MEETING RECORD

NAME OF GROUP:	PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:	Wednesday, May 10, 2017, 1:05 p.m., Hearing Room 112 on the first floor of the County-City Building, 555 S. 10th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska
MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE	Tom Beckius, Tracy Corr, Tracy Edgerton, Maja Harris, Chris Hove, Dennis Scheer and Sandra Washington; Deane Finnegan and Ken Weber absent. David Cary, Steve Henrichsen, Andrew Thierolf, George Wesselhoft, Brian Will, Geri Rorabaugh and Amy Huffman of the Planning Department; media and other interested citizens.
STATED PURPOSE OF MEETING:	Regular Planning Commission meeting

Chair Chris Hove called the meeting to order and acknowledged the posting of the Open Meetings Act in the room.

Hove requested a motion approving minutes for the regular meeting held April 26, 2017. Motion for approval made by Harris, seconded by Edgerton and carried 7-0: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Scheer, Washington, and Hove voting 'yes'; Finnegan and Weber absent.

Prior to calling the Consent Agenda, the Clerk announced that the items under Continued Public Hearing and Administrative Action, **Change of Zone No. 17005** and **County Preliminary Plat No. 17003**, both related to the addition of six single-family lots on property generally located at SW 90th Street and W. Yankee Hill Road, were withdrawn at the request of the Applicant on May 5, 2017.

CONSENT AGENDA
PUBLIC HEARING & ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
BEFORE PLANNING COMMISSION: **May 10, 2017**

Members present: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Hove, Scheer and Washington; Finnegan and Weber absent.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following items: **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN NO. 17007, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 17001** and **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 17011.**

There were no ex parte communications disclosed.

Washington moved approval of the Consent Agenda, seconded by Corr and carried 7-0: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Scheer, Washington, and Hove voting 'yes'; Finnegan and Weber absent.

Note: This is **FINAL ACTION** on **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 17011**. This is a recommendation to the City Council on all other items.

SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 17010 FOR AN INDOOR KENNEL WITH AN OUTDOOR AREA THAT PERMITS MORE THAN THREE ANIMALS, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 222 N. 44TH STREET: **May 10, 2017**

Members present: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Hove, Scheer and Washington; Finnegan and Weber absent.

Staff recommendation: Conditional Approval.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed on this item.

Staff Presentation: **George Wesselhoft of the Planning Department**, stated this applicant came before Planning Commission in 2015 to rezone the property from H-2 to B-3 to meet parking requirements for their use. This application is to allow the outdoor area associated with the kennel to have more than three doges outdoors at a time, up to 30 for some special events. The outdoor area is located in the southeast area of the property and is approximately 275 feet from the closest residential area. The conditions included for approval include solid screening up to six feet, restricted hours between 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., supervision of animals at all times, and the right of Planning Commission to limit the number of animals at any one time. The primary issue is noise. Health Department reviewed this and concluded it is very difficult to quantify the noise depending on the number of dogs. They do not have objections to this application, knowing that the applicant will have to comply with animal noise provisions. A specific condition is that, in the event of repeated violations, the special permit may be revoked.

Washington asked if there is a process for enforcing animal noise provisions.

Steve Beal, Manager of Animal Control for the Health Department, came forward to state that monitoring is usually done on a complaint basis. There is a process in place from the first offense, to repeat offenses, and for how to enforce the provisions.

Hove asked for confirmation that a ramification if this applicant violates animal noise provisions is that the special permit could be revoked. Wesselhoft said that is correct.

Harris asked if the procedures are different for a kennel versus a homeowner and if, after a complaint, the nuisance must be observed and then the individual could then be fined. Beal said there needs to be enough evidence of a nuisance in order to support a strong legal case, if necessary. First, a letter would be sent to the owner indicating that a

complaint was received. Animal control would work with the owner on solutions to get the dog to stop barking. A letter is also sent to the person making the complaint to let them know the owner was contacted. If barking is persistent or excessive, the officer could write a warning or citation.

Washington asked if the conditions on the special permit could be changed if it turns out there are complaints in the future. Wesselhoft said that he is not aware that conditions of a special permit could be changed without coming back to Planning Commission.

Harris noted that one condition is that Planning Commission is able to limit the number of animals allowed. She wondered what kind of scenario would lead up to that. Wesselhoft said he does not know of a situation that would lead to that. Beal said Health would not have a role in that aspect. He added that it is very difficult to quantify an appropriate number of dogs. There needs to be enough staff present to get control if barking becomes excessive.

