a-1

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2006

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Planning Commission and as listed on the agenda for the Regular Meeting of May 11, 2006 together with the maps and staff reports attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

PRESENT: Commissioners Sarah Christie, Bruce Gibson, Penny Rappa, Bob Roos and Chairperson Eugene Mehlschau

ABSENT: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG LED BY CHAIRPERSON MEHLSCHAU.

PUBLIC COMMENT

This is the time set for members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters other than scheduled items.

Bob Llyod: AGP Video wanted to inform the commission and public that his company is testing web streaming for meetings held in the Board Chambers. Their web site is slo-span.org. They have been archiving the meetings in video and audio format for years. They have submitted a bid to the county regarding the RFP Web Streaming.

STAFF UPDATES

Warren Hoag: staff, states the revision to the Commission's Policy & Procedures discussed at the January retreat has been updated and is scheduled for the May 25, 2006 Planning Commission meeting. The commissioners can adopt the policy or send it back to staff for corrections. Discusses recent board actions on items heard by the Planning Commissions: South County General Plan Amendment for Resources heard last Tuesday at the Board of Supervisors and continued the item to May 23. The Board of Supervisors denied the Ficther hot tub appeal. Adelaide General Plan Amendment for Visual issues was continued.

Commissioner Roos: asks if the Board heard the Forbes appeal, with Mr. Hoag responding the appeal was denied by the board.

Commissioner Gibson: would like an update from Mike Wulkan regarding the View Shed Ordinance that went before the board

Mike Wulkan: staff, states on November 1, 2005 the board looked at the proposed ordinance the Planning Commission had recommended and chose not to use it. The board directed staff to meet with various groups within the community and return with a revised ordinance. On May 2, 2006, the Board of Supervisors decided to proceed with the POPPER Group's recommendations. Final action will occur on June 27, 2006. Staff is checking POPPER Group recommendation to make sure it fits within the Framework Ordinance.

Commissioner Gibson: what was the bases upon which the board chose the POPPER recommendation.

Mike Wulkan: staff, the Board decided they did not need different analyses from staff. Staff's request for continuance was to get direction from the board on which concept to proceed with. The Board selected a proposal by POPPER with staff to come back with that proposal as an ordinance.

Commissioner Gibson: how does that relate with the version the Planning Commission approved.
Mike Wulkan: staff, states it was less restrictive than the Planning Commissions recommendation.

Commission Christie: is this a new ordinance and will the General Plan be amended, with staff responding it would be an amendment to the Land Use Ordinance.

Consent:

a. March 23, 2006 Planning Commission Minutes

The consent agenda is fully discussed and thereafter, on motion of Commissioner Rappa, seconded by Commissioner Roos, and on the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Rappa, Roos, Christie, Gibson, and Chairperson Mehlschau
NOES:

the consent agenda is approved with amendment to Page a-12 of the March 23, 2006 Planning Commission minutes to read: "Eric Greening: strongly urges the letter be sent to the Board of Supervisors as suggested by Commissioner Gibson, and states this item should be agendized. Consultations within the 30-day period with the Board of Supervisors from staff should be made public. Cites Illy Egg Factory as an example of where a responsible agency, the State Water Resources Control Board, successfully overrode decisions of the lead agency, which was the county"

1. This is the time set for hearing to consider a request by **MWF PROPERTIES, LLC** for a Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit to allow: 1) exceptions to the sign standards in Section 23.04.310 of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance by allowing two, approximately 50 square-foot, six-foot high shopping center identification signs (monument signs), including tenant names, for the Los Osos (Vons) Shopping Center, to be located behind the sidewalk along Los Osos Valley Road and along 10th Street, resulting in a total sign area of approximately 840 square feet for the entire shopping center instead of the required maximum sign area of 100 square feet, and exceeding the maximum of one common shopping center identification sign having a maximum area of 60 square feet and 2) establish a uniform sign program for the entire shopping center. The project will not result in any site disturbance. The proposed project is located on approximately 5.4 acres within the Commercial Retail land use category and is located along Los Osos Valley Road and 10th Street at 1050 to 1130 Los Osos Valley Road in the community of Los Osos. The site is in the Estero planning area. **County File No: DRC2005-00090.** Assessor Parcel Number: 074,301,024. Supervisorial District: 2. Date Accepted: February 8, 2006

Mike Wulkan: staff, presents staff report and shows overhead of the project. Staff recommends approval.

