Hi there. Welcome to the March 23rd Planning Commission. It is six o’clock. I’m going to go ahead and take roll.

1. Roll:

   Commissioner Coulter?

   I’m here.

   Yay. Commissioner Arthur?

   Here.

   Commissioner Nelson?

   Present.

   Vice Chair Collier?

   Here.

   Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

   Here.

   Commissioner Scherf appears to be absent, as does Commissioner Aviles. I am Eric, I’m here. Do we have anybody online that we know of, staff?

   Our understanding was that Commissioner Scherf was going to call in. That’s what we were told a few hours ago.
Okay.

Since you have a quorum, you're okay to proceed, but he may-
We will proceed, maybe he'll join us a little bit late.

2. Introductions:
    Introductions. Staff, do we have an introduction?

    We have with us tonight Gabby Sinagra. She is our Assistant Planner, and I don't
think the Commission has heard from her yet, maybe one other time. She is the
planner assigned to the Rogue Credit Union tonight, so this will be her debut and
there'll be many more to come.

    Welcome, we can't wait to get you on the hot seat. I have an introduction, too,
Commissioner Coulter has rejoined the Commission after a 10-month hiatus.
Welcome, sir. We appreciate you being here with us.

    Thank you.

3. Public Comment:
    This item number 3 is for public comment. Are all of you here for one project or
another, you're not just public attending the meeting? Am I right?

    One project. Yeah.

    Well, if any of you are here to talk to us, now's your time. You can talk to us about
any items not related to the agenda items. The intent here is to provide information
that is pertinent to the city's jurisdiction. Any of you speakers that want to come up to
the podium, you're welcome to. You've got three minutes. Any takers? All righty,
then.

4. Approval of Minutes:
    Item 4A, approval of the March 9th minutes. Do we have a motion, or does
somebody want to amend anything?

    I'll move to approve the minutes.

    Tokarz-Krauss moves to second that motion.

    Commissioner Collier moves to approve the minutes. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss
seconds. All those in favor, say aye.
    Aye.

    Any opposed? Any abstentions? Commissioner Coulter and myself both abstain.
MOTION/VOTE
Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the March 9, 2022, meeting. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: Chair Heesacker and Commissioner Coulter. Absent: Commissioners Aviles and Scherf.
The motion passed.

5. Informational Items:
Item 5, it says informational items. I don't have any. Staff, any informational items?
None.

6. Findings of Fact:
   a. 405-00127-21 ~ HNA Comp Plan Amendment
   Item 6A, Findings of Fact, project number 450127-21, Comp Plan Amendment. Does anybody have any motion for that Findings of Fact?
   
   I would move approval of the Findings of Facts for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
   
   Commissioner Nelson moves to approve the Findings of Fact, any seconds?
   
   Arthur seconds.
   
   Commissioner Arthur seconds. All those in favor, say aye.
   
   Aye.
   
   Anybody opposed? Abstentions?
   
   Abstain.

   Commissioner Coulter and Heesacker abstain.

MOTION/VOTE
Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the Findings of Fact, project number 450-00127-21, HNA Comp Plan Amendment. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: Chair Heesacker and Commissioner Coulter. Absent: Commissioners Aviles and Scherf.
The motion passed.

b. 104-00146-22 ~ Buckmaster Subdivision PC
Item 6B, Findings of Fact for the Buckmaster subdivision, project number 104-00146-22. Motion to approve? Motion to deny? Motions, motions.

I would move approval of the Buckmaster Findings of Fact for their subdivision.

Tokarz-Krauss seconds.

Commissioner Nelson moves to approve, Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconds. All those in favor, say aye.

Aye.

Aye.

Any opposition? Abstentions?

Abstain.

Commissioner Coulter and Heesacker both abstain.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss seconded the motion to approve the Findings of Fact, project number 104-00146-22 ~ Buckmaster Subdivision PC. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: Chair Heesacker and Commissioner Coulter. Absent: Commissioners Aviles and Scherf.

The motion passed.