Steve Henrichsen of the Planning Department stated there are two places to limit the number of dogs. It could be done today by changing the number from 30, to less, or by denying the application. The second option would be rare. If there are enough complaints, the special permit could be taken back through a public process to be revoked. At that time, it could be revoked altogether, or the number of dogs could be reduced. It is important to note that in this case, because it is difficult to judge the impact in advance, the conditions specifically state that if there are repeated violations, the special permit could be revoked, whether there is a veterinary office on the premises or not.

Hove asked if there is a way to get an exemption. Henrichsen said there are other districts where this does not apply. Beal said local vets are allowed to have more than three dogs outdoors at a time.

Beckius asked about kennels that have been approved previously. Wesselhoft said recent special permits were examined to see if more than 20 dogs was approved for any. They requested waivers for setbacks or something in those other cases.

Washington asked what zoning districts other kennels are in. Wesselhoft said primarily commercial zones, but he is not sure if that is the case for every individual kennel.

Washington wondered how many complaints about other kennels have come in. Beal said Camp Bow Wow was the first of the larger boarding kennels and there have been several others since they opened. There have been no complaints at any of the facilities within City limits where Animal Control has jurisdiction.

Proponents:

1. Christy Schroff, 300 N. 44th Street, came forward as legal representative for the applicant. Her office is a neighbor of this kennel and it has been exciting to see the

revitalization of the vacant building. Two years ago, this use was approved unanimously by Planning Commission. Presently, the kennel is allowed, so the only question is the number of animals allowed outdoors at one time. The Health Department has given their approval of the number proposed by the applicant, who will explain how 30 was arrived at. An important condition is the presence of an animal handler/s outside with the dogs at all times. The applicant agrees to all conditions proposed by staff. His investment is approaching $3 million. Ms. Schroff submitted a letter from a salon located next to Woof, another doggie daycare. It states generally that dogs are heard only occasionally and her customers appreciate seeing that the dogs are being well cared for. She noted that the architect of this project is also here to answer questions.

2. Leon Kilmer, 1531 Kingston Road, came forward as applicant. This is Nebraska's first locally-owned indoor dog park, pool, sports center, trainer, groomer, and doggie daycare --they offer everything. Their entire point with locating in this building was revitalization and beautification. Thirty is a large number of dogs to have outside and it is a number that is way more than will normally be outdoors. That number was chosen to accommodate the few outdoor events that are held there, such as dog diving on weekends. During an event like that, there could be 15-20 dogs outside at a time, with others remaining indoors. The closest facility for this sport is in Kansas City, so this will bring revenue to Lincoln.

Mr. Kilmer went on to say that he is trained in animal behavior and understands why dogs bark. Under normal circumstances, a dog will only bark one or two times; more than that and they are trying to tell you something. Since Nebraska doesn't have laws for handlers in this situation, he has turned to other states for guidance. In Colorado, for example, they require 1 handler for every 10 dogs. Kilmer plans to uphold that because any more could be a potential danger for the handler and the dogs. Handlers are able to immediately assess whether dogs are over stimulated and need to be taken indoors or separated. At his facility, there are 2 "time out" rooms and 77 boarding rooms. A business like this is not like a neighborhood where a dog might be allowed to continue barking at every passerby.

Cleaning of waste is done immediately. Liquids pass through the special turf and a bio-enzyme is used. There is also a sprinkler system to spray the bio-enzyme at the end of each day. A dog bark is around 90-95 decibels. Traffic on O Street is around 70 decibels, and daycares are around 80 decibels. There will be a 6-foot fence to channel noise upwards and not out into the neighborhood. The goal is to comply with all conditions and to not impact neighbors and surrounding businesses. The business is ready to handle complaints and resolve them. The closest residential units are Tanglewood Apartments and they are in support. Comments in opposition will be taken seriously. Mr. Kilmer concluded by asking any opponents what number they would be comfortable with.

Beckius asked for a description of diving events and if dog owners are present at those events. Kilmer said owners are present. There is a dock with a 40-foot pool. The owners give commands and the dogs sprint and jump into the water. This is an American Kennel Club sponsored event and brings a large amount of revenue. Beckius asked about everyday use of the outdoor area. Kilmer said that when weather allows, classes of dogs

would be allowed out for around ½ hour at a time. Dogs are not left outside all day.