Commissioner Gibson: states the maximum aggregate sign area is 100 square feet per site.

Mike Wulkan: replies that 100 square foot per site is standard for a single business, not a shopping center. Shopping Center signs can exceed 100 square feet when applicant applies for a development plan.

Commissioner Roos: asks if the existing signs need to come down, with staff responding no signs would be required to be removed.

Bruce Severance: Sign Craft, Inc., states the smaller tenants are mom and pop type businesses. He states the signs can double their business. The signs will assist businesses achieve more visibility. All existing signs were consistent with development plan.

Commissioner Roos: asks if all of the owners have been informed about the uniform sign plan, with Bruce Severance responding yes, he discussed the signs with most of the owners.

Commissioner Gibson: states the project is consistent with the neighborhood. He discusses changes to Condition 3 on Page 1-8 to change the word "may" to "shall" in the 2nd line.

Commissioner Roos: discusses the change to Condition 3, 4th line, change "directly" to read "directed".

Thereafter, on motion of Commissioner Gibson, seconded by Commissioner Christie and on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Gibson, Christie, Rappa, Roos, and Chairperson Mehlschau
NOES:

the Planning Commission approves RESOLUTION NO. 2006-023, granting a Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit DRC2005-00090 to MWF PROPERTIES, LLC, based on the findings listed in Exhibit A and the conditions in Exhibit B with Condition 3 amended to read: "All signs shall be indirectly lighted by continuous, stationary, shielded light sources internal to them, except that the two shopping center/tenant identification signs shall be indirectly lighted externally by continuous, stationary, shielded light sources directed solely at the signs."

2. This is the time set for hearing to consider a request by **CARITAS CORPORATION** for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the addition of four single-family residences (manufactured homes) to an existing 120-unit mobile home park. The applicant proposes to convert the existing mobile home park into an income-restricted affordable housing project with a designated percentage of the units available to very low, low, and moderate-income families. The site is currently at the maximum allowed density of 8 units per acre. Conversion to affordable housing will allow a density bonus of four additional mobile homes and an overall density of 8.3 units per acre. The project will result in the disturbance of approximately 10,500 square feet of a 14.94-acre parcel. The proposed project is within the Residential Multi-Family land use category and is located on the southwest corner of Cienega Road (Hwy. 1) and Casitas Street, (at 2700 Cienega Road), in the community of Oceano. The site is in the San Luis Bay (Inland) planning area. **County File No: DRC2003-00068.** Assessor Parcel Number: 075-032-008. Supervisorial District: 4. Date Accepted: October 6, 2005

Brian Pedrotti: staff, presents staff report and shows overhead of the project. Staff recommends approval. He states this project is an affordable housing project.

Chairperson Mehlschau: states the Oceano Community Service District does not support this project. He asks about the children play ground, with staff responding there is a large central park in the mobilehome park and staff found that was sufficient. The place planned for the playground was not a safe location. Chairperson Mehlschau asks about parked cars and blocked fire lanes, with staff responding the park does not have a history of violations of blocked fire lanes.

Commissioner Christie: asks if staff has a photo of the existing play area.

Brian Pedrotti: shows overhead of the clubhouse and swimming pool. He states there is a large open space area.

Commissioner Christie: is it the whole mobilehome park that is affordable housing or a percentage of the units in the park. How will the affordable housing be chosen and the duration of the affordability with staff responding it's a percentage of the units in the park, and the applicant will choose the housing units.

Jim Orton: County Counsel indicates the reference to the code section sets 30 years as the duration the units will remain affordable.

Warren Hoag: staff, states Condition 2 references LUO Section 22.12.070 which incorporates the duration of the affordability as 30 years.

Jim Orton: County Counsel, suggests instead of a percentage, it should state the number of units required. He suggests (25) be placed next to the percentage amount.

Commissioner Roos: will this change the status of the mobilehome park; with staff responding it will stay the same. He asks if the whole project should be affordable housing. He states the recommended changes to the conditions they received from staff should read Condition 1a not Condition 1. He has concerns on Page 2-5, Flood Hazard Area regarding how the residents would be notified if the project is located in a flood zone.

