

MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

President Fleisher called the meeting to order.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Fleisher, Shortt, Bennett, Kim

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Neill, Fuentes, Sinclair

STAFF PRESENT: Cooper, Klein

President Fleisher read the following statement:

“The Planning Commission is placing emphasis on effectively addressing the issues in which we are engaged in a respectful and a timely manner. We ask all parties to hearings and administrative matters during our meetings to assist us with this emphasis by participating in direct and relevant testimony and comments.”

II. COMMUNICATIONS AND NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 24, 2019

Commissioner Kim moved approval of the July 24, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Commissioner Shortt. Motion passed unanimously.

B. August 14, 2019

President Fleisher stated he had provided a couple of corrections to the August 14, 2019 meeting minutes to Mr. Cooper before tonight's meeting.

Colin Cooper, Planning Director, noted on Page 28 of 45, "development" should be changed to "*parcel*".

Commissioner Shortt stated she was not at the August 14th meeting, but had read the minutes and felt competent voting on them.

Commissioner Kim moved approval of the August 14, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes as corrected, seconded by Commissioner Shortt. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA – None

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

President Fleisher asked if any Commissioner wished to declare any ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest for any of the public hearing items. There were none.

A. Modification 009-19: Reed's Crossing Phase 1C:

Request: Consider approving an Order recommending City Council approve a PUD Modification consolidated application for Reed's Crossing Phase 1C consisting of a Concept Plan, a Subdivision preliminary plat of 211 lots, Minor and Major adjustments, a Conditional Use application for a neighborhood park, and two Development Review applications for the park and the "stacked-flat" triplex lots. **Order No. 8302 was available.**
(Staff: Ruth Klein)

A video was played narrating the ORS conduct of hearing format.

Ruth Klein, Senior Planner, cited the substantive applicable approval criteria and presented the Staff report via PowerPoint. She noted the Commissioners had a supplemental Staff report dated September 25, 2019, in addition to the initial September 18, 2019 Staff report. Page 2 of the September 18th Staff report listed the applications that would be reviewed tonight. Other highlights of her presentation were as follows:

- The concept plan had been updated and a preliminary plat submitted. The architecture for Phase 1C would be the same as that approved by the Planning Commission for Phases 1A and 1B. A conditional use application for the proposed public neighborhood park and associated development review regarding park amenities was also provided. Major and minor adjustments equivalent to those in Phases 1A and 1B concerned increased block length, solar orientation, lot size, setbacks, and different architectural standards to allow flexibility for the variety of developers for the site.
- The September 25th supplemental Staff report contained minor changes to the original draft conditions of approval, which included the Clean Water Services standards that should be applied to the land use application to allow for the City Engineer to weigh in for special exceptions; a correction to Condition 26 where "eastern" should read "**western**"; a recommended optional condition for the Applicant to receive Transportation Development Tax (TDT) credits if they chose to do a road improvement; an update to Sheet P27 to add a note that the cycle track and planter strip, but not the sidewalk, would be constructed for a specific lot and the frontage along the future school lot to avoid damage to the sidewalk during development.

President Fleisher confirmed there were no questions for Staff and that Staff had no written testimony or petitions to submit. He then called for the Applicant's testimony.

Eric Peterson, Newland Communities, Senior Project Manager, Reed's Crossing, thanked Staff for their help, noting that without it, Newland would not be presenting the application before the Commission tonight. The partnership Newland had with Staff was valued greatly. He presented the application via PowerPoint with these comments:

- He reviewed the geography of Reed's Crossing, noting the location of the subject 463 acres site as the northern parcel within the South Hillsboro Master Plan Area.

