

**CITY OF SILVERTON  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**7:00 P.M.**

**JULY 9, 2019**

The Planning Commission of the City of Silverton met at the Silverton Community Center on July 9, 2019 at 7:02 p.m. with Chairman Flowers presiding.

**I. ROLL CALL:**

Present	Absent	
<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	Chairman Clay Flowers
<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	Vice-Chairman Gus Frederick
<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	Morry Jones
<u>      </u>	<u>Excused</u>	Chris Mayou
<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	Rich Piaskowski
<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	Tasha Huebner
<u>      </u>	<u>Excused</u>	Peter Matzka

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu, Assistant to the City Manager and Human Resources Coordinator, Elizabeth Gray, Planning and Permit Assistant, Kate Schlee.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MEETING HELD , 2019:**

Commissioner Piaskowski moved to approve the minutes of May 28, 2019, as presented. Commissioner Frederick seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Commissioner Piaskowski made a clarification on page 4 of 5, line 28 of the minutes of June 11, 2019. He asked that the minutes be updated to reflect that his comments regarding traffic were more about the second and third order or cumulative effects and not regional traffic per se.

Commissioner Frederick moved to approve the minutes of June 11, 2019, as amended. Commissioner seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

**III. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR:**

There were no comments.

Chairman Flowers reviewed the process and rules associated with public meetings and public testimony for the members of the audience.

#### **IV. AGENDA ITEMS:**

##### **4.1 Case: 5005 East View Lane Annexation Filed by: Thomas and Deanna Moore Planning Department File No.: AN-17-01**

Chairman Flowers opened the public hearing at 7:11 p.m., and asked for declarations of ex parte contacts and conflicts of interest. No Commissioners abstained, declared ex parte contacts or conflicts of interest. No members of the audience challenged the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter, or any individual member for bias or conflict of interest.

Chairman Flowers reviewed the requirements for any party to be able to appeal a decision by the Planning Commission.

Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu used a PowerPoint presentation in order to help explain the application before the commission. The application request is to annex 5005 East View Lane into the city limits and zone the property R-1, Single Family Residential. The property is 17.41 acres in area and contains a single family home. The property is located south of the Vista Ridge and Abiqua Heights Phase 3 subdivision; on the southern terminuses of Shelokum Drive, Yapa Street, Skookum Drive and East View Lane; and, is located north easterly of the Enstad Court and Denton Court development that is adjacent to South Water Street.

Director Gottgetreu outlined the property's conformity to the annexation review criteria and restrictions that would be implemented if the property were annexed. Utilities have been stubbed to the property as part of the street extensions to the north and the city has a water line bisecting the property near the southern boundary. The city also has a 20 foot easement around that pipe. There are sewer and storm facilities on Shelokum Drive running to the Olson Road system and utilities are located along Denton Court and Enstad Road. There is a 60 foot access easement at the end of Denton Court that was platted as part of the original subdivision.

Director Gottgetreu stated that the applicant indicated in the application materials that no development is planned on the hillside area of the property and that it is the applicant's intention to donate that portion of the property to the city as a green-way with walking trails. This could potentially provide connection to the public streets on the downhill Denton Court side of the property. In this case, the development code allows instances where the applicant may offer additional considerations in support of the annexation. Those are typically done through a formalized development agreement. Staff would recommend that when this is brought forward to the council, if the Planning Commission is making a recommendation for approval that be brought to the council to formalize as part of the annexation application.

This property was submitted for an annexation in 2005 and included additional considerations. The dedication of property and restrictions on tree removal within the hillside area could be addressed in a development agreement.

Some of the requirements for development of the property would include a geotech report for the area; a booster pump station for the area at the developer's expense to provide water service for

areas of the property having elevations above the 520 foot elevation, and a water model. An engineer would have to model the water and drainage systems and provide a report regarding water pressure and storm drain impacts.

Commissioner Frederick asked if there are any existing water pumps in the Abiqua development. Director Gottgetreu stated that he believes so, but does not have personal knowledge. He thinks that is part of the testimony that was submitted.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that there was concern in the written testimony about water pressure issues and asked if the city is aware of effects that could occur on the rest of the system. Director Gottgetreu responded that the purpose of the water model is to predict the effects on the system.

