

PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes July 6, 2006

The City of Kalamazoo Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Commissioner Kuseske at 7:00 p.m. in the Third Floor Conference Room, City Hall, 241 W. South St., Kalamazoo, MI 49007. There were 3 additional people in attendance.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Terry Kuseske, Chair; Frank Cody, Vice Chair; Casey Fawley; James Kneen; Bertha Stewart; Linda Wienir

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Kelly DeRango; Sonja Dean

IN ATTENDANCE

Keith Hernandez, Deputy Director/City Planner; Rob Bauckham, Assistant City Planner; John Kneas, Assistant City Attorney; Amy Thomas, Recording Secretary

GUESTS

Kathy Jessup, Kalamazoo Gazette; 2 unnamed students from K-College

ROLL CALL

Planner Hernandez completed roll call and it was determined that the aforementioned members were present.

AGENDA (July 6, 2006)

Commissioner Kuseske requested the following additions to the agenda: 1. Informational item from the City Clerk regarding changes in appointments to boards and commissions and; 2. Budget review.

With a voice vote, the amended agenda for the July 6, 2006 Planning Commission meeting was unanimously approved.

MINUTES (June 1, 2006)

Commissioner Wienir requested the following change to the minutes: near the bottom of page 3, should state that there was concern regarding "student street parties" not street traffic.

Commissioner Cody requested the following change to the minutes: Page 15, paragraph 3; "The motion passed with six in favor and one abstention."

Commissioner Kneen, supported by Commissioner Stewart, moved approval of the June 1, 2006 Planning Commission minutes as amended. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Planner Hernandez advised that the Kalamazoo Township Planning Commission will be holding a special meeting in the near future regarding the update of their master plan at the Kalamazoo Township Hall, 1720 Riverview Dr., Kalamazoo, MI 49004. Questions on the date and time of the meeting can be answered by calling 888-226-4326.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

CITIZENS' COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Kuseske advised that since there are no public hearings tonight, this meeting is being used as an opportunity to discuss issues of concern to the Planning Commission.

Site Plan Update for the Park Building

Planner Bauckham stated that copies of the site plan list for 2006 were included in the Planning Commission Packets. Discussion followed with regard to Greenleaf Trust's plans for the land near South Street and Rose Street, including the site where the Park Building currently sits. The plans include demolition of the Park Building, which is not in a historic district. The Park Building is approximately 100 years old. The proposed plan is subject to the approval of the Downtown Design Review Committee and site plan review. The proposed building is a permitted use on that site and, therefore, the project did not have to be approved by the Planning Commission or the City Commission.

The proposed plan from Greenleaf Trust was submitted for site plan review and was referred by the Site Plan Review Committee to the Downtown Design Review Committee (DDRC). Due to the age of the building, the DDRC requested review of the proposed plan by the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC). The HPC acts in an advisory capacity to the DDRC. The HPC recommended that the Park Building be saved. The DDRC took into consideration the fact that the Park Building doesn't have any historic designations and the fact that it doesn't have any particularly unique or interesting architectural features. Also, the company looking at the site is not interested in moving into the Park Building because it would not meet their needs. If their requests are not met, they would be forced to look at an alternative site outside of the city. Accordingly, the DDRC made the recommendation to approve the project, including the demolition. The proposal was then forwarded to the Site Plan Review Committee, and it voted unanimously to approve the project with the demolition. Planner Bauckham advised that there was a meeting earlier in the day with the city's building code official to discuss the demolition process. A demolition permit was issued, and the demolition will likely move forward next week. The process should take about six weeks and construction will begin shortly thereafter.

Commissioner Kuseske advised that he was a guest at the HPC meeting and two of the site plan review meetings. The process moved along quite quickly and the project manager advised that he was pleased with the assistance he had received from city staff in the planning office. He commended Sharon Ferraro, the Historic Preservation Coordinator, for her help in the process. The HPC expressed concern that without the Park Building, the area nominated for historic designation would need to be updated. The proposed building looks similar to the Radisson Hotel and the Kalamazoo Public Library. These buildings represent a new generation of architecture in the downtown area.

Commissioner Kuseske mentioned that the plans have changed during the process. The living quarters are no longer included in the plan. Ms. Ferraro pointed out that the proposed building design fits in well with the new downtown overlay. One concern is that parking would be at street level, inside the new building, and there was hope that space would be developed for retail use.

