Agenda
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Michael LeVine, Chairman
December 14, 2021

I. **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** – Read by Chair LeVine
II. **ROLL CALL**

Michael LeVine, Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held virtually via Zoom Webinar and telephonically, to order at 7:04 P.M.

Commissioners present: All Commissioners present via video conferencing – Michael LeVine, Chairman; Nathaniel Dye, Vice Chairman; Paul Voelckers, Clerk; Travis Arndt, Deputy Clerk; Ken Alper; Dan Hickok; Josh Winchell; Erik Pedersen

Commissioners absent: Mandy Cole

Staff present: Jill Maclean, CDD Director; Alexandra Pierce, CDD Planning Manager; Teri Camery, CDD Senior Planner; Allison Eddins, CDD Planner II; Joseph Meyers, CDD Planner I; Sherri Layne, Law

Assembly members: Alicia Hughes-Skandijs

III. **REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Ms. Maclean stated that case USE2016 0006/USE2021 0022 had been withdrawn by the applicant.

IV. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Draft Minutes November 9, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to approve the November 9, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.*

V. **BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** – None

VI. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** – None

VII. **ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION** – None

VIII. **CONSENT AGENDA**

~~**USE2016 0006:**~~	~~A Marijuana Retail License Five-Year Renewal for Rainforest Farms (USE2021 0022)~~
~~**Applicant:**~~	~~Blissful Awakenings, LLC~~
~~**Location:**~~	~~201 Seward Street~~

~~**Staff Recommendation**~~

~~Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Special Use Permit five-year Renewal. The permit would allow the renewal of a five-year marijuana retail Special Use Permit without amended conditions.~~

USE2021 0021:	An extension of Conditional Use Permit USE2020 0001 for a new educational and research laboratory structure
Applicant:	University of Alaska Southeast
Location:	11308 Glacier Highway

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit Extension. The permit would allow the extension of a Conditional Use Permit to construct an education and research laboratory structure.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0021.*

The motion passed with no objection.

~~**USE2021 0017:**~~	~~A Conditional Use Permit for an addition of a second story to a nonconforming structure~~
~~**Applicant:**~~	~~Janell Liles~~
~~**Location:**~~	~~923 Glacier Avenue~~

~~**Staff Recommendation**~~

~~Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the construction of a~~

~~second story atop a nonconforming structure in the Light Commercial zoning district.~~

~~**USE2021 0016:**~~	~~A Conditional Use Permit for an accessory apartment on an undersized lot~~
~~**Applicant:**~~	~~Janell Liles~~
~~**Location:**~~	~~923 Glacier Avenue~~

~~**Staff Recommendation**~~

~~Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of an accessory apartment on an undersized lot.~~

Marc Wheeler asked for a full public hearing on items USE2021 0017 and USE2021 0016, so they were moved to the Regular Agenda as items A and B.

USE2021 0008:	A Conditional Use Permit renewal for explosives storage in lower Hidden Valley
Applicant:	Orica USA Inc.
Location:	Lower Hidden Valley

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit with conditions. The permit would allow the development of explosives storage in lower Hidden Valley. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The permit shall be effective for ten years.
2. The applicant shall maintain approved ATF kingpins, locks, and steel hoods on all storage containers/magazines regardless of ownership, mobility, and type of container.

MOTION: *by Mr. Voelckers to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0008.*

The motion passed with no objection.

IX. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – None

X. REGULAR AGENDA

USE2021 0017:	A Conditional Use Permit for an addition of a second story to a nonconforming structure
Applicant:	Janell Liles
Location:	923 Glacier Avenue

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the construction of a second story atop a nonconforming structure in the Light Commercial zoning district.

Mr. Voelckers declared a potential conflict, as he is the owner of the property next to 923 Glacier Avenue. He stated that he can remain impartial.

Mr. LeVine asked if any Commissioners or member of the public had objections to Mr. Voelckers hearing cases USE2021 0017 and USE2021 0016. Seeing none, Mr. LeVine declared that Mr. Voelckers could remain in the meeting and hear the cases.