Director Gottgetreu stated that the storm sewer system was also raised as a concern with the drainage basin that was constructed as part of the Abiqua Heights development. He explained how the current storm drainage systems work in the area and stated that there are options for connecting those services.

Director Gottgetreu outlined the process that would take place, if annexation was approved, before development could take place.

The file number is AN-17-01 because it was put on hold while the city had a hold on annexations due to the 2016 court challenge brought by Corvallis and Philomath on Senate Bill 1573, which precludes cities from sending annexations to a vote among the electorate. The City Council recently decided not to extend the hold on annexations.

The conceptual design that was provided is not what the Planning Commission is reviewing, but an example of what a subdivision on the site may look like. Any subdivision that would be submitted would have to be reviewed by the Planning Commission for compliance with the hillside standards, minimum lot size standards, street connectivity standards and other utility or constraint standards. Director Gottgetreu outlined some of the changes that would need to be made to the conceptual designs in order for the subdivision to be approved.

Chairman Flowers brought up that a lot of the written testimony was in response to the conceptual plan. He asked if that meant that the written testimony is not relevant to the annexation request. Director Gottgetreu responded that a lot of the written testimony addressed traffic, which would be addressed during review of a subdivision street plan to identify impact on the local street network and ensure that it is in compliance with the city's standards.

Director Gottgetreu outlined the review criteria for the annexation process.

Commissioner Piaskowski asked for clarification about number of vacant and re-developable lots given in the Staff Report on page 22 of 32. Director Gottgetreu stated that the numbers in the staff report accidentally left out the numbers for the Blackberry Preserve subdivision so the numbers should have been 267. Thus, the city is in the upper end of the range for a 5 year supply of vacant and re-developable lots.

## **Applicants Testimony:**

**Applicant's Representative, Don Kelley, 110 N. Second Street, Silverton, OR**  
**Applicant, Tom Moore**

Mr. Kelley thanked the city staff and the neighbors for their input and interest in this matter.

He emphasized that this is an annexation request and they are not here for approval of a subdivision. A lot of people expressed concerns about the plans for a subdivision, which will require another process and another hearing. The two plans that were submitted were conceptual only.

Mr. and Mrs. Moore had a meeting at their house to provide information to their neighbors.

This proposal provides the city a unique opportunity to preserve the trees that are a substantial part of the vision of South Water Street. The applicants intend to donate a large area for a park. The treed area could be harvested now, but that is not the intent of the applicants.

Mr. Kelley addressed the topic of traffic by stating that the streets in Abiqua Heights were designed for a lot more traffic than they have now and that they can support it. He also reiterated Director Gottgetreu's statement that there would have to be a traffic impact analysis. Mr. Kelley addressed the comments received about noise by stating that we can't legislate rude behavior. There are other ways to control traffic through good design for subdivisions.

Mr. Kelley next addressed concerns that were brought up about water issues. There are two ways to solve water pressure issues: through individual home pumps or a main pump lift system. Mr. Kelley spoke to Public Works Director, Petra Schuetz who stated that if a main pump lift station were required the city would want it to be placed where it could benefit Abiqua Heights. Thus, if the property does get developed we have the opportunity to examine where to place a main booster pump that can serve more than just the Moore's property.

Commissioner Huebner asked if the run-off problem would be exacerbated by having less land to soak into by there being houses and concrete for a subdivision. Mr. Kelley answered by stating that it is his understanding that the city would require them to be responsible for their run-off. They can't go in and solve a problem that exists within Abiqua Heights, but the city can require them to deal with the run-off from their property.

Commission Piaskowski asked for more information regarding the water pressure issues brought up by Mr. Kelley. Mr. Kelley responded that it is an elevation problem and the fact that gravity does not push water uphill very well. So, they need to find a way to help gravity get it to the fixtures.

Commissioner Jones asked if the trees not being removed become a stipulation of the annexation because the Applicants stated that the trees would remain. Director Gottgetreu answered by stating that the evidence submitted and relied upon in the application process is binding. A formalized annexation agreement can also be drafted to accompany the annexation application.