Brian Pedrotti: staff, states they will need to elevate the building if it is in the FEMA Flood Zone.

Richard Marshall: Public Works, states they need to meet the requirements on page 2-5. Anyone buying in the flood zone will be required to have flood insurance.

Pete Inman: states Caritas is a non-profit affordable housing company. They have owned the park for the last six years. Agreed to maintain 20% of the park in very low income. The park is restricted to rental increases. This project is the addition of 4 spaces to the 120 spaces. The four spaces will add income for the operation of the park. He comments on Condition 9 regarding avigation easement. Asks if the avigation easement would apply for the whole park or only the 4 new spaces? He discusses flood zone requirements. Discusses the suggestion from County Counsel regarding a set amount of spaces as affordable. States the play area was non-existent when they purchased the park. There is playground equipment located by the clubhouse and they will add more equipment as budget allows. Discusses parking issues. The park enforces a no parking rule in the fire lane.

Commissioner Christie: asks if people will be buying the homes from a dealer, but renting the space from the Caritas Corporation, with Mr. Inman responding yes.

Commissioner Christie: what are we gaining from this project unless we restrict the new residents as affordable housing.

Pete Inman: because the county would be gaining 20% more affordable housing plus the 20% that our corporation requires.

Commissioner Gibson: asks if a very low-income person sells his coach, how would the park make sure that another low-income person is purchasing the unit.

Pete Inman: if they are part of the 20% low income, they must sell to low income. There are many that meet the low income or very low income range.

Commissioner Christie: inquires how many children live in the mobilehome park and how much the new units will rent for with Mr. Inman responding there are children of all ages. The spaces will rent for around $500.00 a month.

Commissioner Roos: do the low income and very low-income pay less lot rent then the others.

Pete Inman: no, there is a mixture, some are on leases that are not governed by the rent control and some on the month to month. The rent is the same, whether they are low income or not.

Jeff Ferber: RR Design Group, states the park is a non-profit and they will be putting the money back into the park. The density bonus is a plus to the park. This park is well taken care of. There will be four more homes that will be more affordable than housing in the area. Caritas will help keep this park affordable. He discusses the conditions regarding landscape and fencing. They will put in new fencing for the four units. The condition regarding the avigation easement is hard to understand. If new windows, and other improvements are required because of the avigation easement, some may not be able to afford it.

Warren Hoag: staff, states they will not have to retro fit the existing units. It is a requirement of the Airport Land Use Plan and it is in the ordinance. Will not require additional action on part of the applicant at this time and it applies to the whole park.

Pete Inman: states the additional revenue will be available for additional cash flow and for repair and replacement. Regarding the sale of the homes, the dealer will contribute to the Resident Association from the sale of each home. The Resident Association will decide how to spend the money.

Commissioner Gibson: asks how they guarantee that the next person buying the unit is low income, with Mr. Inman responding the seller must have the approval of the park.

Commission Roos: discusses Page 2-8, Condition 8 regarding new wording for Flood Hazard Zone.

Commissioner Christie: would like to provide more affordable housing. Discusses the addition of a condition regarding the price resale being restricted on the four new units and the units can only be sold to someone in the very low income range.

Commissioner Rappa: we are increasing by 20% the current number of affordable homes in this park.

Commissioner Christie: ask applicant if he would agree to this added condition.

Pete Inman: states there will be a total of 40% affordable housing and it is not within the restrictions they operate. Restricting the sale of the units in the future does not promise a low-income family in that unit. He states they insure that 40% of the residents will be low income for the next 30 years.

Commissioner Gibson: discusses the 20% low-income residents. States the avigation easement is an important condition to keep in. The Flood Hazard notification should be in the conditions. Page 2-7, Condition 1b should read: "Maximum Height is 25 from average natural grade".

Commissioner Rappa: asks for a clarification of landscaping, fencing, screening being restricted to the four new units, with staff responding yes.

