Agenda
**Planning Commission**
***Regular Meeting***
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
*Ben Haight, Chairman*
March 26, 2019

## I. ROLL CALL

Paul Voelckers, Vice Chairman, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Commissioners present:** Paul Voelckers, Vice Chairman; Michael LeVine, Nathaniel Dye, Ken Alper, Shannon Crossley, Dan Hickok, Andrew Campbell, Travis Arndt

**Commissioners absent:** Ben Haight, Chairman

**Staff present:** Alex Pierce, Planning Manager; Beth McKibben, Senior Planner; Laura Boyce, Senior Planner; Tim Felstead, Planner II, Amy Liu, Planner I; Jane Mores, Assistant Municipal Attorney

**Assembly members:** Wade Bryson, Assembly Liaison to the Planning Commission

## II. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA - None

## III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MOTION:** *by Mr. LeVine, to approve the February 19, 2019 regular Planning Commission meeting minutes and the February 26, 2019, regular Planning Commission meeting minutes with any minor changes by staff or Commission member.*

***The motion passed with no objection.***

## IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

## V. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION - None

## VI. CONSENT AGENDA

*Mr. Voelckers recused himself from USE2019 0005 due to a conflict.*

*Mr. Arndt said he is working on another project with this applicant, but the Commission and public found no conflict.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **USE2019 0005:** | A Conditional Use Permit for Legacy Suites, a 15-room, 30-bed assisted living facility |
| **Applicant:** | Alaska Legacy Partners LLC |
| **Location:** | 9290 Hurlock Avenue |

**Staff Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and approved the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of a 15-room, 30-bed, assisted living home. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The encroachment of the accessory structure must be resolved prior to the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy for the assisted living facility.

2. As a condition of approval, staff recommends that prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant shall submit a site plan showing a minimum of 7,224 square feet of vegetated cover. The vegetated cover plan shall be reviewed and approved by CDD staff prior to issuance of a building permit for the assisted living facility. The vegetative cover areas shown on the approved plans shall be maintained with live vegetative cover as shown and approved.

3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan illustrating the location and type of exterior lighting proposed for the development. Exterior lighting shall be designed, located, and installed to minimize offsite glare. Approval of the plan shall be at the discretion of the Community Development Department Director, according to the requirements at CBJ 49.40.230(d).

**MOTION:** *by Mr. Dye, to approve USE2019 0005, beginning condition two with "Prior to the issuance" and deleting the preceding words of the condition.*

***The motion passed with no objection.***

| | |
|---|---|
| **USE2019 0003:** | A Conditional Use Permit for Airport Terminal Reconstruction, Phase 2 |
| **Applicant:** | Juneau International Airport |
| **Location:** | Juneau International Airport Terminal |

**Staff Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and APPROVE the requested Conditional Use Permit. The permit would allow the development of Juneau International Airport Terminal, Phase 2 in an Industrial zoning district.

The approval is subject to the following conditions to ensure the project satisfies the requirements of the Land Use Code:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan prepared by a professional engineer illustrating the location and type of exterior lighting proposed for the development. Exterior lighting shall be designed and located to minimize offsite glare. Approval of the plan shall be at the discretion of the Community Development Department, according to the requirements at 49.40.230(d).

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a landscape plan identifying the wetland garden near the main entrance, the dog park (Service Animal Relief Area), and other existing landscaped areas proposed to remain. Identification shall also be included for new landscaped and/or hardscaped areas that comply with FAA Wildlife Hazard Management programs for any replacement landscaping, and the CBJ Land Use Code, to create a welcoming experience for visitors and staff.

3. Prior to issuance of a building permit, unless an exemption request to the LEED certification requirement (CBJ 49.35.800) is approved by the City Manager, the applicant shall describe how the credits, which will be pursued for the building, aim to meet minimum LEED certification.

| | |
|---|---|
| **CSP2018 0015:** | A review of the Juneau Airport Terminal Reconstruction Project, Phase 2 |
| **Applicant:** | Juneau International Airport |
| **Location:** | Juneau International Airport Terminal |

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend the Assembly APPROVE City CSP2018 0015, the reconstruction of Juneau International Airport Terminal, Phase 2. In addition to the submitted plans and narrative, incorporating these recommendations into the design would ensure the development is consistent with adopted plans. These recommendations have been written as conditions of the associated Conditional Use Permit.