Attorney Kneas commented that the option of a subterranean parking garage had been explored so street level space could be used for retail purposes. However, that option would elevate the cost by approximately \$50,000. There are also issues with the water table when excavating at that level so that option was rejected.

Planner Bauckham stated that there are existing buildings directly to the east and north, so there is need for engineering controls on the walls of the area being excavated to prevent collapse of the surrounding area. That is a very costly procedure. The Park Building has been part of the downtown landscape for over 100 years, and allowing the

demolition was a difficult decision. However, the proposed building is of quality design. It has interesting architectural features and will be primarily brick. The hope is that the new building will be in the downtown landscape for the next 100 years. It is estimated that the new building will be completed in 2008.

Attorney Kneas mentioned that the main tenant for the new building (a law office) was under pressure to relocate from their current location and it would be beneficial to keep them in the downtown area.

Commissioner Kuseske suggested that construction of the new building may also help facilitate the construction of other developments in the area. He mentioned that according to a survey he read, there were approximately 24,000 jobs in the downtown area in the past, but now there are about half as many jobs in downtown Kalamazoo. He commented that maintaining the law office in the downtown area is important to help maintain the customer base for other downtown businesses. Commissioner Kuseske encouraged other Planning Commission members to attend the site plan review meetings. Everyone who attends has a different perspective and comments that are made can be beneficial to the planning process.

Planner Bauckham requested that anyone with questions about projects on the site plan list give him a call to obtain further details.

August meeting location

Planner Hernandez advised that the Planning Commission has the opportunity to hold a regular meeting at the offices of the Northside Association for Community Development (NACD) at 612 N. Park St. If this option is pursued, it would be the first attempt by the Planning Commission to go out into the community as discussed at the Planning Commission retreat.

Commissioner Wienir, supported by Commissioner Cody, moved to hold the next Planning Commission meeting at the offices of the Northside Association for Community Development.

Planner Bauckham advised that there are currently no applications filed with city staff for Planning Commission action. Accordingly, there may be no formal issues to be discussed at the August meeting. If no applications are filed, the Planning Commission has the option of either holding the meeting to discuss other issues or canceling the meeting.

Commissioner Cody mentioned that if there are no issues pertaining to the Northside Neighborhood on the Planning Commission agenda for August, it would defeat the purpose of holding the meeting at that location. Even if there are no issues pertaining to

the Northside, it would be helpful to at least have agenda items that are of concern to the community so that guests can observe how the planning process works.

Commissioner Wienir suggested holding the meeting at the NACD office and addressing issues that are of concern to that neighborhood. Planner Hernandez advised that one of the concerns in the Northside Neighborhood is the condition of the sidewalks near North Park and North Westnedge. City staff in the Community Planning and Development Department will follow up by doing a sidewalk survey on the Northside. The Public Services Department would be responsible for repair of the sidewalks. City staff will also be working with the NACD to target major intersections in the Northside Neighborhood and have them re-landscaped, repair brickwork at the corners, enhance the lighting, etc. However, these issues would not be of major concern to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Kuseske requested a voice vote on the motion, the result of which was unclear. The motion was restated. Commissioner Fawley inquired if there was a caveat on the motion that there would be public hearings at the meeting to be held at the NACD. Discussion followed with regard to a possible amendment to the motion. Commissioner Kuseske requested a roll call vote on the original motion and suggested that a second motion be made for clarification, if necessary.

With a roll call vote, the motion was defeated.

Ayes: Kneen, Stewart, Kuseske

Nays: Cody, Fawley, Wienir

Commissioner Kuseske suggested either making a new motion to include the caveat suggested by Commissioner Fawley, or waiting to make the decision at a later date. Suggestions were made as to the possible content of the motion.

Commissioner Cody, supported by Commissioner Fawley, moved that the next Planning Commission meeting, at which there is a public hearing, be held at the NACD office at 612 N. Park St. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Wienir mentioned that the Neighborhood Associations of Michigan (NAM) will be holding a conference in Kalamazoo on September 22nd and 23rd. She encouraged the members of the Planning Commission to attend this conference. Neighborhood Associations from all over Michigan will be attending the conference, and areas of interest in Kalamazoo will be discussed. This was suggested as a point of information not as a meeting locale for the Planning Commission. The NAM meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn on 9th Street.