**Public Testimony:**

**Proponent Testimony:** None

**Opponent Testimony:**

**President-Abiqua Heights Homeowner's Association, Karen Garst, 1205 Tenino, Silverton**

She stated that the biggest concern her organization has is the drainage. They would like all storm water from a development go down Adams Street, which was suggested as a possible option.

Their other concern is water pressure because they have some homes that have had to have a pump installed to address the water pressure issue. When those homeowners approached the city, they were told that it was their business. So, those homeowners purchased the systems themselves.

Commissioner Jones asked if there was not sufficient drainage when the Abiqua Heights subdivisions were developed. Ms. Garst responded that Abiqua Heights was built in different phases and she is not sure that it was known when they were built that this was a problem and that the city must have thought the drainage was adequate at the time or the city would not have approved it.

Commissioner Frederick asked Director Gottgetreu if the storm drain goes down Olson or Adams. Director Gottgetreu clarified that the drainage from the common area goes down Adams and the way to bypass that would be to go down Olson.

Chairman Flowers asked if the water pressure problems for the houses that go up hill was never determined to be an issue. Director Gottgetreu stated that he did not know. Chairman Flowers further stated that these issues seem to be a failure of the public works department because the details of those plans are not reviewed by the Planning Commission. Director Gottgetreu stated that it is now a standard requirement for a water model to be performed as part of a subdivision submission, but that has not always been a requirement. However, for all subdivisions going forward, the water model is a requirement.

**Citizen and Homeowner, David Miller, 1005 Enstad Court, Silverton, OR**

Mr. Miller represents his wife and family; they share the slope with the proposed property. Mr. Miller provided Director Gottgetreu with pictures of the area. Mr. Miller has concerns about erosion, a loss of identity if the trees are cut down, the type of people who might frequent a secluded park and the loss of habitat for the wildlife. The idea of a park with walking paths is good in theory, but the type of people who might frequent a park that is going to be as secluded as this is might not be there for the right reasons. One of the pictures Mr. Miller provided was of a northern spotted owl that nests in the area. The spotted owl is currently on the threatened list. Mr. Miller has contacted the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Department and he intends to contact the

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Department. He will provide a copy of any paperwork that he gets from them to Director Gottgetreu.

He offered to have the commission members come to his house so that they could see the impacts that a subdivision would have on the area.

Commissioner Jones asked if the drainage causes problems for them. Mr. Miller stated that there is a small rivulet of water or green algae that collects at the end of the driveway, which is at the end of the slope. City workers told Mr. Miller that the drainage was from the hill above.

Commissioner Jones asked for clarification of Mr. Miller's reasons for opposing the annexation. Mr. Miller responded that his concerns are for the communities that are below the ridge, for the ridge itself and the future development of Silverton.

**Martin Hutter, 1220 Skookum Drive, Silverton, OR**

Mr. Hutter stated that his main concern about the annexation is the ability for the Silverton Fire District to get into the area with the lack of road improvements and the need for an increase in access into Abiqua Heights area.

**Karen Trucky, 540 Tillicum Drive, Silverton, OR**

Ms. Trucky represents herself and her husband Wayne Trucky. They oppose Tillicum being used as the main access street to a new development and are concerned about the need for the water pressure and the flooding problems to be fixed.

Her suggestion is that the new development connect to a connector via East View.

Chairman Flowers clarified that the conceptual drawings of the potential development does not count for an annexation.

**Mary Rose Brandt, 659 N James Street, Silverton, OR**

Ms. Brandt stated that one of her major frustrations with annexations is not knowing what is going to happen because once a property is annexed, the citizens lose all control.

**Norm Poff, 520 Yapa Drive, Silverton, OR**

Mr. Poff thinks that the city should be planning and updating streets, curbs and sidewalks instead of looking at adding new developments.

Chairman Flowers responded by stating that it is out of the purview of the Planning Commission's duties to update streets, curbs and sidewalks as suggested. It is up to the city to determine when upgrades will be made using their capital development budget.

Director Gottgetreu stated that the city does try to do infill development. Recently, the Budget

Committee and City Council have been allocating more funds to construct more sidewalks than have been done in the past. He further explained that the structure is set up so that the owner of the adjacent property is responsible for the sidewalks. That is easy to see in new developments because when the subdivision is developed, the sidewalks and curbs are installed. That was not always the standard in the past when driving was a primary mode over walking. He outlined some of the methods the city uses to install sidewalks in the older developments.