To improve consistency with adopted plans, the following recommendations are advised:

1. Bicycle parking continue to be provided by covered bike racks which should be installed in a prominent location that is convenient for airport staff and away from congested areas for the traveling public. The rack(s) should be permanently affixed to the ground, building, or other permanent fixture, and they should be located so that parked bicycles do not encroach into a pedestrian walkway or vehicle area [the 2009 Juneau Non-Motorized Transportation Plan requires them to be compatible with locking the bike frame with a u-lock with two points of contact for a bicycle to lean against (i.e. a 'staple' or 'loop and post' design)].

2. The overall terminal building should have changing and showering facilities for Airport staff, as well as the staff of tenants leasing airport space, to use in order to provide an incentive to cycle to work.

3. The Airport integrates the Recycling, Reuse, and Waste Reduction Plan goals and initiatives into both the design and construction of the Phase 2 development. In particular, the design should incorporate recycling facilities in the terminal building including, but not limited to, the existing recycling receptacles that are placed throughout the terminal.

4. New CBJ buildings should aim to halve their energy use per square foot compared to existing buildings. Energy use targets for the overall terminal should ensure compliance with the intent of the Juneau Climate Action Implementation Plan.

5. All plumbing fixtures should meet a recognized water efficiency standard.

6. Any design should be capable of tracking energy and water use in the terminal. The Airport will use tenant meters if/where appropriate. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Airport will describe the systems that will be installed to do such monitoring.

7. The Airport should continue to work with Capital Transit on improving transit facilities at the airport, such as providing a four-sided, lit, waiting facility that balances the needs of transit users and the operational requirements of Capital Transit.

**MOTION:** *by Mr. Dye, to approve USE2019 0003 and CSP2018 0015 accepting staff's findings, analysis and recommendations.*

***The motion passed with no objection.***

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None

## VIII. REGULAR AGENDA

**AME2019 0002:** A rezone of 3 lots, 8479, 8477, and 8476 Thunder Mountain Road, from D5 to D18
**Applicant:** Wright Services Inc.
**Location:** 8479, 8477, and 8476 Thunder Mountain Road

**Staff Recommendation**
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission concur with the Director's analysis and findings and recommend approval to the Assembly for a rezone request to change 41,985 square feet located at 8479, 8477, 8476 Thunder Mountain Road from D5 to D18.

Ms. Liu told the Commission that the applicant is requesting a rezone to address some nonconforming uses, with the possibility of addressing higher density development in the future.

The assessor's database shows a discrepancy because it combines lot 10 and a fraction lot 11, said Ms. Liu. The remainder of lot 11 is its own lot, she said. These discrepancies date back to a document in 1964, she said. That 20-foot portion on the west side of lot 11 was reserved for lot 10, she said. This may have been done to address an encroachment of an existing structure, she said. This does not meet Title 49 for a lot line adjustment, she said. The staff accepts the recording made in 1963 as the acceptable record, she said.

D18 is an adjacent zone to this D5 piece of land, she said. Lot 10 has storage and a single-family dwelling or an apartment above the garage, she said. It has one former plumbing and electrical shop and four connexes, said Ms. Liu. The shop is not operational. It is used for storage for equipment that serves the park, she said. Lot 11 has a laundry facility and wells which supply water to the mobile home park, said Ms. Liu. The laundry facility is not operational, she said. Lot 12 has one office and one mobile home, she added. The office and mobile home are owned by the applicant and office is used to support the park, she said.

Many of the uses are nonconforming for both D5 and D18, said Ms. Liu. Most buildings appear to be in conformance with current dimensional standards. The mobile home setback is undetermined due to the structure not appearing on site plans or CBJ area imagery from 2013. The shop encroaches onto lot 11 and therefore is nonconforming, she said.

While the requested rezone to D18 does not address all of the nonconforming uses, the applicants are requesting this because it either sets them up for a conditional use permit to incorporate uses into the park, or to terminate nonconforming uses and pursue something that is allowed in the D 18 zoning district, Ms. Liu said.