7. Public Hearing:
   a. 201-00417-22/301-00149-22 ~ Rogue Credit Union ~ Union Avenue Major Site Plan & Major Variance Review ~ Staff Report

Item 7A, public hearing, item number 201-00417-22 and project number 301-00149-22, Rogue Credit Union Site Plan Review and variance. Bear with me as I open the public hearing. We will begin the hearing with a staff report, followed by public comment, and then the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of this commission to consider this matter? Seeing none. Conflicts of interest, do commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Nobody's jumping to that. In this hearing, the decision of the commission will be based upon specific criteria. All testimony and evidence must be directed toward those criteria. The criteria which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be
able to appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals based on that issue. We may now begin the hearing with a staff report.

All right. Is this thing on? Oh, okay. All right. Well, good evening, everybody. I'm happy to be here and finally be presenting in front of you all. My name is Gabby Sinagra, as Brad said, I'm the Assistant Planner with the city, and I was the planner assigned to the proposed Rogue Credit Union. We processed this as a Major Site Plan Review with a major variance request. Let's get into it. First and foremost, the proposed development is located at 340 Union Avenue. The parcel currently has frontage along Union Avenue, which we classify as a collector, in addition to frontage along Redwood Highway, classified as a state highway. The parcel is zoned general commercial and is within city limits. While the lot is currently vacant and undeveloped, there is an existing approach that does take access off of Union Avenue. However, the applicant proposes to abandon the existing approach and would like to be approved for two approaches. You'll notice, circled in red here on the far-left hand side of the Union Avenue frontage, and another along the right-hand side of the Union Avenue frontage.

All right. The application is for a Major Site Plan Review to allow the development of the vacant lot with a single story, 4,598 square foot Rogue Credit Union branch, with three drive-through Personal Teller Machines, or PTMs. The applicant is requesting a major variance for relief from the Access Standards outlined in Article 27 of the Grants Pass Development Code, and request to be allowed to have those two two-way commercial driveways off of the Union Avenue from the previous slide to serve the proposed development. Pictured here is the site plan. Just to give you guys some orientation here, so Union Avenue, this is the Southern part of the parcel. On the north here is where Redwood Highway comes through. The building is proposed on the Northern edge of the parcel. I do want to call out something that was discussed in the staff report. The applicant, as part of their submittal, did include a future development plan. As part of this, there was an indicated future property line, which suggests that perhaps a potential partition might be in their interest later on. That property line is indicated, I believe, right here.

I just want to call out that Public Works did make a comment that with the existing utility configuration proposed for the Rogue Credit Union branch with that optional property line, if they were to move forward with that, that would create a nonconforming situation with the laterals crossing property lines. Just something to take note of. Pictured here are the proposed building elevations for the Credit Union. All new commercial buildings are subject to the standards outlined in Article 20 of our Commercial Design Standards in the Development Code. Staff has reviewed these elevations and has determined that they meet the criteria area in Article 20. In regard to the variance, I wanted to first start with our city traffic engineer, John Replinger's, comments. He did review the submitted Transportation Impact Analysis that was required as part of the applicant submittal. He did provide a comment on the request saying that "The applicant proposes to access driveways to Union Avenue rather than the one that's prescribed under Article 27.121. The applicant provides no justification or analysis for the extra access. I recommend that the applicant resubmit a site plan with access meeting the requirements of Article 27."

Urban Area Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes March 23, 2022
The Article that Mr. John Replinger is referencing, the specific section is 27.121-H4. This is outlined under Access to Arterials and Collectors. The Development Code does specify that each parcel shall be allowed no more than one direct access driveway, regardless of the size of the property or the amount of frontage, unless the variance is granted by the review body, based on a Traffic Analysis Report and the criteria in Article 6 outlining variance requests. A summation of the applicant’s response to the variance requests is that the proposed Credit Union drive-through will see significant vehicular traffic, more than is normal for a proposed office. Therefore, having those two two-way entries and exits provides the most clear, direct way in and out to serve the property. You can see their full response to the variance criteria outlined in your packets from pages 30 to 31. Staff’s response is that we adhere to the provisions for variance criteria that is outlined in Section 6.060 of the Development Code, and we found that the applicant does not meet Criteria 1, regarding topographical constraints, nor Criteria 3, pertaining to the proposal’s benefits, outweighing any negative outcomes for development of adjacent uses.