Brian Pedrotti: discusses changes to page 2-8, Condition 9 and replaces the wording "Prior to recordation of the final parcel or tract map" with, "prior to issuance of construction permits"

Thereafter, on motion of Commissioner Roos and seconded by Commissioner Rappa and on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Roos, Rappa, Gibson, Christie and Chairperson Mehlschau
NOES

the Planning Commission adopts the Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. and RESOLUTION NO. 2006-024 granting a Conditional Use Permit DRC2003-00068 to CARITAS CORPORATION based on the Findings in Exhibit A and Conditions in Exhibit B, with **Condition 1a** insert (25) after 20% in line 4 and line 5.; **Condition 1b** amended to read: "maximum height is 25 from average natural grade"; **Condition 2** insert (25) after 20% in lines 1 and 2; **Condition 8** amended to read: "**Prior to issuance of construction permits,** the applicant shall enter into a covenant and agreement in a form acceptable to County Counsel, a supplemental disclosure to tenants and purchasers of these properties concerning the nature of the neighboring agricultural activities and hours of operation and the County's Right to Farm Ordinance and the existence of the Flood Hazard Combining Designation"; **Condition 9** amended to read: "The property owner shall grant an avigation easement to the county of San Luis Obispo. The avigation easement document shall be prepared, reviewed and approved by County Counsel **prior to issuance of construction permits"**, adopted.

Commissioner Christie: will support the project reluctantly because the commission could do more to assure affordable units to lower income.

3. Hearing to consider a request by **NIPOMO OAKS** for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (Tract 2732) and Conditional Use Permit to subdivide an existing 3.0 acre parcel into twenty-seven parcels including: twenty-four residential parcels ranging in size from approximately 2,430 to 2,748 square feet each, two parcels for common active recreation area, parking, and drainage, and a 1 acre remainder parcel. The project includes approval for the construction of 24 single family residences ranging in size from 1,352 to 1,584 square feet. The project includes off-site road improvements to Hill Street and Tanis Place. The project will result in the disturbance of approximately 2.04 acres of a 3.0 acre parcel. The proposed project is within the Residential Multi-Family land use category and is located on the north side of Hill Street, approximately 900 feet west of South Frontage Road in the community of Nipomo. The site is in the South County (Inland) planning area. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Environmental Document prepared for the item. The Environmental Coordinator, after completion of the initial study, finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is not necessary. Therefore, a Negative Declaration (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and CA Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) has been issued on March 24, 2006 for this project. Mitigation measures are proposed to address air quality, geology/soils, public services/utilities, recreation, transportation/circulation, and water and are included as conditions of approval. **County File No: SUB 2004-00324.** Assessor Parcel Number: 092-130-019. Supervisorial District: 4. Date Accepted: November 14, 2005

Brian Pedrotti: staff, presents staff report and shows overhead of the project. Staff recommends approval.

Chairperson Mehlschau: states on page 3-33 under Transportation Circulation nothing is marked and requests staff check original document and come back with the information.

Brian Pedrotti: states staff will check and bring back to the commission before end of hearing.

Chairperson Mehlschau: asks where the streets are located.

Richard Marshall: Public Works, shows overhead of roads in the project area and the future construction of the roads. Discusses the east-west connector.

Commissioner Roos: what are the improvements this project will be responsible for.

Richard Marshall: shows overhead of the local street network, surrounded by Tefft, Orchard, Grande and South Frontage Road. Shows future connection to Mary Ave and Bloom Street to Hill and Tefft. They will construct improvements in front of the project on Hill Street and dedicate right-of-way along the east-west connector.

Commissioner Rappa: how will this project contribute financially to help the interchange at Tefft, Highway 101, Bloom and Mary.

Richard Marshall: Public Works, this project will be subject to the payment of the road improvement associated with the building permit. This project does not touch any of the big interchange, but they will contribute money to help.

Commissioner Christie: asks if there is pedestrian access with staff responding yes.

Chairperson Mehlschau: asks if staff has the information for page 3-33 regarding Transportation Circulation with staff responding a and b are marked "Impact Can and Will be Mitigated, and the remaining c through h are marked "Insignificant Impact".

Commissioner Roos: why isn't this project being required to build some of the east- west Street with Mr. Marshall responding Public Works does not see the street as an important connector. This street is local circulation on this project.