- The focus tonight would be on Phase 1, which was broken into three subphases along with the Greenway that cut east-west through the middle of the phase. Phase 1A was the initial phase, and 62 home sales had occurred since April, so the project had been very well received. Phase 1B, approved by the Commission in May, was well under construction, and Newland was racing to beat the rain expected in the next few weeks. They were busy grading streets and installing sewer pipe, which would be completed next summer, and then foundations for Phase 1B would begin.
 - Phase 1C was 30 total acres in the southeast corner of Phase 1 and was designed with 221 lots. Some significant backbone infrastructure would be built with Phase 1C, including the extension of NW Cornelius Pass Rd at the intersection with SW Kinnaman Rd, and then building west on Kinnaman to SE Reed Dr. The aerial photograph showed Reed Dr under construction; it now connected to the corner of Kinnaman.
 - Because Phase 1C was the final subphase within Phase 1, consistent architectural standards would be used. The design housing types in Phases 1A and 1B would be carried into Phase 1C. A new product type would be used in Phase 2 that would focus on increased density and include a zero lot line product.
 - The Applicant would maintain the design principles seen through Phases 1A and 1B, such as pedestrian connectivity as shown by the green space on the slide. The design tried to make the home buyers less reliant on their automobiles.
- Finally, Newland tried to make the site an amenities-rich community. For the first time within Phase 1C, two components to the project were included that were part of the overall Master Plan vision: the school and the neighborhood park, which would be owned and maintained by the City's Park Department. In designing the park with the Parks Department, the Applicant brought the school in as well because they wanted a good connection from a pedestrian standpoint. Additionally, within the Greenway just to the north of the park the nature education area had been designed with the school district to ensure students and teachers could go from the school through the park and into the nature education area.
- Newland was excited to deliver this phase because they were able to combine the early pieces of the puzzle that fulfilled the vision of Reed's Crossing. The vision was of a great community that was incredibly well-connected and well-designed. The Applicant was very proud of Phase 1C, because it accomplished that vision.

Mimi Doukas, AKS Engineering, displaying Phase 1A, she noted Phases 1A and 1B were currently under construction. Now, the Newland team was ready for Phase 1C, which included two subphases: Phase 1C West had streets adjacent to it, so it was kind of a microphase that could proceed with development fairly quickly, and the remainder of Phase 1C East, which included a neighborhood park, which was part of the application both as a Conditional Use permit and Development Review; and the future elementary school site that would come before the Commission at a future date. She was working with the School District and GreenWorks on that application.

- The roadway network around the site included an arterial, a collector, and a neighborhood route. The existing pedestrian network was located to the north within the Greenway and the Applicant's team continued that relationship into Phase 1C; indicated in blue was the planned trail connection from the So-Hi Community Plan. The combination would bring pedestrians through the neighborhood park, into the neighborhood, and through an enhanced streetscape within the residential portion of the project.

- Similar to the rest of Phase 1, the team continued pedestrian connectivity throughout the development, which consisted of pathways that opened up the neighborhood to give that connectivity some breathability. The Applicant wanted to balance density and open space in So-Hi to ensure the residents were choosing to live in a community that had access to larger planned green spaces.
 - The green spaces were a combination of public green spaces and homeowners association (HOA) maintained green spaces. HOAs managed micro-maintenance well and Parks was very good at macro maintenance. The green spaces connected to the larger public green spaces like the Greenway and the neighborhood park.
 - The Neighborhood Park Plan was reviewed by the Parks Commission, and the parks were similar to the other neighborhood parks for Rosedale Parks and Butternut Creek which were walk-to parks that did not have parking facilities. Amenities chosen by the Parks District and by the public through an outreach included a skate spot, bocce court, picnic areas, meadow area, lawn for active recreation, a play spot, and restroom.
- The product distribution map showed the different housing types, as seen in Phases 1A and 1B, and included a mix of attached and detached housing that were for sale as fee simple homes. A courtyard design would be used adjacent to Cornelius Pass to strike a balance between buffering and good architectural design along that tough edge, so those homes faced onto green streets that had the pedestrian connections out to Cornelius Pass Rd. The lower-density homes would be located on the interior of the project.
- Stacked flat homes were presented for Phase 1B. This interesting housing type accommodated density, but still had good urban design and a different ownership component. Newland was still trying to make stacked flats work. Mr. Peterson would address Newland's vision for the stacked flats. Included in the Development Review were the same designs examples used for Phase 1B and were schematic at this point; the team was still trying to determine who would be the end-users for that product and who would tackle that particular type of housing.

Mr. Peterson stated Newland was excited about the stacked flat product because it provided density and affordability in a very unique way and yet, from the outside, the elevations looked strong and looked like larger homes. The homebuilders were struggling with the condo component from a liability standpoint, but Newland believed they would find one or two builders that were willing to tackle it. It had been a challenge when they brought it to market.

Ms. Doukas added Staff's help with refining the conditions of approval was appreciated as it helped the team on the implementation side.

Commissioner Kim asked for the anticipated level of use of the park and if space for vehicle parking would be adequate.