Once again, just to reiterate, we found that Criteria 1 and 3 for the variance requests were not satisfied. We recommend that the Planning Commission deny the request for a major variance for the two two-way entries and exits from the Union Avenue, based not only on the provisions outlined in Article 6.060 of the Code pertaining to variance criteria, but also to Mr. John Replinger’s comments, which you can see in page 34 of the packet. In regard to the Major Site Plan Review, we do have 13 criteria that outlined the process of approval which is, excuse me, outlined in pages 32 to 41 of your packet. Staff reviewed it and found that the criteria are met with the associated conditions outlined in the staff report. Just some relevant conditions to discuss, the first being the revised utility plan and the future development plan, as discussed earlier, for the nonconforming utility laterals, a landscape plan that meets requirements of the code, lighting details. The applicant would have to conform with Public Works and public safety requirements.

On that note, there was one particular comment in the Public Works staff report worth discussion here. Currently, the sidewalk configuration for the entire Union Avenue is a five-foot sidewalk and a five-foot planter strip. As part of their proposal, the applicant is proposing to do a reconfiguration of the sidewalks, but they do propose to meet those same standards of the five feet. However, this does not meet the requirements outlined in Section 27-3 of our Development Code. Public Works is requiring that if the applicant does indeed reconfigure the sidewalks, they'll need to meet the standards listed it in 27-3 and provide a six-and-a-half-foot sidewalk with seven-and-a-half-foot planter strips. Apart from that, a revised site plan. If the variance tonight is denied, then the applicant will need to submit a revised site plan indicating that the approach standards in Schedule 27-1 are met. All of the other criteria for the Major Site Plan Review requests are met with the associated conditions. Again, you can find that in pages 41 to 45 of your packet.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the request for the single story, 4,958 square foot Rogue Credit Union branch with the three drive-through Personal Teller Machines with the associated conditions in the report. For call to action, staff recommends denial of the major variance, and we recommend the approval for the request for the Major Site Plan Review. Thank you.
Any questions of staff before we let her get away? Commissioner Coulter?

Yes, sir.

Well, I guess I jump on the wagon again. The site plan recommendation is in opposition to the variance and the two-way driveway, from my perspective, is part of the site plan. For consistency, it would seem that you would recommend against the site plan, because we can't... If the commission disapproves the variance, there is no site plan that we can approve. Am I correct?

That is correct, yeah. They would need to submit a revised site plan with the appropriate access.

One of the reasons I say that, so really, if the variance is disapproved, we can't even discuss the site plan, or we shouldn't until the new site plan is put on. This is the way we've done it in the past.

No, that makes sense.

It also keeps the applicant from having to start from scratch, almost, on a site plan.

Okay.

Or at least the permitting fees and stuff.

No, I think that's a solid point. Brad, would you agree?

But we don't want to make it harder on the applicant if we were to disapprove the variance. I want to make it as easy for them in the resubmittal process as possible, the way I see it.

Right, Commissioner, I think that's generally right. You certainly are open to discussion about the site plan. Obviously, you need to hear the applicant's presentation if there's other things that are relevant that you would want to point out, so that the applicant can also consider those things if-

We haven't even, in the past, even considered a site plan, if we didn't approve the variance, is what I was going to say.

Right. That's not a standard that is required in the Development Code, nor is it mandatory. It's a case-by-case basis.
Okay. But it's integral to the site plan, so a little concerned about that. Oh, whatever, just wanted to bring it up.

Commissioner Collier?

In just the brief two years that I've been here, I think since you've been gone, what we've done, I've seen at least twice, is that we've worked on the variance first and the site plan second. I think that was something that Commissioner Nelson introduced us to. Because we've had this more than once where we've talked about the variance first, voted on it separately, and then moved forward. But that's what we've done within the last year.

How did you-

Oh, that's historical. I'm just letting you know.