STAFF PRESENTATION by Planner Allison Eddins for both case USE2021 0017 and USE2021 0016

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF
Mr. Voelckers asked Ms. Eddins to elaborate more on Question 1 regarding the rebuilding of the structure and if “rebuilding” included the addition of the second story, just the original structure.

Ms. Eddins stated that staff took these cases piece by piece and broke them down into sections. Question 1 was a Director’s decision and the cost for rebuilding was in regards to the first floor only. Code states that this can be done; however, a second permit would be needed for the addition of a second story.

Mr. LeVine asked if the cost estimate came from the CDD Building Official.

Ms. Eddins replied that that was correct.

Mr. Arndt asked for clarification on the cost requirements for rebuilding a structure and how it works into code.

Mr. LeVine noted that this information did not fall under the Planning Commission’s purview, but deferred to Ms. Maclean.

Ms. Maclean stated that Ms. Eddins' information was correct and the section of code Mr. Arndt was referring to, while accurate, was not the code section used for this this development and it falls under another category.

Mr. Dye asked for clarification on how the 72% or 75% cost estimate would be determined.

Mr. LeVine stated that this determination was not for the Planning Commission to make; this determination is made by the Director of Community Development. The Planning Commission begins with knowing that the applicant has been allowed to move forward on this and all of this information is just background information and not for the Planning Commission to debate. Mr. LeVine asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Dye asked for more information on the dimensions of the parking spaces. He expressed concerns that the drawings didn't accurately convey what is truly possible on this lot.

Ms. Eddins stated that, based on the required dimensions and the potential for a combination of different parking types, the applicant can meet the parking requirements. Some vegetation may need to be reorganized, but with the dimensions of the lot and the requirements, also knowing that stacked parking is allowed and back-out parking would be allowed into the alley, staff are confident that the applicant can make the parking space and type requirements. Staff did consider having a condition that entering the lot from Glacier Highway would only be allowed to back into the space. She noted where and how the applicant could work parking spaces in, showing these options on the drawing.

Mr. Dye asked if a parking waiver was considered as a more appropriate option.

Ms. Eddins noted that parking waivers are typically only applied for when the requirements cannot be met and the lot itself cannot support the number of parking spaces required. The applicant can meet their vegetation requirement, as well as their on-site parking requirement set forth in Title 49, so staff didn't feel recommendation of a parking waiver would be appropriate here.

Ms. Pierce stated that the applicant submitted application materials showing that there were options and flexibility for meeting the parking requirements.

Mr. LeVine asked if it was relevant that the parking spaces in the front of the lot are actually parallel, or if they should be considered in a different way.

Ms. Eddins replied that the spaces could be considered stacked parking, and the alley would likely be used as a right-of-way, or they could be considered parallel if Glacier Highway was being used as the right-of-way. It all really depends on which situation you consider. Ms. Eddins stated that if width is an issue, the applicant would have the option to use the narrower parallel parking spaces in lieu of a standard parking space.

Mr. LeVine asked if the only requirement to deem a parallel space "parallel" is that is has to run parallel to the right-of-way. He expressed concerns with someone being able to actually parallel park in these proposed spaces.

Ms. Eddins noted that staff considered this, but without driving around and trying to park there, it would be hard to know for sure. Ms. Eddins then showed examples of how the parking spaces Mr. LeVine was referring to would be able to be used for parking.

Mr. Voelckers asked if the Planning Commission needed to go into great depth when considered the geometry of the parking situations, or if it was sufficient to say that the application includes the requirement to have three legal parking spaces on site and the Engineering and Building Departments will ensure that they will make it work.

Ms. Eddins reminded the Planning Commission that the parking dimensions and exact placement of vegetation is something that will be reviewed by staff and must be approved when the applicant submits a building permit.

Ms. Pierce agreed with Ms. Eddins and reiterated that the dimensions will be reviewed and if the requirements cannot be met, a Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued until the requirements are met.