- **Mr. Peterson** replied Newland hoped the park was very highly used by the local residents. He understood that from the City's standpoint, no additional parking was included because the hope was that users would not come from outside the area to use the park. It was meant to be walked to, so additional parking was not included. Quite a bit of street parking would be available on the frontage, so those who lived close by could drive to it.
 - The multi-functional design concept of the park was unique and he was proud of it. A lot of uses would be provided for kids, but also for adults, such as the bocce courts and a fire pit with Adirondack chairs, so adults could be at the park with their children, but still have a little separation to enjoy their time.

- **Ms. Doukas** noted the road to the north that curved around Tamarack St had parking on both sides of the street, no driveways, and not many competing homes. In addition, the school would have a parking lot along Reed Dr and one of the parking lots was designed to be along Reed Dr. The walking distance to the park was not huge if one wanted to drive to the area. However, the primary audience for the park was not those who would choose to drive there.

Commissioner Shortt asked how the additional stories in the stacked flats would be accessed.

- **Mr. Peterson** confirmed each unit was on a single level and direct access was available to each unit through a stairway. Two would have stairways from the garage, and the first floor unit had access directly from the outside. No elevators would be installed. He confirmed those with mobility issues would be only on the bottom level.

President Fleisher:

- Stated his overall impression was that the Applicant had done a great job. He inquired what public benefits were proposed to justify the request for Major and Minor adjustments.
 - **Ms. Doukas** replied the public benefits were designed to function for all of Phase 1 which was why they were built into the Concept Plan for the entirety of that phase. The team had stayed consistent with the housing type and the setbacks for all of Phase 1. Some setbacks were adjusted as building took place when the Applicant realized that tweaks were needed to some of the architectural standards. All of Phase 1 had a large list of public benefits, including a substantial Greenway, neighborhood park, school site, pedestrian connectivity, and a lot of Greenway network. Also, Newland had committed to a sustainability program. All of those items fell into the balance of public benefit standards.
 - Part of the struggle with adjustments on all of the So-Hi projects was the zoning as it was placed on the map. The Zoning Map showed weird puzzle pieces for the zoning boundaries which zigged and zagged across the property. Design intent existed for transitioning density inward from the edges and inward from certain amenities, but the shapes did not follow property lines and did not necessarily reflect what the development plan envisioned. In the actual design, the density was transitioned in the aggregate, the way So-Hi wanted it to happen, but the zones were moved around in functionality to match the design plan. The zone lines were not moved. When the team applied for adjustments, for example, townhomes might be placed where 6,000 sq ft lots were zoned, so the adjustments that had to be requested looked gargantuan from a percentage standpoint but, in reality, if the zone lines could be moved around, detached single-family larger lot housing type was available. The exceptions would not be so dramatic if the zoning wiggled around to mimic the Development Plan in a more nimble way. The goal was to achieve the aspirations of the Community Plan and to achieve a blend of densities and an overall range of density, which was partly why the team was doing a planned unit development (PUD). All of those things had been done, but the traditional zoning matrix still had to be addressed in the giant documents they needed to assemble. So, some lots would have a big percentage drift from the underlying zoning standards and were much closer.