How did you reconcile that if-

I wouldn't answer that question, because it's not specific to staff, but I'm just letting you know that's how we've done it. Since you've been away, we've talked about the variance first and the project second, voted on the variance, up or down. And it was different from this situation.

We did have one when I was here on Board that whatever the variance was, wasn't integral to the site plan. I do recall that. My concern is we're going to end up, if we don't approve the variance, of having to probably disapprove the site plan. I don't see how we can do conditions of approval on that.

I would say you're correct in that you couldn't approve the site plan, but there is the option to continue the hearing.

Got it. Good answer. I like that.

Other questions of staff? All right, you get a break.

Oh. All right.
Anyone from the applicant side like to come up and give us a presentation on the project, please? State your name and address for the record and go right ahead.

My name is Matt Small, I'm with KSW Architects. Address is 66 Water Street, Ashland, Oregon. I'm not quite sure where to start. I think you bring up a really good question and I want to maybe start with that, if we could.
Sure. Go ahead and start with that and then go right into the variance, that'd be great.

Okay. Our hope tonight is to convince you that two driveways are what we need and would be acceptable. We'll get into that in a bit. If you choose not to agree with us tonight, what we would like to do is ask for a continuance, which my understanding is that the continuance would happen, our next meeting be would April 6th, is that correct? In addressing your question, my thought is we could have... The reason for the continuance, it would buy us some time to get a traffic engineer involved. The traffic engineer that we had involved initially did what was required for the TIA, but she didn't really study the two access points. That was my problem for not asking her to do that. She's away on spring break this week, so she couldn't get a report to us for tonight. But she'll be back, and she could get a report for us for the April 6th meeting. My thinking is, we would present it again, if we don't get approval tonight, on April 6th. We could have at that meeting, two options, the original option, and then a secondary option that would only have one.

The reason why I'm spending time on this is that our project is under some very strict time frames. The Credit Union, as you may or may not know, they're occupying their West Branch in the West side of town. Their lease is up in 2023, our whole schedule is set up to get them a new building by the time that lease is up. It's a very time-sensitive situation, that's why it's important. I don't know if that's a scenario that would work for you, that I just described. In our worst-case scenario, we have a decision April 6th, with two or one driveways. Does that make sense?

It makes sense. Our deliberations following your presentation will outline how we're going to proceed.

Okay. But any questions about my thinking there from anybody?

The next UAPC meeting, I believe, is the 13th of April. City Council's the sixth.

Yeah. Thank you for that clarification. They meet the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month.

Whatever, I thought it was April 6th is what- [crosstalk 00:20:58]. Or whatever that next...
13th.
13th.
13th, okay. We just added another week, but... Okay. Let's go back to my original presentation. Gabby, thanks for the good work. It was great. We have really very few problems with the report, but there are few that I would like to discuss. The first is a clarification. We noticed that there is a planter strip required along the Redwood
Highway. Typical planter strip [inaudible 00:21:51], and we have the same requirement on Union Avenue, which makes perfect sense. I'm not sure it makes sense along Redwood Highway, so I'd like some clarifications and thought about that. I'm not sure that ODOT would be appreciative of that landscape. I don't know what it does. It certainly doesn't do the job that it does on Union Avenue. If you could discuss that and perhaps offer some clarity to that, that would be great. Second item, one of the requirements in the staff report was for a Type 3 bicycle parking area. Type 3 is a covered parking area. The need for a Type 3 is based upon square footage. Gabby and I have spoken about this, I think our calculations for the square footage are different.

I do have a drawing that I'd like to share with you. The issue with the Type 3 bicycle parking is that it becomes required in a commercial use when your square footage exceeds 4,000 square feet. The code allows us, when we calculate that square footage of the building, to exclude spaces like storage spaces, restrooms. The drawing that I just gave you, the building is 4,598 square feet, the total square footage of the building. You subtract the restrooms, the storage areas, which is the yellow part of that drawing, that equals 659 square feet. You subtract that from the 4,598 and you end up with 3,939 square feet, which is less than 4,000 square feet. What we're asking is to have [inaudible 00:24:37] staff take another look at that. It's certainly not the end of the world, but I think it's an expense that we don't need to incur on this project. I don't think I provided the information for Gabby that she needed to make that determination. Any questions about that Type 3 bicycle parking?