Mr. Dye stated that he understands the process, but expressed concerns that issues could arise down the road that would require a modification. He asked how much the Planning Commission could expect this to change and what they should be considering at this time.

Ms. Pierce stated that if this plan does not work, or cannot work with minor changes, then the Planning Commission will likely see it before them again.

Ms. Maclean suggested that if Commissioners have strong concerns, they can add a condition, such as the standard condition, stating that prior to issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall be required to meet the parking requirements. Then, if it turns out that the dimensions or the maneuverability aren't practical, the applicant would have to come forward for a parking waiver.

Mr. LeVine then asked to bring the applicant forward for their presentation.

<u>APPLICANT PRESENTATION</u> – Janell Liles presented further information, noting that all the utilities are buried underground and that she is very willing to modify any of the plans for the landscaping and driveway parking to make it safe and user-friendly.

QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT – None

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marc Wheeler, W. 9th Street – Excited about the project and believes it will be a great addition to the neighborhood, but has concerns about the parking. Currently, parking is very limited and congested in the neighborhood. He noted that it is hard to come in off the alley, but he doesn't see how someone could back in from Glacier Highway.

ADDITIONAL APPLICANT COMMENTS – None

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT – None

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Voelckers asked if there were other examples where a condition was made for parking and back-out parking.

Ms. Eddins stated that back-out parking is only allowed onto the alley, not Glacier Highway. The condition she mentioned earlier was used prior to make it so vehicles could only back into a driveway, then would drive forward onto the right-of-way. However, she believes this has been discouraged in the past though, because it would be difficult to enforce.

Ms. Maclean agreed with Ms. Eddins and could not recall a situation similar to this one. She asked Ms. Layne if it would be possible for the Commission to waive a parking space at this time, even though the applicant hadn't applied for a parking waiver. If the issue is with the maneuverability of the site, maybe this could alleviate concerns from the Commission.

Ms. Layne stated that if the Planning Commission were to go through the same analysis if the parking waiver had been applied for and made clear findings, the Planning Commission could approve a parking waiver during this hearing.

Mr. Dye asked if there would be potential for issues to arise from this, since abutters notices had not gone out, informing the neighborhood that this was a possibility.

Ms. Layne stated that it would be cleaner to go through the whole process, but the Planning Commission could make it very clear on the record that they could see that this was the best option for this situation and had proper findings and analysis.

Mr. Pedersen asked if the third required parking space came into play, because of the proposal of the accessory apartment, but the two-story building only required two parking spaces.

Ms. Eddins stated that that was correct.

Mr. Arndt asked if separate motions needed to be made for each case.

Mr. LeVine stated two separate motions would be needed.

<u>MOTION:</u> *by Mr. Dye to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0017.*

Mr. Voelckers asked for clarification on the required parking spaces and how they fell into place with this motion.

Mr. LeVine clarified that the parking space requirement is for USE2021 0016 and the cases were being broken apart for approval.

The motion passed with no objection.

<u>MOTION:</u> *by Mr. Dye to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve USE2021 0016 with a condition that prior to the issuance of a building permit, a site plan with dimensions must be submitted that demonstrates all parking and maneuverability requirements per Title 49 are met, or a parking waiver is approved.*

Mr. Hickok objected to this motion, stating that this is already a nonconforming area that is very congested and this would cause more congestion.

Mr. LeVine spoke in favor of the motion, but felt that a parking waiver may be needed in the future.

ROLL CALL VOTE
Yea: Dye, Winchell, Alper, Pedersen, Arndt, Voelckers, LeVine
No: Hickok
Motion Passed 7-1

WCF2021 0010:	Modification to an approved facility
Applicant:	Vertical Bridge, LLC
Location:	10020 Crazy Horse Drive

<u>Staff Recommendation</u>

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Wireless Communication Facility Special Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of a self-supporting Wireless Communications Facility Tower.

STAFF PRESENTATION by Planner Meyers

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Arndt asked if the Planning Commission was only looking at the modification of this permit, and not the rest. If the Planning Commission denied the modification, the applicant could still build the monopole as originally approved.