A developer or property owner may only make rezone requests during the months of January and July, said Ms. Liu. Notice of a neighborhood meeting regarding the rezone request was

mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject parcel, said Ms. Liu. Notice of the public hearing was mailed to the same owners advising them of the March 26, 2019, hearing date, she said. Public notice was also provided in the March 5, and March 15, 2019 issues of the Juneau Empire, she said. A public notice sign was posted as well on the site on March 13, and it was visible from the right-of-way, which was at least two weeks prior to the scheduled Planning Commission hearing, she said.

The rezone request meets the requirement that the land is adjacent to an existing zone that is requested, she said. It is adjacent to a D18 zone, she added. The adjacent mobile park is a D18 zone, she said.

The Planning Commission and Assembly are required to meet the findings of the Comprehensive Plan land use map, said Ms. Liu. The Commission and the Assembly have the discretion to base findings in conformance with the Plans' recommended policy, she said. Rezones should also result in the best use of land and be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, said Ms. Liu.

The rezone does not substantially conform to the land use maps, said Ms. Liu. The property is under the Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR) portion located in Subarea Four of the Comprehensive Plan Map G, she said. The D18 zone of the mobile park corresponds to Medium Density Residential (MDR), said Ms. Liu. In this area there is a policy guideline that states that it is important to maintain the density of existing neighborhoods while encouraging in fill development for low to moderate income affordable housing, said Ms. Liu.

There are policies relevant to the proposed rezone such as policies 3.2, 4.1, 4.8, 10.1 and 10.2, said Ms. Liu. Policy 3.2 promotes compact urban development within the designated urban service area. Policy 4.1 is to facilitate the provision and maintenance of affordable housing. Policy 4.8 is for the protection and preservation of the character and quality of life of the neighborhood. Policy 10.1 is to promote the availability of sufficient land with adequate public facilities and services for a range of affordable housing. Policy 10.2 recommends flexibility and creative solutions in residential development.

The findings can be based on both maps and policies, said Ms. Liu. The proposed rezone does not conform to the land use maps. However, a guideline for the land use map of the area also supports in fill development of low to moderate income affordable housing, she said. The previously mentioned five policies also support diverse and affordable housing, she said.

The Table of Permissible Uses supports multifamily structures such as rooming houses and mobile home parks, said Ms. Liu.

These lots could be served with City water and are served with City sewer, said Ms. Liu. They could be upgraded to meet the utility demands of more intense uses, she said.

D5 lots are typically larger than D18 lots, said Ms. Liu. However, some of the setbacks and dimensional standards are similar, she said. These lots conform to both D5 and D18 dimensional standards, said Ms. Liu. A lot zoned D5 could have one single family home with an accessory apartment, or a duplex or a common wall structure, she said. D18 zoning supports 18 units per acre. This zoning would allow each lot to have six units or 18 units for the combined three lots, she said.

The proposed zoning would not generate enough daily trips to require a Traffic Impact Analysis, said Ms. Liu. The engineering department indicated that more intense development would require an upgrade of the utilities, said Ms. Liu.

Three people attended the public meeting, said Ms. Liu. It was brought up at this meeting by the staff that the rezone itself would not generate changes to the lots. Further action would be required by the administration, said Ms. Liu. No one expressed disfavor with the rezone request, said Ms. Liu.

*Commission Comments and Questions*
Mr. LeVine asked what the ineffective boundary change has to do with the Commission's consideration.

The conveyance to which Mr. LeVine refers does not affect the rezone, said Ms. Liu. That issue may come up at a later point should the applicant apply for a building permit, she added.

Mr. LeVine said he had concerns over the Commission recommending a rezone of lots hat the owners think are different, he said. He said it appears the staff is confident that the conveyance in 1964 is ineffective and that the legal definition for these three lots is in accordance with the original plat and that it should not be concerned about that, he said.

Ms. Liu said she concurred with Mr. LeVine's analysis.

Mr. LeVine asked about the composition of the adjacent lots.

Ms. Liu said the majority of the adjacent lots have single-family homes.

Mr. LeVine asked if the lots which appear to be wooded have homes in the front or if they are undeveloped.