I don't have any questions about that, but I'm hoping you can get straight to the variance so that we can discuss that, the access points.

Okay. I can do that, but I have a... How about one more item?

Go right ahead.

Okay. Thank you. The next item is the 10-foot city utility easements. As you probably know, we have a requirement of 10-foot utility easements along Union, and also along Redwood Highway. We have absolutely no problem with the easements, the issue is the timing of the easements. The staff report is requiring that the easements be recorded before a building permit can be issued, or before we can submit for a building permit. The CUE process can be quite lengthy. There are drawings involved, there's legal descriptions involved, there's recording at the county. As I mentioned earlier, time is of the essence for this project. The change that I would like to see is make this a condition but make it a condition before the Certificate of Occupancy. That buys us months of time to get this process done. As far as I understand, the building department really doesn't care much about easements. I'm not quite sure why that's even a requirement.

Any questions about that? I really truly hope that those requests will be considered. Let's talk about the variance. Again, I want to be really clear, my hope tonight is to
convince you that we need two driveways. If I fall short in that, for the record, we'd like to do a continuance. Okay. Gabby, you got that drawing? Can we put that up there?

Is there a way to make this full screen or-

That's great.

Is that perfect? Okay.

Yep. First of all, it's important for you all to understand how important this second driveway is to the Rogue Credit Union. They are just an incredibly successful, and because of their success, a very busy Credit Union. They see a lot of traffic. One of the things that they pride themselves on is great service. The ability for someone to use the PTM machine and then zip right out is, really, very, very important to them. Gabby [inaudible 00:29:09] mentioned there were four criteria that we had to meet for this variance to be allowed. We satisfied two of them and two we did not. The first criteria that we didn't meet was Criteria number 1. I'm going to read a portion of what that criterion says. It says, "The variance is necessary because the subject code provision does not account for special or unique physical circumstances of the subject site, such as topography, natural features, or adjacent development." The thing that I want to focus on tonight is the adjacent development, and the that's why we have this plan up here.

What you'll see on the right side is our proposed Credit Union with the two driveways. To the left was a proposal that was put together by a developer. You'll notice that they have an exit onto Union Avenue, and they also are showing an exit up to Redwood Highway. Do you see that? If I had a pointer, I could point it to you. [inaudible 00:31:06]. Here's the driveway onto Union, this was their driveway out onto Redwood Highway. They had a meeting with ODOT. ODOT said, "No way. We're not going to give you access to Redwood." And so, when that happened, the project stopped. What you'll see on this proposal is a gas station with fuel pumps and a convenience store. This is a drive-through coffee shop and then another drive through restaurant. Here's our proposed drive-through bank, PTMs, and then a future project here.

Just so I can see it, this is all to scale?

I'm sorry, what?
This is all to scale?

Yes, it's to scale. But keep in mind that this is off of Google Earth and then imposed drawings, so it's not an exact scale, but it's sufficient for this discussion.

How long ago was this proposal made adjacent?
Not too long ago.

Years? Months?

No, months.

Okay. Thank you very much.

At least that's when we saw it, just a few months ago. I don't know if they would mind that I've got this up here or not, but I went ahead. What this shows is what the potential of this lot is. There're three drive-through businesses, right there generating a heck of a lot of traffic that's coming out on Union. They're not allowed to go out here. The other piece that I want to talk about here, is that when they lost this second access, they dropped the project. It's an indication to me that they want and need two exits out of this project, given the traffic load. By the way, the owners of this property also owned our property. When the Credit Union bought this property, this owner, which is the same owner, required a cross access easement between these two properties. It was a requirement of the developer with the anticipation that as this got developed, they're going to need a second way out of here. This piece right here I want to talk about it a little bit.

