Molina stated that a Temporary Sign Permit is specifically for an A-frame sign or a banner for a new business.

Vice-Chair Brewster stated that a \$1,800 Variance was an expensive avenue to try to keep the dragster and asked staff what would happen if the appeal were denied.

Ms. Molina stated that staff was willing to work with the applicant to integrate his existing sign onto the dragster and conform with the sign permit requirements.

At the hour of 2:50 p.m., Vice-Chair Brewster reopened the public hearing to hear an additional comment from Mr. Conklin.

Mr. Conklin informed the Commission that he had previously mentioned bolting his existing sign to the dragster but that staff had said this would not meet the provisions of the Sign Ordinance.

At the hour of 2:51 p.m., Vice-Chair Brewster closed the public hearing.

Ms. Molina clarified that if Mr. Conklin could meet the provisions listed in the Sign Ordinance, staff would approve his Sign Permit.

Moved by Commissioner Dokter, seconded by Commissioner Boll, to adopt Resolution No. PC2005-006 upholding the City Planner's determination and denying Planning Appeal 2005-003, based on the findings as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. PC2005-006

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BIG BEAR LAKE, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, UPHOLDING THE CITY PLANNER'S DETERMINATION THAT A DRAGSTER AFFIXED TO THE FRONT OF AN AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR BUILDING LOCATED AT 40367 BIG BEAR BOULEVARD CONSTITUTES A SIGN AS DEFINED BY SECTION 17.12.020 OF THE DEVELOPMENT CODE, AND DENYING PLANNING APPEAL 2005-003.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES: DOKTER, BOLL, BREWSTER
NOES: NONE
ABSENT: NONE
ABSTAIN: BRIGHAM, BEEDE

At the hour of 2:55 p.m., Vice-Chair Brewster called for a recess.

At the hour of 2:59 p.m., Vice-Chair Brewster reconvened the meeting and turned it over to Chairman Beede.

2.4 Development Code Amendment 2004-330

Applicant: City of Big Bear Lake
Representative: Same
Location: All properties zoned Multiple Family Residential (R-3)

Ms. Molina presented the staff report, stating that this application was being continued from the Planning Commission meeting of January 19, 2005, and reminding the Commission that during a special meeting held on November 23, 2004, the Planning Commission directed staff to prepare draft language to amend Table Chapter 17.25.030A (Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Zones) of the Development Code and establish a new Section 17.25.220 (Development and Performance Standards for Ancillary Uses Within Commercial Lodging Facilities), to allow the use of ancillary facilities by general public, non-lodging guests to use meeting and conference rooms, and to allow general public, non-lodging guests to use dining room and food services. She stated that an advisory letter was mailed out to all lodges in the R-3 zones, and that two parties responded with questions and were not in opposition to amending the Development Code.

Ms. Molina informed the Commission of a formatting error on Page 14 of the staff report, noting that 17.25.221 should be corrected to 17.25.220, and that D through F should be shown as A through C. She stated that staff recommends that the Planning Commission continue the public hearing, take public testimony and adopt a resolution recommending that the City Council adopt an Ordinance adopting a Negative Declaration and approving Development Code Amendment 2004-330, based on the findings contained in the resolution.

Commissioner Boll informed the Commission that although he was not in attendance for the meeting of January 16, 2005, he had listened to the audio tape from the meeting and read the staff report, so therefore was eligible to participate in today's discussion.

The Commission and staff reviewed changes to the draft language as directed by the Commission from the meeting of January 16, 2005 for the new Section 17.25.220, specifically reviewing revised wording for outdoor patios, conference rooms used as separate dining areas, additional holiday dining, monitoring noise, parking standards, and serving of alcohol within conference or meeting rooms.

It was the consensus of the Commission that determinations need to be made as to what public dining is, and what private events are. Ms. Molina asked for clarification from the Commission regarding outdoor use of decks and patios in order to integrate them into R-3 zone districts. She asked that if the Commission is going to allow outdoor use, what is going to be allowed? For example, is outdoor food service to be allowed in any fashion, and, if outdoor decks were not situated at the interior of the property but located next to property line, should setbacks be established for the outdoor patios?

Commissioner Dokter stated that a 55 decibel noise level at the property line was acceptable, that Valentine's Day should be added to the list of holidays, and that indoor and outdoor dining should be listed as separate uses.

Commissioner Boll stated his agreement with Commissioner Dokter's changes, stating that it was his belief that outdoor patios should not include full dinner service, as most outdoor patios are just too close to R-1 zones, but added that Item A (4) should be changed from between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 10:00 a.m. to between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., and that perhaps Item B (2) should be added back in to cover a wedding reception.

Chairman Beede asked for clarification regarding submitting a Conditional Use Permit for bed and breakfast facilities in an R-3 zone. Ms. Molina stated that a formal Conditional Use Permit would be required, and the Commission would be able to put any operational conditions it deemed appropriate on specific locations and ultimately to have staff bring back the Conditional Use Permit to the Commission if it were not being operated in accordance with the conditions.

Commissioner Brewster stated he thought public use of outdoor patios should be clarified in Item A (3), that Item D (1) should be modified to cover simple outdoor wedding receptions, but that it was his opinion that the Commission should limit general public dining to the inside spaces in R-3 zones.