Washington expressed appreciation that Mr. Kilmer looked into regulations in other states. She asked for more information about the ratio of handlers to dogs. In the very early stages, there could be 1 handler per 20 dogs, but only until there is enough revenue generated to bring that number down. Kilmer anticipates that could be as early as one month into operation. Washington asked about the "classes" of dogs. Kilmer said that is the term used for groups of dogs. There is typically 1 handler per 10-15 dogs that could be taken out in shifts. There is also the indoor area of 13,000 square feet. Washington asked how many diving events there might be per year. Kilmer said four.

Opponents:

1. Ron Wilhelm, 1301 Piper Lane, played a recording of barking dogs. He stated the point he is making is that the noise cannot be turned off in a real kennel. He asked to proceed with his testimony while playing the recording but Commissioners agreed they understood his point. He and his wife have owned the abutting property to the east since 1999. In January of this year, they were approached by a developer potentially looking to rezone the area for mixed uses, including residential units on upper floors of a multi-story building. He wonders how those potential residents above would be affected by the kennel noise. He is not confident with the procedures the City has in place to enforce noise violations.

Harris asked how many dogs Mr. Wilhelm would be comfortable with. He stated he would be comfortable with three since that is the number currently allowed.

Washington asked what his property is zoned now. Wilhelm said it is currently H-2.

Hove asked whether his land is currently vacant. Wilhelm said it is. Hove concluded that the opposition stems from the development prospect and Wilhelm agreed.

2. Herb Friedman, 3800 Normal Boulevard, appeared as a property owner. The applicant's property is in the middle of a 4-block radius. If the kennel is outdoors in that location, the prospect of renting out his own office space is not good. It is wrong to have that type of noise pollution in the center of this area. This is not the best use of the property. Discussion is currently happening regarding mixed-use development in the area to include apartments, retail, and Grade A office space. The applicant stated he spoke with all of the surrounding property owners, but no one approached him.

Harris asked what number of dogs he would be comfortable allowing outdoors. Friedman replied zero. This is not the right place for this type of business. It invites a nuisance lawsuit.

Corr asked how full Mr. Friedman's existing office buildings are. Friedman said they nearly zero. Corr noted there are already problems finding tenants for the area. She asked how long that has been the case. This question was deferred to Charlie Friedman.

3. Charlie Friedman, 1901 S. 25th Street, said they are at around 40-50% occupancy. There is a current effort underway to develop Grade A office and excellent living units so there is concern about this type of filtration. People living above will still hear the noise despite a 6-foot barrier.

Harris asked how many dogs would be appropriate. C. Friedman said he would need to know more about exactly what was taking place but could say it should be three to zero. He'd like to know more about the noise control and what the 6-foot fence does to help.

Staff Questions:

Harris asked what would become of the kennel if a change of zone and mixed-use development occurred. She wondered specifically if the kennel would then be non-conforming. Wesselhoft said the zoning is H-2 and under that, residential is not permitted. If the change of zone were to occur, he would defer the answer to the legal department.

Harris expressed concern that other kennels abide by the 3-dog rule and wondered why this kennel should be allowed 30. Would this lead to a loosened number for everyone? Wesselhoft said that currently kennels are a conditional use in this district. It requires a 200-foot separation to residential and that only 3 dogs be allowed outdoors at one time. The current ordinance allows a special permit to waive either of those conditions, subject to Planning Commission approval. Harris asked if other kennels could come forward to ask for the same thing if this were approved today. She wondered if there is an overall vision for an appropriate number as it relates to surrounding development. Wesselhoft said each case is viewed individually, with their own sets of circumstances and surrounding zoning.

Edgerton asked whether it is the role of Commissioners to look at the current property within existing conditions, or to consider what types of changes might occur. Wesselhoft said he cannot speak on the matter of plans being made by private parties. The Comprehensive Plan designation for this block is commercial.

Harris wondered why the Friedman's had not heard of this until now. Wesselhoft said they would have been notified unless they are outside of the usual 200-foot notification range. Washington said she did not notice the Friedman's in the notification labels. Beckius said they are part of the report and it appears Mr. Friedman was notified. Washington noted the difficulty in making a decision about potential future plans.