- A clean slate was needed to look at the totality of the density attempting to be achieved within the project, the variety of housing, and how that housing functioned in regard to setbacks. The proposed setbacks were fairly consistent with other development throughout Hillsboro in the last 10 or 15 years. Some of the setbacks were more generous than what had been seen in years past. During a substantial chapter in Hillsboro, 3-ft side yard setbacks were done in an attempt to find a way to accommodate more density, but still maintain a detached-type of housing. A lot of 3-ft setback projects were approved and there was push back. The proposed setbacks in the current project were softer with a blend of 4-ft and 5-ft setbacks. The underlying zoning required 5 ft. The team believed the blend of setbacks provided a good balance.
- She encouraged the Commission to take the underlying zoning standards with a grain of salt; understanding that a full package of public benefits was offered, to look at what was being proposed on its own, and ask if the setbacks and lot development standards were reasonable. They were similar to what was seen in other parts of Hillsboro, bundled with high-quality design for both the architecture, the community, and the open space.
- Referred to Lots 655, 656, and 657, and asked what could be expected for lot utilization on the smallest lots indicated as Type A, specifically the width and length of the residences with 4-ft side yard setbacks and how they filled the site. The materials stated, "The requested adjustment will not adversely affect adjoining properties in terms of light, air circulation, noise levels, privacy, and fire hazard." He asked what the expectations were regarding those criteria.
 - **Ms. Doukas** replied Plat Page P10 showed the lots were 32-ft wide and 70-ft deep, and the homes were alley-loaded. President Fleisher's question concerned housing Type A, which had 4-ft interior side yard setbacks, a porch setback of 8 ft, and a 12-ft setback for the structure itself. The homes backed to an alley and some of the lots had parking, so the minimum setback was 19 ft from the alley to allow a car to park in back.
 - A 70-ft deep lot, minus 8 ft for the porch and 5 ft for garage, would allow for a 57-ft deep house. Most of those lots would have two story homes.
- Asked Mr. Peterson to talk about his improvements of side yards.
 - **Mr. Peterson** replied one challenge with the side yards was matching the glazing and making the 4-ft side yard setbacks livable, so neighbors were not looking into each other's windows. Newland had learned a lesson coming out of Phase 1A to make sure that builders were cognizant in the architectural designs they submitted to not place the windows in a way that limited privacy.
 - Three lots in a five-lot bank would have homes next to them on both sides with 4-ft setbacks, to total 8 ft between the homes. It was not the most usable space and was basically for passage from the back to the front.
- Asked if Mr. Peterson, as the developer, was suggesting that he had some influence over builders when considering window placement in the narrow lots. Was it possible to provide obligatory guidance?
 - **Mr. Peterson** replied that all the builders' plans were reviewed and commented on, so yes.
- Responded that was excellent and suggested that reviewing the builders' treatment of side yards could be added to the checklist without mandates, but to make them aware that consideration was being given to side yards.
 - **Mr. Peterson** replied affirmatively.
- Stated he would like to discuss parks and asked for Mr. Kok to come forward. He noted the park on the slide looked too big.

- **Jeroen Kok, Planning and Development Manager, Parks and Recreation Department,** replied that the park site was just under four acres, adding typical neighborhood parks throughout the city were three to five acres. Neighborhood parks were generally walk-to and bicycle-to and typically served a half-mile area. Their main function was to provide park amenities for the immediate neighborhoods. Larger community parks had a much larger and different mix of amenities, as well as parking lots because they attracted people from a much larger service area.
 - He emphasized that Newland and GreenWorks, their consultants, had done an outstanding job of working with the Parks Department to ensure that not only was the park sized appropriately, but that it was located perfectly, right next to the Greenway. Connectivity was good to the Greenway and people could travel through it to the park. Another mandate or guideline within the South Hillsboro Community Plan was to locate parks next to schools as much as possible and this project met that guideline.
 - As the Applicants presented earlier, the park was similar to but also different from the parks in South Hillsboro, including both Century Oaks Park in the Rosedale Parks development and the Butternut Creek Neighborhood Park. Certain amenities in the park were typical and somewhat standard to neighborhood parks such as a small picnic shelter, a small restroom, a loop trail system, some open lawn area for a variety of activities, and a playground. The park was a bit different because the skate pod was atypical for a neighborhood park built by Newland, and the bocce court was only the second Newland had installed in the city so far. The orchard area with the swing benches was unique, as was the fire pit area. Because the homes on the south and west sides fronted the park, it provided a much greater neighborhood feel and a great place for people to participate in all sorts of activities or inactivities; part of the design's appeal was that the park was a great place to hang out.
- Stated he knew nothing about parks design, but believed the illustration of equipment was a bit timid as it was located by a small restroom facility along with a couple of other amenities and then the giant open area. He asked if in the Parks Department's experience the giant open area was something that would be appropriately used.
 - **Mr. Kok** replied he believed so, especially considering the density in the project. People would not necessarily have traditional backyards to participate in activities. Part of the idea with the park's design was to have a large central lawn area for kids, dogs, and adults to run around in and enjoy a variety of activities.
 - **Ms. Doukas** said the area was where people would engage in activities like disc golf, pick-up games, or flag football after Thanksgiving. Some flat open space was needed and it was a programming piece that was not available in the rest of Phase 1 until the school was built. The school's field was expected to be artificial grass turf which would have a different feel. The park's lawn area could be used for soccer drills, for example. It was necessary to have the proposed type of programming within a community for a park area. She clarified that the park area would not accommodate a soccer field, but would be appropriate for drills or a pick-up game.
- Stated that in a number of parks near his home, pavilions were frequently used by large groups with equipment nearby. He did not see the proposed park accommodating such activities.