At the hour of 3:40 p.m., Chairman Beede reopened the public hearing.

Stan Miller, resident of Big Bear Lake and owner of a bed and breakfast establishment, spoke of his basic support of the draft language, but stated his opposition to noise monitoring at 55 decibels, that he thought food service should be allowed anytime if served indoors, and suggested that special events open to the public should be allowed up to six times per year.

Barbara McLean, resident of Big Bear Lake and owner of a bed and breakfast establishment, stated her support for the Development Code amendment, that parking requirements would take care of unsuitable locations for potential bed and breakfast establishments, and expressed her frustration with the 24-7 hotline phone number for Private Home Rental complaints.

The Commission summarized their suggestions for revisions, which included deleting the words "first level" from Section A (3), changing indoor hours from 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. in Section A (4), a noise standard of 55 decibels in A (5), adding Valentine's Day to holidays in Section C (2), and expanding Section D to include a list of permitted outdoor uses and the hours of each.

After determining that additional revisions were needed, Commissioner Dokter made a motion to continue the public hearing and Development Code Amendment 2004-330 to the Planning Commission meeting of February 16, 2005 to allow time for staff to make the requested changes. Chairman Beede seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by the following vote:

AYES:	DOKTER, BOLL, BREWSTER, BEEDE
NOES:	NONE
ABSENT:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	BRIGHAM

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Commissioner Boll made a motion to change the Agenda order to hear Item 3.2 before Item 3.1. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 4 in favor and 0 against.

3.2 General Plan Amendment 2004-058 and Zone Change 2004-059

Ms. Molina presented a status report on the project, stating that on April 24, 2002, Larry Cooke submitted a Pre-Development Review application to develop a dock manufacturing and boat storage facility for properties owned on Rathbone Drive. She stated that he was informed at that time that establishing such uses would require a change in the Zoning and General Plan Land Use designation from Commercial-General to Industrial. On March 8, 2004, Mr. Cooke submitted General Plan Amendment and Zone Change applications to change the land use designation from Commercial-General (CG) to Industrial (IND) and the Zoning from Commercial-General (C-2) to Commercial-Industrial (C-5). At that time, staff asked Mr. Cooke if it was also his intent to move forward with the dock manufacturing and boat storage project that he had conceptually proposed in 2002 and he indicated that it was not his intent. During this discussion, the applicant was informed that the blanket C-5 designation allows for more intensive uses than the City would want to see within this area, and that moving ahead with a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change without a development application could not be supported. She continued, stating that although the Council has expressed their support to incorporate light industrial uses within the China Gardens area, it has not been determined where within the China Gardens area such uses would be better suited. Mr. Cooke indicated that he would be willing to entertain moving the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change application forward with some sort of mitigation or condition that would limit the type of uses he could have on the property.

Ms. Molina listed three possible mechanisms for conditioning the uses desired by Mr. Cooke; one being the creation of a new Zone District through a Development Code Amendment with the appropriate development standards and uses, the second being a Development Agreement that would bind the property for an established period of time. She stated that either option one or two would allow staff to review how the proposed use would relate to surrounding properties and to place special limitations on the property within the context of effects on those properties. The third option would be to file a development application with the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change applications. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public discussion.

At the hour of 4:30 p.m., Chairman Beede opened public discussion.

Larry Cooke, the applicant, requested the Commission to direct staff to move forward to schedule a Planning Commission meeting date for his General Plan Amendment and Zone Change application so that he might move forward with his dock building and indoor boat storage business, stating that at joint planning and growth workshops between the Planning Commission and City Council, City Council gave staff direction

to identify areas to incorporate light industrial uses into the vision of the China Gardens area. He stated that he would agree to submit a Development Agreement for a five-year period, emphasizing the need for industrial zoning in the Big Bear Valley.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Beede closed the public discussion at the hour of 5:05 p.m.

A discussion ensued regarding the pros and cons of Development Agreements in general and specifically for this applicant and this property. Ms. Molina stated that a Development Agreement seemed like a viable solution, but noted that staff would need to process the necessary CEQA documentation and applications before the City could move forward with the project.

Commissioner Brewster stated that he thought a C-4 ½ zone would be a good solution for the China Gardens area and asked staff to look at putting this on the schedule for the future. Ms Molina informed the Commission that this item is on the City's workplan and that it is a priority of City Council to master plan that area.

The Planning Commission directed staff to work with the applicant on a basic format of deal points for a conceptual project, to eventually move forward with a Development Agreement, and report progress back to the Commission at the meeting of March 2, 2005.

3.1 Appointment of a New Member to the Slope Density Ad-Hoc Committee

Commissioner Boll was nominated to the Slope Density Ad-Hoc Committee, replacing Bill Jahn upon his election to the City Council. The next meeting will be held on February 15, 2005 in the Training Room of the Civic Center.

4. PLANNING OFFICIAL'S REPORT

None.

5. SUMMARY COMMENTS

Chairman Beede thanked everyone for a difficult afternoon.

Vice-Chair Brewster congratulated Tim Brigham on his appointment to the Planning Commission.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments, Chairman Beede adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 16, 2005.

Lynne Rayner

Lynne Rayner, Administrative Secretary