**Neutral Testimony:**

**Ben Settecase, 785 Chickamin Loop, Silverton, OR**

Mr. Settecase stated that there are a lot of items left in question at this point.

**Additional Information by Staff:**

Director Gottgetreu responded to some of the topics brought up in testimony. In regards to the drainage for the site, it is a large pipe put under the road that has a smaller hole at the end of it. The engineers would have to determine the length of pipe needed to meter out the water at the slower rate.

In regards to the comment about the fire district, they did respond stating that most of their concern was related to the uphill slope and the influence it could have with fire spread and wildfire situations. They would like to develop strategies to create defensible spaces to help minimize risks where these areas exist.

In regards to the differences between the annexation and subdivision review criteria, the annexation criteria is more subjective and gives the Planning Commission more latitude in approval or denial whereas, the subdivision review criteria is based on clear and objective standards..

**Written Testimony:**

**Rebuttal:**

Mr. Kelley reiterated that this property is and has been for a long time within the urban growth boundary. The intention has always been to annex this property, it is just a matter of when. The utilities and roads for Abiqua Heights are stubbed to this property and they were not intended to end there. The water and sewer in Abiqua Heights was planned to connect to this property.

With regard to traffic, there will have to be a traffic study. The applicants cannot stop people from speeding through Abiqua Heights. All they can do is try to control the flow coming out of this property into Abiqua Heights by using traffic control devices.

In response to Ms. Trucky, there will be four streets out of this property.

In response to Ms. Brandt, the city has already suggested that the applicants put together a

donation agreement to be reviewed by the City Council.

Commissioner Frederick made a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion. Chairman Flowers closed the Public Hearing at 8:52 p.m. and called for a five minute break.

The meeting resumed at 8:57 p.m.

Commissioner Frederick stated that he is leaning towards approval. He agrees with Mr. Kelley that this is an obvious addition to an existing subdivision.

Commissioner Huebner thinks that we should listen to current residents before looking at future development. The city has five to eight years of housing available and it is not a pressing issue to bring in additional space for housing. She feels that it will have an adverse effect on the people who live in the area and does not think that annexation is the right decision at this time.

Commissioner Piaskowski does see it as a logical extension of what is expected to occur in this area and that the park is an excellent idea to deal with the sloped area. However, he thinks that it is necessary to proceed with caution due to the issues being brought up. The issues raised do not rule the property out for annexation, but it raises a reason to be cautious when we have an adequate supply of developable land.

Commissioner Jones is in favor of recommending approval.

Chairman Flowers thinks that we have a sufficient amount of re-developable land. He is leaning towards recommending to the City Council that they deny the annexation.

Commissioner Piaskowski asked for clarification from Director Gottgetreu on the next steps if the annexation is approved.

Commissioner Huebner made a motion to recommend denial to the City Council of the proposed annexation. Commissioner Piaskowski seconded the motion. The commission voted 3-2 to recommend denial of the proposed annexation to the City Council with Commissioner Huebner, Commissioner Piaskowski and Chairman Flowers voting in favor of recommending denial of the proposed annexation; and, Commissioner Frederick and Commissioner Jones voting in opposition of recommending denial of the proposed annexation.

The proposed annexation will go before the City Council on August 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Amendments to conditions: None**



**4.2 Case: 811 South Water Street Zone Change**  
**Filed by: Twilight Courts, LLC, PO Box 311, Silverton, OR 97381**  
**Terry Thomas, Representative**  
**Planning Department File No.: ZC-19-02**

Chairman Flowers opened the hearing at 9:16 p.m., and asked for declarations of ex parte contacts and conflicts of interest. No Commissioners declared conflicts of interest. Commissioner Jones declared ex parte contact with his neighbor, but he feels that this will not influence his judgment on this application and can make a fair and impartial decision.

No members of the audience challenged the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to hear this matter, or any individual member for bias or conflict of interest.

Chairman Flowers reviewed the requirements for any party to be able to appeal a decision by the Planning Commission.