- **Mr. Kok** responded that with neighborhood parks, the scale of the improvements were smaller than in a traditional community park. Community parks such as Orenco Woods, Rood Bridge, and Noble Woods would have much larger picnic areas with reservable shelters. The idea for the proposed park was to focus primarily on the surrounding neighborhoods and on smaller-scale picnic and gathering-type events. One reason for that was because parking would not be as available at the smaller sites as it was at the larger sites with larger accommodations.
- **Ms. Doukas** added the community parks had larger pavilions that could be reserved. Neighborhood parks were for a bit of recreation, like having a picnic, pick-up sports events, or letting kids play at the playground while parents sat by the fire pit. It was very different from planned Saturday events like reunions under a reservable pavilion.

Commissioner Shortt:

- Asked if the park had accommodations for dogs. The lots in the development were mostly small so a place for pups to stretch their legs was needed.
 - **Mr. Kok** stated that leashed dogs were allowed in parks and dog bags were typically offered. In other areas of South Hillsboro off-leash areas were planned, such as in Butternut Creek, along the BPA powerline trail. Land for a future community park was available on the west edge of South Hillsboro and was a much larger site that would also have a full-blown, off-leash dog area.
- Stated the large scale plans did not give her a feel as to where parking would be located. It appeared a lot of rear access would be created to the homes, and some of the streets were wider, but some smaller spots did not seem to have parking for more than one or two vehicles.
 - **Ms. Doukas** replied a combination of parking accommodations was proposed. Parking was very intentional, and the team was concerned about how parking would be addressed within the proposed density. Specifically for the stacked flats, parking courts had been provided to ensure room for guest parking. Most of the homes would have a two-car garage. The team tried to spread out the driveway parking for the alley-loaded homes, so some of those homes would have a 5-ft minimum setback to ensure drivers did not try to park in those driveways and block the alley. Some lots would have a minimum setback of 19 ft to allow driveway parking adjacent to the alley, and those sites were dispersed throughout the development with awareness given to the areas that had readily-available access to on-street parking. They made sure to locate on-street parking adjacent to areas that had limited driveway parking.
- Noted the lots were relatively small and the homes relatively confined. In her years as a realtor, she found that people rarely used garages to park their cars but almost always used them for storage. Storage was usually insufficient in a very small home. That was why having street parking readily available was very important. The last thing anyone wanted was for people to not have any place to park, especially for family on Thanksgiving. A subdivision she had seen in the Beaverton area had guest parking, and she asked if that kind of parking could be distributed evenly throughout the proposed subdivision.
 - **Ms. Doukas** replied a Parking Plan was available on Sheets P23 through P26 which showed the on-lot private parking available within the garages or the driveways or both. It also showed the available public on-street parking throughout the entire project. Because the plan was on four sheets, zooming out in the slide show did not convey the message very well, but 880 parking spots had been accommodated for the 221 dwelling units in this phase, which was a pretty good parking ratio.

President Fleisher asked if the slide indicated that four parking spaces would be available for Lot 648.

- **Ms. Doukas** believed Lot 648 would accommodate two cars in the garage and two in the driveway.
- **Mr. Kok** clarified the driveways would be approximately 22 ft wide and would wing out at the street. Lot 655 was an alley-loaded home, and the driveway would be the full 24-ft width of the structure.

Commissioner Bennett understood the Applicant's team was complying with the City's Code requirements for parking. He did not believe the Commission could be responsible for people's behavior in stacking piles of stuff in their garages and not using them for parking. If the Applicant met the Code requirements, that was all that was required.

Commissioner Shortt:

- Replied that she had seen mass numbers of people coming in to complain about parking in subdivisions preparing to be built. She believed it was important to address the issue at the Commission level, but acknowledged his point. She was a little concerned with the housing on Lostine on the other side of the neighborhood park, noting the only parking available there was in garages.
 - **Ms. Doukas** replied that was why on-street parking was planned along SE 72nd Ave as well as along SE Tamarack St. On Lots 794 and 642, driveways were proposed and on the other side of 72nd, the homes would have driveway parking so parking was less likely to overflow onto 72nd. That was how the team thought through how to address parking, and why the streets had parking on both sides to accommodate the proposed density. Not every project took that approach; a lot of projects had parking on one side. She believed it was also important to point out that with 221 dwelling units, 239 on-street public parking places were planned that would not be clogged up with treadmills and Christmas decorations.
- Appreciated that Ms. Doukas understood the issue. She was a voice on the Commission regarding parking because, as a realtor, she saw it as a perpetual problem. When the Commission was considering these gigantic subdivisions and PUDs, she liked to take the time to review the parking.
 - **Ms. Doukas** responded that Newland had been in it for a very long time. Phase 1 was the Applicant's demonstration project, and they had a long way to go. If people drove through Phase 1 and the model home complex and could not find parking, or the development looked wrong in some capacity, whether it was the architectural design, physical design, or the Greenway, that was their sales pitch for all the subsequent phases. Newland was very focused on doing it right.