Henrichsen clarified that Mr. Friedman was referring to the statement made by the applicant that he had informed neighbors personally. The City did notify the adjacent properties. The Comprehensive Plan does show this area as commercial. In a broad sense, that plan also encourages mixed uses, but then there are areas where uses do not mix well. Residential uses are not currently allowed in the 'H' districts. That does not mean the land cannot be rezoned. The previous change of zone related to the kennel was about changing the parking requirement.

Corr asked if it is fair to say that priority should be given to existing properties and zoning. Henrichsen said it is legitimate to consider impacts on the existing environment. It is also fair to take into account potential uses for vacant properties. If there were an R-5 area next door, staff would hesitate to recommend that use because the impact would be completely different. It is also valid to compare this noise with noise generated by other uses in the area.

Harris wondered if, for the sake of compromise, it would make sense to allow more dogs during an event, but to bring the requested number down on regular days. Henrichsen said it is the role of Commissioners to take in all of the information and testimony. If you want to lower numbers, it would be necessary to be very specific about the number of events that would be allowed. Another option is to postpone a vote for two weeks to deliberate.

Beckius inquired if there was equivalent guidance for kennels in terms of correlating the number of animals allowed per square footage, as there is for residential homes in the City. Beal said it is correct that there are permits for fowl that require a certain amount of square footage and setback from neighbors. For dogs, the maximum number allowed is three.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Kilmer said the adjacent lot owned by Mr. Wilhelm has been vacant for at least 18 years; it has had all this time to be developed but has not been. The kennel was part of the overall redevelopment discussion. The developer approached us when we had already begun deconstruction. Their development relies on the use of TIF funding. We gave them a 2-month period to present more detailed ideas, but construction cannot be held off indefinitely, especially with a $3 million loan being paid off. In preliminary concepts for the area, Mr. Wilhelm's property was shown as a parking lot. Kilmer apologized for not approaching the Friedman's; but he did approach the businesses leasing from them. He went as far as Lincoln Lighting Center across O Street to let them know about the plans and to offer his information if they had any questions or concerns. He is also aware that kennels in B-4 have no limit on the number of dogs outdoors and he is sure they are not the only ones. None of them have had complaints.

Washington said that the diving events used to be held at the Lancaster County Event Center which is a large place where people expect animals and noise. She asked how many people attend and participate in the events. Kilmer said the target is 200-300 people. They have the large indoor facility where dogs can be housed. Washington asked about parking during events.

Beckius noted the current plan shows the outdoor dog pool, just shy of 2,900 square feet.

1. Don Schleining, 857 S. 48th Street, came forward as architect to state that the current pool is still in place. A revised plan reduces the width and decreases the size of the pool. Beckius asked if that means there is roughly 5,000 square feet of outdoor space. Schleining said it depends on how the space is ultimately used. Beckius asked if Mr. Schleining

happened to research similar facilities to come up with best practices in terms of what kind of square footage dogs need. Schleining said most research was based on findings in other planning departments. Three cities the size of Lincoln were selected. This facility far exceeds the average in indoor space. One report mentioned the same kind of approach to dog noise control as has been suggested here.

Harris asked Kilmer if he would be comfortable if the application were deferred to get more consensus about the number of dogs allowed outside across the board. He said that would be fine, but reiterated that the outside number of 30 will not be typical. He mentioned that he chose a high number to accommodate birthday parties where he cannot limit the number of animals invitees might bring. The number was picked carefully.

SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 17011
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: **May 10, 2017**

Corr moved Conditional Approval, seconded by Scheer. Harris asked for clarification that the motion was for Conditional Approval, as-is. Corr said yes.

Harris said she would feel more comfortable deferring because it seems a compromise could be in order. She is unsure of what that looks like, but would hate to come up with changes on the fly. She would be more generous with her vote with more time.

Beckius said he struggles with the fact that there is no guiding principle in terms of number of dogs allowed in kennels verses other animals in the city. Going forward, consideration might be given to establishing a number per square foot in area. He is also uncomfortable working on the fly. Thirty sounds like a lot, but he does not know what the alternative should be. On the flip side, he is unsure of what knowledge he needs to inform his decision and it does not appear that those in opposition are interested in compromise. For lack of anything better, he will vote with his gut, and he would be more comfortable if no more than 20 dogs were allowed.

Washington shared concerns that a decision today would be based on partial information. She would prefer time too look at a lower number, but to add that condition today feels unwise.