Mr. Meyers stated that this was correct, but the applicant doesn't have the tools necessary to complete the project in an affordable manner, which is why they are applying for the modification.

Mr. Arndt asked why this case needed to be heard on the Regular Agenda, as opposed to the Consent Agenda.

Ms. Maclean stated that department policy is to place an item on the Regular Agenda if anyone makes a comment regarding the item. While the comment received about this item was not necessarily about the modification, the department felt it was important for the public to have a chance to speak.

Mr. LeVine also noted that having the item on the Consent Agenda may add an additional burden to the member of the public, since they would have to ask to have the item pulled from Consent and have a full public hearing. He suggested this could be discussed more outside of a Planning Commission meeting, if needed.

Mr. Pedersen asked when the original application had been approved.

Mr. Meyers stated that it was approved in 2019.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION – Matt Grugan presented further information about the project and the need for a modification.

QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT

Mr. Dye asked if the monopole foundation would be feasible without the extra antennas.

Mr. Grugan stated that the three necessary antennas made up about 75% of the weight, so while the depth may be able to be reduced some, a large hole and large equipment would still be needed to build the tower.

Mr. Pedersen asked if this particular tower design required cables.

Mr. Grugan stated that the tower design would be free-standing and there would be no guiding anchors.

Mr. Voelckers noted that there had been more soils investigation done to determine if there was a practical alternative and asked if this was correct.

Mr. Grugan replied that this was correct. The proposed location would need to be cleared and their team doesn't want to unnecessarily disturb the land until necessary. The team didn't drill until further analysis could be done.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Mr. Dye asked if the Notice of Decision for the original permit was available.

Ms. Maclean stated that the original permit was approved in March of 2020 and a Building Permit was applied for in July of 2021, so this modification is still timely.

MOTION: *by Mr. Pedersen to accept staff's findings, analysis and recommendations and approve WCF2021 0010.*

The motion passed with no objection.

AT EASE 8:17 P.M. – 8:25 P.M.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2021 Legislative Capital Priority List

Mr. LeVine stated that there was a letter in the packet regarding the Legislative Capital Priority List and the Commission's action at this time was to decide to either send the letter with Commissioner approval or modify the letter.

Ms. Pierce noted she had nothing to add and that Mr. Arndt was the Chair of the committee that put the letter together, so she would let him discuss the letter.

Mr. Arndt stated that the committee met and reviewed and discussed the list of projects from the Director of Engineering and Public Works. They felt these projects stood out and recommend they move forward.

Mr. LeVine noted that the projects fall into three categories: big and visionary (the second crossing to Douglas), smaller projects (the Lemon Creek multimodal project), and something that wasn't on the list, but the committee felt was important (deferred maintenance).

Mr. Arndt stated that after looking at the governmental funding, it's transportation related and that's another reason these projects rose to the top of the list.

<u>MOTION:</u> *by Mr. Voelckers to adopt the letter and forward to the Assembly for additional action.*

The motion passed with no objection.

B. CIP Review

Ms. Pierce stated that when the committee met, they discussed the CIP process in previous years. The committee agreed to send the same letter as last year, because things really haven't changed. CIP projects are due from the nominating departments to the Engineering Department on December 17. In the New Year, draft CIP list will be issued, then the committee will meet again to go over everything in more detail. The Commission's purview this evening is to review the list for conformity with adopted plans and make a recommendation to the Public Works and Facilities Committee. In the past, the committee performed a very detailed and exhaustive review of the list. Last year, the committee looked at the new projects or the projects that were highlighted, but the committee considered projects that were just straight maintenance to fall under the section of the Comprehensive Plan that discusses maintaining existing infrastructure. Ms. Pierce suggests the committee continues this way. Irene Gallion will be taking over the CIP committee, as this is Ms. Pierce's last Planning Commission meeting as Planning Manager.