Ms. Liu said those lots are developed with single-family homes.

Mr. Alper said if the area is served by City water and sewer how that fits with the mention that the mobile home park is served by wells. He asked if the wells are still functional.

Ms. Liu said the wells currently serve the mobile home park. The engineering department has advised that the applicants hire an engineer to further assess if any changes to the water service would be necessary with further development, said Ms. Liu.

Mr. Alper asked if those City services would be accessible by the mobile home park.

Ms. Liu said that would be for the applicant to explain.

Mr. Voelckers asked what the actual purpose of the rezone request is.

The applicants are interested in using the shop for another use, said Ms. Liu. It was brought to their attention by CDD staff that nonconformities need to be resolved prior to any new development, said Ms. Liu.

Mr. Dye asked why a small triangle of land was conditioned for traffic for Valley Boulevard and Mendenhall Loop road, and what the "T's" stood for. He asked how the utility service and pedestrian access on that portion of land was to be used.

Ms. Liu said she did not currently have those details.

*Applicant*
Applicant Charles Collins said he is the general manager of Wright Services and the owner of Thunder Mountain Mobile Park. Wright Services purchased the park several years ago, he said. They have five working wells that serve the park, he said. They keep the heavy equipment in the shop, he said. Mr. Collins said it is his goal to get all of the lots attached to the park. They do have a future plan of hooking up to the City water service, he said. His goal for the immediate future is to have everything in compliance and in accordance with the park, he said.

*Commission Comments and Questions*
Mr. Hickok asked who owns the property.

Mr. Collins said that Wright Services is a property management company set up by the owners. The trailer park was sold to Wright Services, said Mr. Collins.

Mr. LeVine clarified with the applicant that they do not currently have plans to expand the park, but at some point, in the future, may want to engage in future development.

Mr. Collins agreed with this assessment. At some point, they may want to add apartments. He said he understood that a Conditional Use Permit would be required for this, even if the lots were rezoned to D18. He said at this stage he just wants to bring the lots into conformance for their actual use.

Mr. Voelckers said the staff report mentioned there was some precipitating reason the applicant wanted to rezone the lots. He asked what this was.

Mr. Collins said for example he wanted to add on to the old laundry building for added workspace, but was told by CDD that was not an allowed use. He said everything he considered for this area was not an accepted use.

Mr. LeVine asked if there was a title search performed when Wright Services purchased the property, and if so, if it revealed the problems with the zone at that time.

Mr. Collins said he did not know why the zoning of the lots was never an issue before. He said they do not actually own the lot with the shop on it. They have a contract to take it over as soon as they can rectify the zoning.

Mr. Campbell asked when the current zoning of the lots was initiated.

Mr. Collins said he does not know. He said the lots have always been a part of the park.

Ms. Liu said the current zoning was put into effect in 1987.

Mr. Campbell asked if the D5 zoning was an error.

Ms. Liu said the current zoning does not correspond with the existing use.

Mr. Dye asked if the staff knows the history of the zoning of the lots in question.

Ms. Liu said she does not have an exact answer but that the zoning of the lots was enacted to what is now known as D5.

Mr. Campbell asked if the owner would have been notified in the 1980's that the use of their property was nonconforming, or if it could have been put into effect without their knowledge.

The previous zone of the lots still would have not allowed a commercial use, she said.

Mr. Campbell said since there was a commercial operation going on at the property, if permits were put in place for the use.

Ms. Liu said the laundromat does not have a permit, and that she was not sure if the shop had a permit.

Ms. Crossley asked if the property was ever attached to the mobile park, or if it was just adjacent property.

Ms. Liu said the lots were never attached to the park.

Mr. LeVine asked Mr. Collins if he knew if the lots have had the same use since the inception of the trailer park.

Mr. Collins said this property has always had the same use, as far as he is aware. He said he is not aware if the shop was ever permitted or legal. The shop existed in 1989, he said, and the laundromat was in operation at that time, he said.

Mr. Alper asked if the mobile park is connected to the City sewer.

Mr. Collins said it was connected to the City sewer.

Mr. Alper asked if there were structures on the part of the lot that protrudes.