Work Session Discussion

Planner Bauckham advised that there has been some discussion in the past about having Planning Commission work sessions to discuss various issues, and to give the commissioners an opportunity to get acquainted.

Commissioner Kuseske mentioned that work sessions would provide an opportunity for the newer members of the Planning Commission to ask questions. He stated that he would provide to the new commissioners a copy of the information from former Commissioner Marcia Miller regarding the procedures to be followed by boards and commissions.

Commissioner Kuseske mentioned the need to thoroughly interview potential candidates for the Planning Commission. He also stressed the need to maintain diversity among the Planning Commissioners. Some of the elements of diversity to be taken into consideration are geographic representation in the city, representation by minorities, and gender equity. During the process of filling the most recent vacancies, there was concern about the small number of qualified applicants who applied for the vacant seats. Accordingly, it would be beneficial to have more discussion regarding the appointment procedure.

Commissioner Stewart stated that there are basically two issues: the need to discuss the process for filling vacant seats on the Planning Commission and the relationships among the Planning Commissioners. She stressed the need to develop working relationships among the commissioners, but questioned how best to go about that.

Commissioner Cody suggested either going to educational activities, such as the presentation at the Radisson Hotel on intergovernmental relations and planning, or the site plan meetings at the Development Center, etc. Commissioner Cody mentioned several events he attended with other commissioners and city staff, which have provided an opportunity to get to know people better.

Commissioner Wienir added that it is also important to provide positive feedback to fellow commissioners, presenters, developers and city staff. She commended Commissioner Fawley for compliments he has made at the Planning Commission meetings to individuals involved with the planning process. She stressed the importance of the planning commissioners working as a team and fully communicating to each other with regard to issues that are of importance.

Commissioner Kuseske also mentioned the importance of the planning commissioners respecting each others' opinions, and explaining their perspectives to the other commissioners.

Planner Bauckham encouraged the commissioners to continue to state their opinions and their perspectives on issues at the Planning Commission meetings. It is important that the Planning Commission not “rubber stamp” issues that are on the agenda. Active dialogue and differing viewpoints and opinions are important to the planning process.

Commissioner Kuseske mentioned that the site plan review process is helpful for pointing out potential effects of projects on the community. Suggestions that are made at the site plan review meetings can be catalysts for improvement in the community.

Commissioner Cody commented that there has been concern that not enough African Americans or Hispanics are on the Planning Commission. It would be nice to see more applications from minorities. He suggested that holding a Planning Commission meeting at the NACD office might have a positive impact in that regard.

Commissioner Kuseske mentioned that there has been some discussion about members of the Planning Commission meeting with neighborhood associations. Such meetings might provide a means of educating residents about how the Planning Commission works, and could also be beneficial for helping recruit new commissioners. Commissioner Kuseske stated that he spoke with the director of the Hispanic American Council. She advised that Hispanics involved with local organizations are in great demand and they are already working at capacity. It is important to continue to build those connections. He suggested working with the neighborhood organizations and encouraging people to apply to be on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Stewart mentioned that according to a demographic study done at Western Michigan University, only about 10% of African Americans in Kalamazoo are from the Northside Neighborhood. She advised that some African Americans don't want to serve on boards because they don't see the benefit in participating. It is important to communicate the importance of having minorities serving on boards and commissions. She mentioned that the majority of minority board members are recruited by non-minorities.

Commissioner Fawley commented that people who serve on boards/commissions are just good citizens who view their work as an opportunity to serve the community; no one is here to serve themselves.

Commissioner Wienir stated that she spoke to several new residents in her neighborhood who are minorities. She advised that she would be having a picnic around the end of July and that she planned to invite her neighbors and fellow planning commissioners to the event. She commented that there are several houses for sale in her neighborhood that have not attracted buyers over the last six months. She suggested that one reason might be the lack of jobs in the area. It appears that the “Kalamazoo Promise” has not helped with the housing market in that neighborhood.

Commissioner Kneen mentioned that the younger generation is often not interested in serving on boards. Commissioner Fawley commented that no matter how much you want people to participate, they may not want to serve. It is important to have people who are willing to serve. Commissioner Kuseske advised that sometimes people don't serve because they feel powerless. It is important to let them know they have influence in their community and it is important for them to participate. It might take awhile to change these viewpoints. Commissioner Kuseske urged the members of the Planning Commission to help recruit new members.