Mr. Arndt noted that the Public Works and Facilities Committee would be drafting the list in its entirety, then the Commission would be able to comment on it after the fact. However, Mr. Arndt felt it would be better to try to work together.

Mr. LeVine noted that this had been an issue for six or seven years now and the Commission would like to see that change. This is why the CIP Committee was developed, allowing the Planning Commission to engage more and play a more important role in this process. Mr. LeVine suggested that the CIP Committee revisit this discussion with Ms. Gallion at the next CIP Committee meeting.

Mr. Winchell stated that he would like to be more involved in future events working through this process.

Mr. LeVine stated that all Commissioners would be made aware of all future CIP Committee meetings, so they have the opportunity to participate.

Ms. Pierce noted that ability to get the Planning Commission's priorities into the CIP really comes with the nominating departments, less so than Engineering. Most of the CIP is maintenance, but when other departments are nominating projects that are new, they should come from somewhere. The logical places for those to come from are the adopted plans. Some people understand that and want to see that happen, so it's really a matter of working together on a process that works, also recognizing that the burden of maintenance in the CIP and the difficulties that surround that. As we're looking at new capital projects, no one should be nominating a project based on personal preference. Having a paper trail in the CIP process that shows where the nominations are coming from would be helpful.

Mr. Voelckers felt another issue to be aware of is that the institutional practice has a lot of inertia to it, too, so the new projects aren't the only areas that need more scrutiny. There can be blind spots sometimes and the Planning Commission has a valuable role in helping shine a light on areas that have been overlooked and underrepresented.

Mr. Winchell agreed, but noted that at the joint Assembly and Planning Commission meeting, the Assembly stated that they are in favor of seeing the Planning Commission bring new ideas forward. Therefore, the Planning Commission does have a part in the process that is more contributive.

Mr. LeVine suggested that the Planning Commission seek more advice from Ms. Pierce down the road.

C. APL2021 0006: An appeal related to BLD2021 0765

Mr. LeVine stated that this is an usual appeal, as it is an appeal of the Director's determination for a Building Permit. Both Staff and the attorney's office are conflicted out from assisting the Planning Commission. However, due to current staff in the CBJ Law department, it has been agreed that Ms. Layne can walk the Planning Commission through the process, but she cannot provide advice about what to do or answer questions that are not strictly related to the procedural requirements. Mr. LeVine asked Ms. Layne to walk the Planning Commission through the steps and decisions needed at this time.

Ms. Layne stated that, at this time, the Commission needed to decide whether they are going to accept the appeal or not. The options are to accept the appeal, certify it and send it to the Assembly, or don't accept it. However, there are very few circumstances where you can deny an appeal. These circumstances are listed in 49.21.10. If the Commission decides to hear the appeal, they also need to decide if they are going to hear the appeal on the record or de novo, and appoint a hearing officer. The person appealing, or an aggrieved party, also has the opportunity to speak to the Commission on why the appeal should be accepted.

Mr. LeVine asked if there was any prefatory information needed before deciding to hear the appeal.

Ms. Layne replied that the only determination needed is to determine that the appeal is timely, and CDD has already done that.

Ms. LeVine asked Ms. Layne to read the code section with reasons why an appeal will or will not be accepted.

Mr. Voelckers asked Ms. Layne to clarify the distinction between on record and de novo and if she has a recommendation on either of those.

Mr. LeVine stated that Ms. Layne would not be able to make a recommendation for the Commission.

Ms. Layne clarified that on de novo means everything is new for the Commission and everyone presents their evidence. Whereas, on the record means the Commission would look at the full record that CDD presents and used to make their decision.

Mr. LeVine noted that the vast majority of appeals heard by the Commission are heard on the record.

INFORMATION FROM THE APPLICANT

Mr. LeVine stated that the information coming from the applicant should not be about the substance of the appeal, the Commission will make no decision at this time on the merits of the appeal, and testimony needs to be strictly limited to whether the Commission should accept the appeal.

Mariya Lovishchuk stated that she was available for questions, but did not have any information to present at this time.