Director, Jason Gottgetreu presented a PowerPoint presentation of the staff report for a Zone Change Application to change the zoning of 811 South Water Street from R-5, Low Density Residential to RM-10, Multiple-Family Residential. 811 South Water Street was developed in 1968 with 30 single bedroom dwelling units and is known as Twilight Courts. The site is 2.37 acres in area, which currently has a maximum density of 24 units, making the site non-conforming in terms of density. The RM-10 designation would allow a density range between 24 and 47 units, which would bring the development into compliance with the comprehensive plan designation of multi-family. The application by Twilight Courts states that they intend to add one additional four-plex to the site.

Chairman Flowers asked where the proposed location of the new building would be located. Director Gottgetreu pointed out the site on the PowerPoint presentation photo.

Director Gottgetreu outlined the written response to written testimony, which was submitted by Mr. Terry Thomas who was unable to attend due to having to attend a funeral out of state.

**Applicants Testimony:**

**Secretary of the Board for Twilight Courts, Robin Kuhn, 1386 S. Water Street, Silverton**

When the development was built, the bi-laws were set up to help the elderly and handicapped in Silverton. The property is owned by Twilight Court, LLC with a volunteer board and is completely a non-profit organization. The reason for the zone change request is because they were surprised that they were non-compliant with the zoning and they need to be able to rebuild if anything were to happen.

In the near future, the board is going to get the financing necessary to rebuild each unit, one at a time, in order to build them to today's standards and build them correctly. The new four-plex that they intend to build will allow them to continue to provide housing to the current residents while rebuilding each four-plex.

Commissioner Huebner asked what will happen if the property is sold. Ms. Kuhn responded that the bi-laws state that if the property is sold that it needs to be sold to another non-profit.

Commissioner Piaskowski asked if the units are all one-story. Ms. Kuhn responded that they are all one story, one bedroom, one bathroom units as will the additional unit they intend to build. The units are approximately 500 square feet each.

**Public Testimony:**

**Proponent Testimony:**

**Linda Gessler, 1224 S. Water Street, Silverton, OR**

Ms. Gessler stated that Twilight Courts has a 15 year contract that started in 2018 with Marion County housing to subsidize the rent of tenants that meet the qualifications. The housing is not only for elderly, but low-income elderly. It is a one-of-a-kind facility in the state of Oregon.

Commissioner Jones asked if this is a HUD program. Ms. Gessler stated that the loan with USDA was paid off and now the contract is with Marion County to subsidize the rent of applicants that meet the qualifications. Orville Roth was one of the original people who created this development and program.

**Jim Squires, 1209 Mill Street, Silverton, OR**

Mr. Squires lived at Twilight Courts for nine years in the part of property near where the new structure is proposed. He gave a history of the evolution of the property. Mr. Squires also reiterated how important it is for affordable housing and housing for disabled and elderly people.

**Connie Barrett, 805 S. Water Street, Silverton, OR**

Ms. Barrett stated that her backyard is adjacent to the parking lot for Twilight Courts. She is in favor of this zone change and encouraged the members to visit the grounds. It is beautifully maintained and a wonderful community of people.

**Harry Douglas, Resident of Twilight Courts and Affordable Housing Taskforce Member**

Mr. Douglas thinks that it is important that they keep the amount of units. There are a lot of people who live in Twilight Courts that would not be able to live in Silverton and may not be able to afford anything else.

He said that last week he asked the Board of Directors, Terry Thomas what would happen if the property is sold. Terry Thomas told him that Twilight Courts has a 15 year moratorium through the contract with Marion County, which means that if it was sold, the new owner would have to follow the guidelines of Marion County Housing.

Commissioner Huebner asked for clarification if the 15 year moratorium meant that the property would have to remain housing for low-income elderly and handicapped residents. Mr. Douglas

responded that is what he understood from his conversation with Terry Thomas. Commissioner Huebner followed her question by asking if they could increase the units to 47 units with the zone change. Mr. Douglas stated that he and Mr. Thomas did not discuss that part, but if you look at the map there is only room for one more four-plex unless you built a second story. Mr. Douglas indicated that no one was going to stand for a second story because the residents are older.

Chairman Flowers asked if each building was a four-plex. Mr. Douglas stated that they are all four-plexes.