Mr. Collins said there were not structures at that location, but some rotting timber. They do not plan on expanding the park into that area at this time, he said.

*Public Comment*
There was no public comment.

In answer to a question by Mr. Alper, Mr. Voelckers said the action required of the Commission on this item was to approve or deny the request, which would then go to the Assembly for final approval.

Ms. Mores clarified that the applicant could appeal the Commission's decision to the Assembly, should it not approve the rezone request.

Mr. LeVine said several years ago the Commission approved both a rezone and also a change to the Comprehensive Plan Map to bring it into compliance for property containing the Catholic Diocese in town. He said he cannot recall how the Commission accomplished this action procedurally.

Ms. Boyce said as part of the rezone the Commission recommended that a concurrent Comprehensive Plan Map amendment move forward as well.

Mr. Voelckers asked if that action by the Commission several years ago established a precedent for its potential action on this item before them this evening, since the circumstances were similar.

Ms. Boyce said the Commission also approved a rezone in Douglas with a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment, so the zone and the map would match.

Mr. Dye said he recalled the Douglas rezone was sent to the Assembly for approval, and it came back to the Commission several months later with the request that the map be amended so that it would match the new zone.

Ms. Mores said the actions are separate procedures.

Mr. LeVine said the Comprehensive Plan states that a procedure be developed for amending the maps in conjunction with rezones, but that this has not occurred at this time. He said he feels the Diocese rezone was similar to this situation, in which there is a clear error in the zoning. He said if someone had actually looked at the lots up for a rezone this evening that it would have been clear they should be zoned the same as the mobile home park. Mr. LeVine said this use should clearly be allowed. He said this is an error in the underlying Comprehensive Plan map.

Ms. Mores said the Commission does have the ability to review and direct change in the Comprehensive Plan maps.

Mr. LeVine said he thought the Commission could direct both actions; the rezone to D18 and recommend the Comprehensive map change to the Assembly to reflect the new zone. The Assembly could ask for more analysis and request public comment when the rezone was before it for approval, he added.

Mr. Arndt said he would like to see the recommendation to amend the Comprehensive Plan map go with the rezone request, but that he did not want to hold up the rezone process for the applicant.

Mr. Campbell said he would hate to see the application for a rezone delayed for a map amendment.

Mr. LeVine said he thought that they should have the rezone accompanied by a request for an underlying change to the Comprehensive Plan maps. He said he felt they were contingent upon each other.

Mr. Dye said he agreed with Mr. LeVine, that the two actions of a rezone request and Comprehensive Plan map amendment should be tied together.

Mr. Voelckers said he agreed that the two actions should happen contemporaneous with each other. The line is simply drawn in the wrong place, he said.

Mr. Campbell asked if the Commission recommends the Comprehensive Plan map be amended to match the rezone, if that would make a future Conditional Use permit request by the applicant more difficult to obtain in the future.

Ms. Mores said she was not sure how much accompanying information the Assembly might want for both actions to be presented to it simultaneously.

**MOTION:** *by Mr. LeVine, to recommend to the Assembly that it amend the Comprehensive Land Use Map (g) to designate lots 8479, 8477 and 8476 as MDR and recommend that the Assembly approve the rezone request to change those same lots from D5 to D18.*

Speaking in favor of his motion, Mr. LeVine said he feels there is an error in Comprehensive Land Use map (g). These three lots have been used to support the mobile home park as long as anyone can recall, and these lots are necessary and integral to the operation of the park. Mr. LeVine said he does not agree with the analysis in the staff report that they could approve this rezone without changing the underling map. Therefore, said Mr. LeVine, his motion does not rely upon staff findings but instead thinks the underlying Comprehensive Land Use map should be amended to match the rezone to MDR.

Mr. Arndt asked if this could be taken care of during this meeting, or if it would have to go back to the staff for another report.

Mr. Voelckers said he feels it is simply one more condition on the action the Commission is approving.

Mr. LeVine said he feels the Commission has sufficient justification based upon the information in the staff report and the information supplied by the applicant this evening. He said he feels the record clearly indicates the zoning of these lots was a mistake. The Assembly could request further analysis and public comments if it felt that was necessary, said Mr. LeVine. He said he does not feel the Commission needs to do that.