Mr. LeVine asked Ms. Layne if the Commission had the ability to ask Ms. Lovishchuk questions at this time.

Ms. Layne replied that the code does not say anything about asking the applicant questions.

Mr. LeVine stated the Commission could ask questions at this time if they had any.

Mr. Dye noted that the applicant, or an aggrieved party, also has the opportunity to recommend if the Commission hears the appeal on the record or de novo, and, in the past, the Commission has been advised not to ask questions until a later time.

Mr. Winchell asked if the Commission was allowed to ask the applicant what they are requesting from the Commission.

Mr. LeVine replied that this was not permitted, and can only ask questions about the procedure. Mr. LeVine asked Ms. Lovishchuk if she had any preference on hearing the appeal on the record or de novo.

Ms. Lovishchuk stated that she did not have a preference.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Mr. Winchell stated that he had questions about the density and the changing of the density with the subject property, and that he has grave reservations about hearing the appeal de novo. He feels that hearing the appeal on the record is important.

Mr. LeVine stated that the density questions could not be discussed at this time.

MOTION: *by Mr. Dye to accept APL2021 0006 and hear it on the record in its entirety and appoint Mr. Arndt as the hearing officer.*

The motion passed with no objection.

ROLL CALL VOTE
YEA: Dye; Winchell; Hickok; Pedersen; Alper; Arndt; Voelckers; LeVine
NO: ---
Motion Passed 8 Yea – 0 No

XII. STAFF REPORTS

- Ms. Maclean congratulated Ms. Pierce on her new position as the Tourism Manager and thanked her for her hard work with CDD. The new plat reviewer position has been filled and will be starting on December 27, 2021; he will be working on most of the subdivision review. Staff hopes this will bring consistency with the review process and build strong relationships with the development community. The Planner II position has also been filled and she will be starting on January 3, 2022. The new Administrative Officer has started, as well, and believe she will be invaluable and bring a lot of great information to the department. The parking ordinance is being reviewed by the Law department. The

Alternative Development Overlay District ordinance will be coming back to the Planning Commission. Accessory Apartments is moving forward again. Commission Dye had flagged a possible systemic racism issue, which we believe we have addressed, so we are working with the Law Department on that to make sure the policies presented to the Planning Commission are strong enough.

  - Mr. Dye noted a section of a map in the parking information in the additional materials packet that needed a small edit.

XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Mr. Dye stated that the Title 49 Committee had met 2 weeks prior and discussed stream sides, and would be meeting later in the week to discuss stream sides again and coastal zone management. The Housing and Development Task Force is also moving forward.
- Mr. Voelckers stated that the Public Works and Facilities Committee met and had a presentation from the City Manager. The fund balance is good, but current projects were facing serious budget overruns. There was also a discussion on a new City Hall and where it might be located, with Lemon Creek being the top ranked area and Downtown being the second option. There was also a presentation given on waste management and efforts on how to keep the issues with the landfill odors under control. The Housing and Development Task Force may meet twice in January.

XIV. LIAISON REPORTS

- Ms. Hughes-Skandijs reported that the Assembly had met the night before and approved the purchase of the land for the University of Alaska Southeast and Docks and Harbors. The Assembly moved forward with funding another piece of the Seawalk downtown, and appropriated more funding for Statter Harbor Phase III. The Meadow Lane improvement project was approved. The Assembly had their retreat the first weekend in December and reviewed their objectives and goals from the prior year. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs felt it was worth noting that an implementing action that did not make it into the final cut was to work existing area plans into decision-making process.

XV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None

XVI. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Voelckers asked if there was any information on how the Planning Commission meetings would be held in the New Year, whether they would still be held via Zoom, or if they would be a hybrid-style meeting, or in person.

Mr. LeVine replied that there were many discussions about this topic and the biggest challenge at this time is CDD's staffing situation and not having enough people on board to effectively manage the technology for hybrid meetings. Now that more staff is coming on board, there will be training and hybrid meetings will likely be starting, as long as everything keeps progressing well.

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT – 9:10 P.M.