Stuart Overlay Project

Planner Hernandez stated that earlier this year, there were two Planning Commission meetings involving applicants who applied for Special Use Permits (SUP) in the Stuart Neighborhood. One request was for a fraternity and the other was for transitional housing. Many of the Stuart Neighborhood residents appeared at the Planning Commission meetings in an effort to get those measures defeated. The Stuart residents expressed concern about having to appear at Planning Commission meetings every time a SUP is requested in the Stuart area. Accordingly, they have requested an overlay to restrict group living situations in the neighborhood.

City staff suggested a cap on the number of group living situations that would be allowed in the Stuart Neighborhood. The residents were not happy with that since there are almost no group homes in the neighborhood and a cap would allow more than what already exists. The Stuart residents want to be the first to review the SUP requests with the applicants. They also want dimensional restrictions, which would mean that a series of things would have to happen before certain uses could occur. Planner Hernandez advised that city staff has not moved forward on that request because there is uncertainty as to whether or not the Planning Commission can refer the SUP back to the neighborhood for approval.

Commissioner Kuseske stated that he met with several people from the Stuart Neighborhood. They have concerns that the Planning Commission is acquiescing their authority. Commissioner Cody inquired if it would be possible to allow the Stuart residents to have discussions with the applicants, but still maintain the authority of the Planning Commission to vote against a SUP. He pointed out that the Planning Commission overturned the decision of the DDRC (Downtown Design Review Committee) with regard to the decision about the Up & Under restaurant. He inquired if city staff was looking for an authoritative approach from the Stuart residents or if they would just give recommendations.

Attorney Kneas indicated that it would be difficult to grant the request from the Stuart Neighborhood since the city would be allowing a special mandate from one neighborhood. The DDRC is supported by the local ordinances, but the request from the neighborhood would be a mandate.

It could be done but it would add a hurdle for applicants in one area of the city and that wouldn't work. The process should be uniform throughout the city.

Commissioner Kuseske pointed out that there are opportunities for the residents to participate in the Planning Commission meetings. Commissioner Fawley added that he thought the process was fine and that the Stuart residents need to continue participating as they have in the past. Commissioner Kuseske requested that Planner Hernandez convey this information to the Stuart Neighborhood residents.

Attorney Kneas commented that a public hearing is required for a SUP, and a quasi public hearing could be problematic. He added that the SUP criteria applies no matter what neighborhood is involved. The Planning Commission felt that not all criteria had been met to allow the recently requested special use permits in the Stuart Neighborhood. Attorney Kneas stated that the old zoning code was not the best mechanism for planning in the city; it was more of a suburban code. The new code tries to recognize that there are certain areas of the city with unique characteristics, and there is potential for zoning overlays in those areas.

Planner Bauckham mentioned the possibility of a zoning conservation overlay district for the Stuart Neighborhood. Attorney Kneas stated that the conservation overlay is being developed for areas where the houses are old and close together, etc. The zoning overlay will recognize the special characteristics of neighborhoods, but this particular detail is a fairly new feature in the zoning ordinance. Commissioner Kuseske added that there will likely be more of these issues brought forth with the new ordinance. The overlays are designed to allow adjustments for new situations.

Commissioner Kuseske commented that the general consensus from the commissioners is that the current planning/public hearing process is fine and the Planning Commission appreciates the input from the residents. Planner Hernandez advised that city staff would contact Leslie Decker at the Stuart Area Restoration Association (SARA) to advise her of the discussion by the Planning Commission at tonight's meeting. City staff will continue to ask applicants who have projects in the Stuart Neighborhood to contact SARA since that has always been the process.

Planner Hernandez advised that the overlay process for the Stuart Neighborhood is at an impasse because there is some question as to whether certain uses can be excluded. However, the Stuart Neighborhood will at least have what is known as a traditional housing density overlay to provide them with some control over the types of businesses/living situations that are allowed in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wienir mentioned that, "compatibility" and "uniqueness" are subjective concepts and that's part of the democratic process that is being discussed this evening.

Planning Commission Procedures

Commissioner Kuseske stated that a copy of the Planning Commission Rules and Procedures were provided in the Planning Commission packets. Planner Hernandez will provide a copy of the Rules and Procedures to the new commissioners.

Planner Bauckham stated that it is important for Planning Commissioners to advise city staff if they are unable to attend a meeting. This information is critical for city staff to determine if the meeting will be cancelled due to a lack of quorum.