Chairman Flowers stated that the neighbors on Adams Street are opposed to losing the open space in the back of Twilight Courts where the additional four-plex is proposed, but he doesn't think that they can see it. Mr. Douglas stated that he lives on the opposite side of the complex from the open space and he does not know much about the neighbors on Adams Street. However, he does not see how they would even interact with the people because there is a fence and shrubbery between Twilight Courts and the houses.

**Twilight Courts Stockholder, Gene Oster, 6182 Cascade Hwy NE, Silverton**

Mr. Oster is a member of the Affordable Housing Taskforce and a Twilight Court stockholder. He thinks that the board is committed to the current type of housing and that if the property were to be sold, he thinks that a deed restriction agreement would be made to retain this type of housing.

When the 50 year USDA loan was paid off, the options for the property uses was wide open, but the Twilight Courts board was committed to keeping the property as low-income, elderly housing. After the loan pay-off, the board negotiated a contract with Marion County in order to subsidize the rent. The agreement also allows for Twilight Courts to borrow money in order to make necessary upgrades to the facilities.

**Opponent Testimony:** None

**Neutral Testimony:** None

**Written Testimony:** Provided in Staff Report.

**Rebuttal:**

Robin Kuhn stated that she thinks the opposition to the proposal is that no one likes change and she has explained why they need this change. She had nothing further to add.

Commissioner Frederick moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Chairman Flowers closed the Public Hearing at 10:02 p.m.

Commissioner Huebner expressed concern about not knowing the legalities of the 15 year agreement.

Commissioner Piaskowski agreed that they have to think through possible outcomes for the future when making zone changes, but in this case there is a well-established board, a community of seniors who live there with a 15 year agreement that make this low-risk. His long-term concern would be the height of the buildings adjacent to the R-1 zone.

In regards to Commissioner Piaskowski's concern, Chairman Flowers clarified with Director Gottgetreu that a review of any proposed structure would have to be done prior to approval of building plans being issued.

Commissioner Piaskowski agrees with the proposed zone change.

Commissioner Jones is in favor of this zone change because he thinks that Silverton needs this low-income housing.

Commissioner Frederick is in favor and has no problems because he has been here long enough and knows the members of the board and the track record of the members.

Chairman Flowers is in favor, but read and addressed some of the written comments that were submitted by the public. He also addressed a petition signed by 34 people from Adams Street.

Commissioner Jones made a motion to approve the application as written. Commissioner Frederick seconded the motion. Motion carries 4-1, with Chairman Flowers, Commissioner Frederick, Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Piaskowski in support of the zone change application; Commissioner Huebner in opposition of the zone change application.

The proposal will be heard by the City Council on August 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Amendments to conditions:** None.

#### **4.3 Neighborhood-Based Groups**

Director Gottgetreu and City of Silverton Assistant to the City Manager and Human Resources Coordinator, Elizabeth Gray walked the members through the recommendations following the discussion on May 28<sup>th</sup> regarding neighborhood-based groups.

Commissioner Huebner likes staff's proposal.

Commissioner Piaskowski thinks that there should be a check-in in a year to see how the resolution has been applied.

Commissioner Jones said he thinks it is a great idea, but he's not sure if it will work everywhere.

Commissioner Frederick agreed that it is a great idea, but might not work everywhere.

Chairman Flowers expressed his appreciation of staff's work and agreed with staff's proposal.

Mr. Squires gave some examples of the importance of neighborhood associations.

The members all agreed to recommend staff's proposal for neighborhood associations to the City Council.

## **V. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Director Gottgetreu informed the Planning Commission members that the legislation passed House Bill 2001, which is a state-wide ban on single family zoning. For cities between 10,000 and 25,000 people, you have to allow a duplex on any lot that you would allow a single-family home. The city has until January 1, 2021 to create the development code changes to address the new law. The state is going to come out with model codes to be used during the process.

Chairman Flowers explained that where we currently only allow 20% of lots in a sub-division to have a duplex, now all lots could have duplexes.

The new law would allow someone to buy a lot that has an existing single-family home and turn it into a duplex.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The Meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kate Schlee,  
Planning and Permit Assistant