Corr said she is fine with allowing 30 dogs. This is the second time seeing this applicant and he is clearly neighborly and this plan is well thought out. Dogs tend to have various characteristics, like people, so, like kids, some will be quite, others may not. That is why handlers are present to determine what needs to be done. Policies for these situations are well developed. She also disagrees that the noise cannot be turned off. There is a complaint and enforcement process in place. There are sufficient parameters in place to deal with this if it is a problem.

Scheer is also impressed with the applicant’s knowledge on the subject and his willingness to become even more knowledgeable and to operate his facility properly. His

overriding though is that a deferral will not change his vote. The owner is now implementing a plan that was started and approved in 2015. It is important to be cognizant and respectful of existing zoning and of the direction the Comprehensive Plan is providing for this part of the city. Putting all of that together, this use fits. There are two letters in support from surrounding business owners. The potential project proposed by those in opposition is speculative. To achieve their vision would require a change of zone and many other things to pull it all together. Before this body today is a project that makes sense for now and for what the Comprehensive Plan directs for the future.

Edgerton echoed many of the comments of Corr and Scheer. Her vote would not change between now and the next hearing and she is impressed with the thought and foresight of this project. The conditions are adequate and there is a due process to handle situations and concerns that come up. She will vote in favor of the motion.

Hove stated he also supports this project. He is also unsure that any compromise would occur given that Mr. Friedman indicated he would only be happy if zero dogs were allowed outdoors. This body needs to consider the impacts as they stand now. Much of the surrounding property is undeveloped and there is only an idea of a potential project that has not been exercised yet. The fact is, the barking can be turned on and off, by the handlers, or by the revocation of the special permit, if necessary.

Motion failed to carry due to lack of majority vote, 4-3: Corr, Edgerton, Scheer and Hove voting ‘yes’; Beckius, Harris and Washington voting ‘no’; Finnegan and Weber absent.

Harris moved to defer the application two weeks to the regular Planning Commission hearing of May 24, 2017; seconded by Edgerton.

Henrichsen came forward to clarify that the motion simply failed to have action one way or the other and therefore, it is only necessary to decide whether to continue public hearing for new information only.

Harris and Edgerton agreed that was their motion and second.

Motion carried, 7-0: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Scheer, Washington and Hove voting ‘yes’; Finnegan and Weber absent.

COUNTY TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 17008 AMENDING VARIOUS ARTICLES OF THE LANCASTER COUNTY ZONING REGULATION AND REPEALING APPROPRIATE ARTICLES AS HITHERTO EXISTING: **May 10, 2017**

Members present: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Hove, Scheer and Washington; Finnegan and Weber absent.

Staff recommendation: Approval.

There were no ex parte communications disclosed on this item.

Staff Presentation: Tom Cajka of the Planning Department said Planning Department is the applicant. This is an update to the County Zoning Articles and primarily includes clean-up of items, removal of redundancies, the addition and clarification of definitions, and other zoning revisions.

Some highlights of the amendments include updating of definitions such as replacing terms like “churches” with “places of religious assembly” and “nursing home” with “healthcare facility”. These terms and others were made more consistent with definitions in the City Municipal Codes. Some items were updated at the request of other departments. Under conditional uses in the AG zone, conditions were added to “winery” to make it clearer what a winery is and to eliminate the possibility that locations cannot call themselves a winery when what they really want to be is a social hall. Those changes were sent out to all wineries and the Nebraska Wine Growers Association and no negative response was received. An amusement license can be obtained for a large event once per year. The amendments add that religious places would be exempt from that limit because they often have three to four fundraisers.

Cajka indicated that it came to our attention that problems have come up with frontage regulations being enforced. The zoning codes say that to build a house on a lot, there must be 550 feet of frontage and 20 acres. Prior to 2002, no building permit was needed. In 2002, the permit was required. People created lots with no frontage and in the interim, until 2016, the frontage rule was ignored. Around a year ago, the County Attorney informed departments that the regulation could not be ignored and the frontage must be enforced. This rendered many parcels unable to build, so language has been added to state that if the parcel was created prior to January, 2013, the frontage requirement will not apply.