Planner Bauckham advised that it is helpful for commissioners to explain how they will vote and why, particularly on controversial issues. When there are major issues on the City Commission agenda, each City Commissioner states the rationale for the vote they will make.

Commissioner Cody mentioned that sometimes he is undecided by the end of the public hearing. He suggested allowing time for discussion before the Planning Commissioners make their statements. According to Roberts Rules, there is an option of making a motion to “postpone indefinitely” if there is opposition to the issue. Also, the person who makes the motion has the right to speak first, and everyone should have a chance to speak once before someone speaks a second time. This helps eliminate the confusion of having people talking back and forth.

Commissioner Stewart advised that it would be helpful to know the rationale behind staff decisions. Commissioner Fawley mentioned that the staff report generally explains the staff rationale, and commissioners can ask for further clarification if necessary. Attorney Kneas suggested requesting that Planner Bauckham return to the podium to address questions when needed. Planner Bauckham commented that the “finding” portion of the staff report could be discussed at the meeting to provide further clarification.

City Commission Liaison

Planner Hernandez stated that Bobby Hopewell is the City Commission Liaison to the Planning Commission. Concern was expressed that Vice Mayor Hopewell had not been present for several meetings. Planner Hernandez advised that he would follow up with the Vice Mayor in this regard.

Commissioner Kuseske inquired as to the role of the City Commission Liaison in the past. Planner Bauckham advised that a prior liaison would give a synopsis of events that occurred at the City Commission level and take information from the Planning Commission back to the City Commission. Sometimes the liaison would appear at every other Planning Commission meeting or every third meeting. Planner Bauckham stated that he would request more City Commission representation.

Commissioner Kuseske mentioned that sometimes it feels as though the Planning Commission is operating in a vacuum. He stressed the importance of conveying to the City Commission the concerns expressed by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Cody mentioned that the City Commission receives copies of Planning Commission minutes, and City Commission minutes are posted on the City's website for the public to view. Commissioner Kneen commented that it might be beneficial to know what the City Commission decided on issues that have come before the Planning Commission. Commissioner Wienir stressed the importance of working closely with the City Commission.

Commissioner Kuseske referred to an e-mail from Scott Borling pertaining to City Commission Liaisons. Commissioner Cody noted that the liaison duties had been stricken from the text as part of the proposed changes to the City Commission rules. The general consensus among the Planning Commissioners was that the proposed changes were not acceptable.

Commissioner Kneen inquired as to why the changes were being proposed. Attorney Kneas advised that the changes had been proposed based on discussions he had with Jerome Kisscorni and Scott Borling, regarding the board membership of the EDC (Economic Development Corporation) and the BRA (Brownfield Redevelopment Authority).

Planner Bauckham mentioned that the City Commissioners are liaisons to as many as three boards/commissions and they are asked to attend many of the meetings. Commissioner Cody pointed out that the text states City Commission Liaisons are to "attend meetings when possible" as they pertain to advisory board meetings. He further advised that he would like to have the language remain as is.

Planner Hernandez will convey this information to the Clerk's office.

Budget

Commissioner Kuseske expressed concern that last year's city budget was presented to the Planning Commission without much detail.

Planner Hernandez stated that a list of projects for the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2007 – 2012 was provided to the Planning Commission. The city is now working on a 5-year budget process. The Project Coordination Team meets two times per month to allow department heads the time to discuss coordination of the CIP. There is about one million dollars in the budget per year and the Project Coordination Team decides which projects take priority. So far, the team has only scored the first five proposed projects. Fully funded items are only on the list for tracking purposes as mandated by state &

federal legislature.

Work will begin on the Comprehensive Plan in 2007 and so far \$150,000 has been allocated for the Plan. Commissioner Kuseske advised that he would be interested in participating in the budget meetings.

Commissioner Cody inquired if the Planning Commission actually approves the budget. Planner Hernandez advised that the Planning Commission endorses the budget, and the City Commission approves it.

Commissioner Cody questioned if it was typical for the Planning Commission to receive the budget for endorsement at the last minute. Commissioner Cody expressed skepticism about the Planning Commission's influence on the CIP. If the Planning Commission Chair is to become active in the CIP process, is it within the purview of the Planning Commission to take an active role in this process?