Mr. Dye said he agreed with the findings of Mr. LeVine, and that this item would be an ordinance at the Assembly level, with further opportunity for public comment at that time. It was a mistake, and should have carried an MDR use with D18 zoning, he said.

Mr. Hickok agreed with the motion. He asked if the Commission has in the past-approved rezones without accompanying amendments to the land use maps.

Mr. Voelckers said previous recommendations of the Commission for a rezone with map amendments to match have created a precedent for future action of the Commission in these instances.

Mr. LeVine said there are rezone requests that are in alignment with the Comprehensive Land Use maps, so the second action would not be necessary. In this instance, he said, it is best to bring the maps into alignment with the rezone, since it was a mistake.

***The motion passed with no objection.***

**IX. <u>BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT</u>** - None

**X. <u>OTHER BUSINESS</u>** - None

**XI. <u>STAFF REPORTS</u>**

*Auke Bay*
Ms. Pierce reported that the Auke Bay neighborhood meeting to discuss zoning is on April 10, (2019). At the last meeting, the decision was made to recap the zoning process at 6:30, take a ten minute break and then the regular meeting will start at 7:00 p.m. Those who are familiar with the issues can come to the meeting at 7:00 p.m., she noted. Alison is scheduling the Auke Bay Ad Hoc Committee meeting, said Ms. Pierce.

*Blueprint Steering Committee*
The Blueprint Steering Committee meets April 3, (2019) at the Fire Hall at 6:00 p.m.

*Title 49*
The Title 49 Committee is scheduled to meet April 11, (2019) at noon.

*Mountainside Estates Appeal*
There has been an appeal on the Mountainside Estates preliminary plat approval, said Ms. Pierce. The Assembly will decide on April 1, (2019) if they will hear it.

*Comprehensive Plan Update – Funding*
The funding for the Comprehensive Plan update remains in the budget, currently.

## XII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

*Rules Committee*
Mr. LeVine reported that the Rules committee met. They discussed some of the changes to the operating procedure, said Mr. LeVine. They discussed testimony and presentations, and went through the process of red lining some of those changes. The Rules Committee should be meeting again the week of April 1, (2019). Following that meeting, the committee should have some amended rules and procedures to present to the Commission. They tried to weed out inconsistencies and typographical errors, said Mr. LeVine. They are working on making the rules clearer for both the Commission and the public, and are working on some rules for decorum for the public, so the public understands when it is appropriate to speak. They are also working on time limits, not only for public testimony but for applicants as well. They are also working on some suggested time limits for staff presentations, said Mr. LeVine. Deadlines for PowerPoint presentations were discussed.

Mr. Campbell attended the Public Works and Facility meeting, during which the CIP was discussed. They discussed how some cuts can be made, and it has moved to the Assembly for review, said Mr. Campbell.

## XIII. LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Bryson reported that on March 13, (2019) the Assembly and the School District Joint

Facilities met. They are looking for space within the school district for childcare. On March 14, (2019), the Assembly and the School Board had a joint meeting. They discussed the budget at great length. There has been $11 million in cuts to the school district since 2011. On March 18, there was the Public Works and Facilities meeting which Mr. Bryson also attended. There was a joint Airport and Assembly meeting on March 21, (2019) during which they discussed the Airport remodel at great length. That project is 95 percent funded with federal funds. On March 22, (2019) there was a special Assembly meeting where the lawsuit between the City and the cruise ship industry was concluded.

Mr. Voelckers asked if the way the City uses its passenger fee funds will now change.

Mr. Bryson said the City maintains total control and decision-making. He said $9.3 million will go to the Statter Harbor rebuild project. All of the legal fees are paid out of marine passenger fees, he said.

Mr. Dye asked if the Assembly has made any decision on the leasing of Pocket Park to food trucks.

Mr. Bryson said there was a special Assembly meeting on that topic on March 19, (2019). He does not know of the outcome of that meeting but will find out and report back to the Commission.

**XIV. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** - None

**XV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** - None

**XVI. EXECUTIVE SESSION** - None

**XVII. ADJOURNMENT**

***The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.***