Chairperson Mehlschau: asks if the construction of east-west street could be bonded, with Mr. Marshall responding yes.

Commissioner Gibson: ask about the calculation of square footage regarding public and open space. He states the internal driveways do not count for open space.

Brian Pedrotti: staff, shows overhead and explains the open space areas.

Jim Orton: County Counsel, asks where is the common area and will the entire owners of the subdivision hold them in common as an undivided interest. If not, staff needs to add language in the CCR's to create a homeowners association. Condition 24 amended in third line by adding "establish a homeowners association".

Commissioner Roos: would like Condition 3d amended to have the 10 foot wide pedestrian access across Lot 26 and 27 built or bonded for.

Commissioner Christie: asks where the drainage basin is located with staff responding it is located along Hill Street and is underground drainage. It is open space and sidewalk area.

Commissioner Gibson: the Advisory Council recommends denial for the 42 units. Can the Planning Commission require public pedestrian access on this project.

Jim Orton: County Counsel, states the commission can require conditions that the project must be compatible with the neighborhood.

Richard Marshall: Public Works, states he has language for walk way across Lot 27. He reads new Condition 2b "A pedestrian connection that satisfies the requirements of ADA constructed from Nipomo Oaks Lane to the future local road along the northwesterly property line within a minimum 10 foot wide pedestrian access easement". A new Condition 2c "A street constructed to 2/3 A-2 urban standard in a minimum 40 foot dedicated right-a-way fronting the property along the northwesterly property line".

Commissioner Rappa: Request that more formal maps for roads and vicinity be in the staff report.

(Recess for lunch and the Commissioners reconvene at 1:30 p.m.)

James Pender: applicant, discusses the east -west street. The road does not go anywhere and does not tie in with Mary Ave off Tefft.

Terry Orton: Westland Engineering, discusses history of the property. He states they have been working with the traffic division. States the applicants do not want to development east-west street at this time. Would need to put in dry utilities or dig up the road in the future. Not sure of the grades on Mary Ave where it ties into Tefft. East-west street is not needed for the circulation at this time. It is too early to construct the east-west street or to bond for it.

Chairperson Mehlshau: asks if project puts Mary Ave next to their project.

Gary Geihs: applicant, states Mary Ave comes through the property to the east. A portion of the east-west street will be to the east of us.

Commissioner Roos: states the applicant's own Lot 27, and he requests they bond for the pedestrian easement.

Terry Orton: Westland Engineering, states until we know what will be built it would be hard to know where to install the pedestrian easement.

Commissioner Gibson: states a temporary pass may be appropriate. Discusses east-west street and that there are other projects that will connect Mary Ave and east-west street.

Commissioner Roos: asks why the applicant didn't build apartment or duplex units.

Gary Geihs: states people don't like to buy houses with common walls.

Terry Orton: discusses other projects similar to this project. The applicants want to build a project that will sell. The right-of-way would be 40 feet in width.

Commissioner Rappa: asks who owns Lot 27, with Terry Orton responding the applicants own it.

Commissioner Gibson: discusses multi-family use. County should have a clear land use element for attached housing, density and size of units. Comments on his concerns because this project does not meet the standards regarding enough common open space, the houses are densely packed, and no active playground area shown in the plan. The applicants should provide public access through Lot 26 and 27.

Commissioner Christie: agrees with Commissioner Gibson. Need public benefits over and beyond normal because of the density of the housing. They are not meeting the open space requirement. Not all of them need to be 3 bedroom homes. They could have smaller houses. She encourages the applicants to design the community with more walkways.

Brian Pedrotti: states staff felt this project met the standards. The playground could be better defined in the common open space area. The overall project has a future development with different types of units on Lot 27.

Commissioner Rappa: asks how the project meets the design standards the way it is currently proposed.

Brian Pedrotti: shows overhead of the site planning criteria. Points out the central located common area. States they could have guest parking in the common area.

Commissioner Rappa: asks why the applicant didn't vary the edge of buildings.

Commissioner Gibson: states this project doesn't meet the planning area standards.

Commissioner Roos: asks if the applicants are going to alternate the different designs on the streets. Agrees with Commissioner Christie that maybe there should be some smaller houses. He discusses the problems contacted with the common wall issues.