Commissioner Stewart inquired if the City Commission's approval of the CIP is based on endorsement by the Planning Commission. Planner Hernandez explained that the Planning Commission must review the CIP before it goes to the City Commission. Commissioner Stewart added that it makes sense for the Planning Commission to understand the CIP before they endorse it.

Commissioner Kuseske stated that he found the 2005 CIP difficult to follow. An explanation was later provided for how certain projects are carried over into the following year's budget.

Commissioner Wienir commented that if the Planning Commission is a real part of the budget process, they should meet to discuss it.

Planner Bauckham inquired if it would suffice for part of the Planner's report to address CIP issues. Commissioner Kuseske commented that the Planning Commission is reviewing the CIP to see if the budget is on track and so far it has been.

Commissioner Cody inquired as to the extent the Planning Commissioners should become knowledgeable about the CIP. He added that he would read the material if it were presented to him. Planner Bauckham stated that the CIP approval process is a system of checks and balances. City staff reviews the CIP and then brings it to two separate commissions for review; the Planning Commission and the City Commission.

Commissioner Kuseske announced that the budget team meets on Mondays at 10:00 a.m. in the Community Room at City Hall if anyone would like to attend. The meetings generally last about three hours.

Commissioner Stewart inquired about the point system for the CIP. Planner Hernandez advised that 13 points is the highest score, but that he was not aware of any projects scoring that high.

Commissioner Wienir stated that she would like to know more about the budget process and requested that it be placed on the Planning Commission agenda. Planner Bauckham advised that the budget information could be added to the City Planner's report.

CITIZENS' COMMENTS

None

CITY PLANNER'S REPORT

Planner Hernandez stated that final action on the Riverfront Overlay Zoning District has been postponed. The City Commission wants city staff to talk more with the owner of Express Auto about his proposed development.

Planner Bauckham advised that he would speak with the owner and his attorney to seek alternatives. The owner has two lots. He wants to construct a building on the back lot and have cars for sale on the front lot. The lines drawn by city staff for the new zoning overlay have placed the back lot in an area that would not be suitable for the proposed project. The back lot can continue to be used for parking but the owner could not construct a building on it under the proposed zoning overlay. The back lot is adjacent to a residential area and City staff has concerns about noise with the proposed use. It would be difficult to attract developers for the residential area if the back lot of the commercial land is used as the owner has requested.

Commissioner Fawley inquired as to how soon the owners of Express Auto hoped to make the proposed changes to their property. Planner Bauckham advised that the owner of the property submitted a plan to city staff to build the parking lot on the rear parcel before the interim ordinance went into effect. The way the ordinance is set up now, the owners could not put up the building they want on the rear parcel unless the City Commission chose to override the Planning Commission's decision.

Planner Bauckham stated that the owner of Express Auto has stated that he would be hiring 20 new employees if he is allowed to complete the proposed project.

Commissioner Fawley inquired if the owner has invested a lot of money in the property, and Commissioner Stewart advised that he has not.

Planner Bauckham stated that the City Commission has requested that city staff work on a compromise. The owner could have some cars up front and some in back, but the overlay calls for new buildings to be built close to streets.

Planning Commission Minutes

July 6, 2006

Page 14 of 14

Attorney Kneas stated that the City Commission wanted to know the rationale for configuring the overlay in this manner. Commissioner Kuseske commented that this would have been a good opportunity for the City Commission liaison to relay a message from the Planning Commission to the City Commission. The Planning Commission minutes explained the rationale. Attorney Kneas advised that attorney Rodbard made a presentation at the City Commission meeting last night.

Commissioner Wienir requested a status report regarding Planning Commission representation on the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Planner Bauckham advised that there are currently no openings on the ZBA. There are six regular members and two alternates. When an opening comes up, this situation will be explored in more detail.

Commissioner Cody mentioned an e-mail that was circulated with regard to Commissioners being allowed to serve on only one board. However, exceptions can be made to that rule.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Cody advised that he enjoyed what was discussed but that he would like to be more prepared. Commissioner Kuseske advised that this opportunity has just presented itself, and that maybe the commissioners need an opportunity to hold a work session. He added that he thought the current meeting has been a worthwhile effort.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Kneen, supported by Commissioner Cody, moved to adjourn the July 6, 2006 Planning Commission meeting. With a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Hernandez, AICP
Deputy Director/City Planner
Community Planning and Development