One of the biggest changes is in Article 13. Previously, it said any special permit could be done in any district. That was not appropriate for every district, such as in a residential area. All the permits issued were reviewed to see which district they apply to. Waivers requested to lot area, setbacks and frontage are routinely asked for and approved, so instead of having to go through that process every time, we recommend that in the AG District, it is allowable to use AG-R standards.

Article 22 requires advertising eight days in advance of the meeting. This will be changed to five days. The goal is to keep the eight days, but there have been occasions where the paper did not get the ad run in time and then the application had to be deferred. There were other items that are being removed because they have not been applied for in 40 years. This includes things like outdoor theaters, roadside stands in residential districts, government landfills, and parking lots.

Harris asked if removing items will cause any non-conforming special permit holders. Cajka said based on the review of the permits, no. The review led to the determination

about which permits had never been applied for. There was one for a parking lot in AG, but it was never built. Cajka indicated that he would have to ask the County Attorney if they could still build that lot if it were removed from the AG District. Harris noted that riding stables has been removed. Cajka said that they were removed to permit the use. Harris asked for confirmation that they will be a permitted use, and not a use that is completely removed. Cajka said that is right.

Harris asked if the changes made regarding expanded home occupancy will clear up issues that occurred with applications that came forward in the past year. Cajka said the revised language clarifies what an employee is, which was one of the main issues. Corr noted that the language was changed to include any person who participates in the home occupation at an event center. She asked if that means that a caterer or beverage provider would be considered participants, whereas a delivery person would not. Cajka said that is correct. She asked about people setting up events. Cajka said that if they are setting up an event, they will be there, on the property as an element to the event, and they are considered a participant.

David Derbin of the Lancaster County Attorney's Office said the line between the employer and an independent contractor is difficult to enforce so a lot of work went into determining how many employees. The real intent is that it is difficult to differentiate between employees and those people working on the site, so the effort was to get it back to those participating in the event.

Harris asked about whether a use formerly permitted by special permit but removed by this new amendment could still be done. Derbin said he has not looked at any specific permits, but assuming it was originally issued, it could not be revoked without going through that process. Cajka said there are none that create that situation.

Corr noted that a large event such as Froggie Fest can be done in the county, regardless of the zoning, one time per year with the amusement license, unless they are a place of religious assembly. Derbin said the difference is the invitation to the general public. Under roadhouse statutes, counties are allowed amusement places for those types of public uses. There are additional regulations where we limit to one per year, but that is not limited by statute.

Corr asked for clarification that trailer courts and mobile home parks are not allowed in AG zoning. Cajka said that is correct.

Corr debated how a recreational facility differs from a social hall in its effect on neighbors. Cajka said a recreation facility is usually applied to something like an athletic event or outdoor field, whereas a social hall is for social gatherings, receptions or parties. There is some added confusion because the residential district allows "community buildings", but that term is being replaced with "social hall". Corr said social halls cannot be in residential, but it is okay to have recreational facilities. She does not see much difference in the land use since both are gatherings of many people. Cajka

said in most cases, the recreational facilities are within areas like parks, which are embedded in residential areas. There are not usually buildings intended for use by 100-plus people for social events in a residential setting.

Proponents:

1. Mike Eckert, Civil Design Group, came froward to say that his firm frequently works with developers in the County. He expressed his thanks to the Planning Department for working on this. It is really helpful on our end and for developers. Some things have become easier as a result, and staff has done a good job of taking these things on, regardless of whether they are busy or not. He reiterated his appreciation for the time and effort spent.

Hove asked if these amendments make things cleaner and more effective. Eckert said yes. In the county, there were several items that were simply not used at all. This is a worthwhile effort.

There was no testimony in opposition.

TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 17008
ACTION BY PLANNING COMMISSION: **May 10, 2017**

Corr moved Conditional Approval, as amended by staff; seconded by Beckius.

Washington said that, having worked as a planner, she knows it can be tedious, particular work to go through regulations and proofread them many times over again. She thanked staff for their effort.

Commissioners echoed her thoughts and thanked Staff.

Hove stated he will support this application. It is a good clean-up and he appreciates the work done by Planning and the comments from the public.

Motion carried, 7-0: Beckius, Corr, Edgerton, Harris, Scheer, Washington and Hove voting ‘yes’; Finnegan and Weber absent.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Note: These minutes will not be formally approved by the Planning Commission until their next regular meeting on Wednesday, May 24, 2017.

F:\Boards\PC\Minutes\2017\pcm051017.wpd