Commissioner Rappa: states this project does meet a need. She discusses concerns with project not meeting the planning standards.

Commissioner Christie: feels this project should go back to the drawing board and come back to the commission with a different design.

Commissioner Gibson: discusses the lack of open space between the houses.

Brian Pedrotti: staff, states the elevations are different and the building will step up.

Chairperson Mehlschau: states the Advisory Council is against anything less than 6,000 square feet. Asks if the applicants would re-design the project.

Gary Geihs: states staff required the project have 15 feet by 15 feet private open space in the backyards. The road curves through the project and it is not a straight line. They could stagger the homes

Thereafter, on motion of Commissioner Christie, seconded by Commission Roos, and unanimously carries, to continue this item to August 10, 2006 to allow time for staff to work with applicant to meet the Planning Area Standard.

Commissioner Gibson: would like applicants to consider the duplexes and triplexes to meet the requirement before the commission.

Commission Christie: states keep size of parcels uniform but give more variation in the size of the units. By providing 2 bedrooms, 1 bath and 2 bedrooms, 2 baths houses it will provide some affordability.

Commissioner Roos: suggests moving park/drainage basin which is now Lot 25 next to Lot 26 and make it a larger common place.

4. **Study Session on the Annual Report of the County General Plan**

Jim Lopes: staff, presents the General Plan Progress Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2004-05. He discusses the general plan progress regarding major new planning activities, amendments to the General Plan, and implementing the General Plan. He discusses the elements of the General Plan, major planning activities, and Integrating Smart Growth into process and long term growth issues. Discusses affordable housing goals and production from 2001-2005.

Commissioner Christie: states the county does not have a housing ordinance. She asks staff how they achieved the numbers used for units of affordable housing.

Dana Lilly: we estimated what was built in the county. County or other agencies helped finance the building of very low and low income and moderate-income housing. People's Self Help is also part of the

number used. There was the Growth Management Ordinance exempted units where people volunteered to restrict the price of their home to moderate-income level in different areas of the county.

Jim Lopes: staff, discusses population growth in the last 5 years. Development Services in 2004 and 2005 and building permits, use permits and subdivision applications.

Commissioner Rappa: comments on page 4-9 regarding the status of the general plan elements. She asks if there is a targeted schedule to update the general plan elements with staff responding.

Commissioner Gibson: do we have an element plan that will integrate with the cities and give a big picture, with staff responding.

John Euphrat: staff, states phase 1 is updating framework for planning, recently authorized by the Board of Supervisors. He states some of the Area Plans not updated are in the rural areas; phase 2 will be the development of a countywide plan to encompass all the rural planning areas. Updating our Conservation Ordinance is a high priority. The Energy Element and Off-Shore Element will be implemented into the Conservation Ordinance. Staff will begin July 1 and it will take at least 36 months to update the ordinance.

John Euphrat: staff, gives Planning and Building Department web page address: sloplanning.org

5. **Study session regarding proposed changes to county affordable housing standards for initial rents, sales prices and long-term affordability**

Dana Lilly: staff, discusses affordable housing and how the county can ensure that affordable ownership housing remains affordable. 45 years for ownership or 55 years for rental. He discusses preserving affordable housing stock, encourage owners to maintain and improve their homes, avoid interference in private markets, minimize complexity and cost of government role. He discusses gradually allowing all equity to accrue to owner during affordability period, share equity increases between owner and government, and limit future sale prices and buyers' income to affordable definitions. Discusses the different models of resale prices and buyer incomes. Discusses additional issues regarding alternative initial and long term standard for nonprofit organizations if special financing and affordability controls are implemented and using equity sharing for units county finances, but resale control for units required by zoning ordinance. He comments on major policy options. Community land trust model may be to far a leap at this moment. Nonprofit owns the land under the house; the buyer only owns the house.

Commissioner Rappa: compliments Mr. Lilly on his presentation.

Commissioner Christie: thanks staff for bringing this forward. Didn't understand the resale units are lost when they are sold.

Commissioner Gibson: thanks staff for clarity to a complicated issue.

Thereafter, on motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Gibson, and unanimously carried, the Commission receives all documents submitted today for the record.

There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eleanor Porter, Secretary
County Planning Commission