President Fleisher confirmed there were no further questions for the Applicant and called for public testimony. Seeing none, he acknowledged the Applicant had no additional comments and called for additional comments from Staff.

Ms. Klein indicated where overflow parking spaces were available in the neighborhood.

President Fleisher closed the public hearing and confirmed there was no Commission deliberation.

Commissioner Bennett moved to approve Order No. 8302 with the modifications referenced in Staff Report No. 2 dated September 25, 2019, including modifications to Conditions of Approval Nos. 5, 7, 26, and 32, and a new Condition of Approval No. 38, seconded by Commissioner Shortt. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

VII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS OR REPORTS

Commissioner Shortt stated she would send the real estate report to the Commissioners tonight via email. She noted the Feds had been lowering the interest rate, which generally indicated a softer market, but the market was stronger now than it had been in the first two quarters.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS – None

IX. STAFF REPORTS AND INFORMATION

Chris Barry, Development Services Manager, introduced Laura Kelly and Dakota Meyer, who were part of the Development Services team. Ms. Meyer was permanently on the team as a Planning Technician and Ms. Kelly split her time between the Long-Range Division and Development Services. She had been able to supplement Staff every week, which was an indication of how busy City Staff were and of their effort to move work through the City's process as efficiently as possible. The Commissioners were likely to see both Ms. Kelly and Ms. Meyer before them in the future.

A. Planning Director's Report (*Staff: Colin Cooper*)

Colin Cooper, Planning Director, reported that several items were stacked up for the October 9th Planning Commission meeting including quasi-judicial and work session items. At the September 4th meeting, the Methodist Meeting House monument and Majestic Huffman South Project was heard, and the Appellant was now working closely with the Applicant. The resolution of the matter was still unknown. The work session at the October 9th meeting would address the first phase of housing amendments, focusing on State legislation and Metro's requirements for accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The State and Metro were requiring all cities within the Portland Metro region to remove the requirement for parking for ADUs, as it was seen as a hindrance to their production. The focus of discussion that evening will be on reducing barriers to the production of ADUs. The passage of HB 2001 and HB 2003 required the City to take a number of actions and the Commission's input would be needed.

Commissioner Bennett stated it would be helpful in starting those discussions for Staff to lay out what the Legislature had said the City must do to accommodate the new requirements to avoid unnecessary discussion.

- **Mr. Cooper** replied that the presentation would start that way because the City was constrained by State Law and by the Metro Council.

Commissioner Shortt agreed that not every situation required additional parking for ADUs because many people living in them did not own vehicles, so she did not have an issue with not providing parking for ADUs.

President Fleisher inquired if the notice about the Safety Briefing held before the meeting tonight had been adequately published because some Commissioners had not attended.

Commissioner Kim replied he had a personal conflict, so he did not accept the invitation. To be clear, he believed it was not necessary to say anything because it was not the regular Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Shortt stated she also had a long-standing scheduling conflict.

Mr. Cooper stated the Administrative Staff had sent at least two notices to the Planning Commission.

President Fleisher noted that it was not clear enough that attendance was expected, and perhaps it could be expressed differently next time. He inquired about the November 5th City Council work session.

- **Mr. Cooper** replied that a work session for Jackson East would be held after the City Council meeting on November 5th for City Staff to give Council an update on the actions taken by the Planning Commission and to receive more direction, if any, from Council for a possible appeal hearing. The Council meeting would begin at 7 pm and the agenda would determine the length of the meeting. The Planning Commission was welcome to be in the audience. No one from the public was allowed to speak at a Council work session because it was strictly an opportunity for Staff and Council to communicate at will. He clarified the minutes for Council meetings were much more summarized than for the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Shortt stated she would like a copy of the Council meeting minutes because she would not be able to attend the meeting, but was still very interested in what would take place.

Mr. Cooper confirmed the Council work session would be recorded.

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, President Fleisher adjourned the meeting at 7:26 pm.

Charles Fleisher, President

ATTEST: _____
Gretchen Olson, Secretary