We drew in a driveway, and it's roughly 150 feet from the intersection, which is the closest it can be to that intersection by code. You can see, there's really not much room for this development to have two exits. Whereas here, if you look at this, we've got three that are equally spaced. I think it would be problematic for all this traffic to have to come through here, to exit, if this were not there. Getting back to the criteria, where it talks about unique, physical circumstances of adjacent development, that's what I'm talking about. The other thing to point out is, this is actually two lots currently. It's split roughly here, with one lot here and one lot here. This lot is landlocked. It has to go through this lot to get out, so another physical constraint. Who knows if and when this development will happen, but I would surmise that having this as an option for them would help promote the development of that piece of property, which I'm assuming from your point of view is a good thing. Any questions?

Commissioner Arthur, go right ahead.

Sort of in that direction. Where were they allowed to have access at all on that other property, because there isn't anything that's 150 feet from a corner, the entire thing?

You mean access for this property?

No, for the other one. For the brown part.
Yeah. This is roughly 150 feet from that intersection, so they have that from here over-

Oh, that's the 150 feet? I thought you said your entrance was 150 feet.

No, I'm sorry.

Okay. I misunderstood that.

It's this piece right here-

The thought I had that I didn't understand why you were asking for two two-way entrances and exits, instead of the east one being in and the west one being out. I was trying to envision what happens with the traffic with that center lane if people are coming opposite directions trying to go into the different ones, instead of there just being one in and one out. I was wondering why you were choosing to ask for two two-way-

We were just trying to make it as easy as possible for people to- [crosstalk 00:38:05].

Yeah. I-

How is that easy?

Given there's going to be a lot of traffic, so... But I think you bring up a really good point. It would be perhaps feasible to make this just one-way. That would be one way out, and I still like the idea of having this being two-way.

If somebody came, it wouldn't be very many people lives down where I grew up, at the end of the street on Union Avenue. There're no houses left now. But if they're coming from that direction, from the west, why would anybody turn in the west exit, the west one-

Here.

... and then thread their way through to get around to the drive-through?

That's a good point.

If they're coming from the east-
Not everybody is visiting the [inaudible 00:39:05].

... the same question, why would they go in the west exit and double back to go? It seemed like-

That's a fair question.

Everybody would use the east entrance in any case. Whoever occupied that front space later would be lucky to have it if they were also a drive-through. I just didn't understand the logic of two two-way-

We were greedy. Sorry.

Well, it's all right.

We're just trying to make it as easy as we can for the people using the bank. Not everybody coming to the Credit Union is using the PTMs. There are plenty of people coming to visit the actual building. But I want to, also, I want to make sure that you understand that I'd have to confer with the Credit Union, but I think they would be acceptable to this being a one-way out only, as an option.

Other questions of the applicant? Sir, did you want to discuss anything else?

Yes.

Go right ahead.

That was Criteria number 1. The second criteria that staff was not satisfied with was Criteria number 3. Let me read that criterion, a portion of it anyway, "The proposal's benefits will be greater than any negative impacts on the development of the adjacent uses." I think that's pretty self-explanatory. Having two driveways, certainly, will alleviate some congestion. These driveways will provide access for this future development, which is a plus. As I mentioned, we already have this cross-access easement, it's recorded as in the deed of this property. As far as this second driveway benefiting this development, I think there are many positive ways it does. In terms of negative impact, I don't see any to this development. Again, this development wanted this access point. Any questions about that? That concludes my comments on the variance.

Questions? Go ahead, sir. Are you going to impart more information to us?

I'm sorry.
Anything else you want to say about the site plan?

Just keep in mind the idea of a continuance. If it looks like you're not in favor of what we just discussed, please keep that in mind. That would buy us time to get a traffic engineer involved who could maybe give us some more information. Other than that...

Anyone else from your camp want to speak to us?

I will.

Name and address, please?

My name's Tony Workman, 1370 Center Drive, Medford, Oregon. I am with Rogue Credit Union. I just wanted to come back on your question a little bit about how we came up with this. Really, when we go into a new development like this, we sit down with the architect and we really look at safety for our members, and flow, and how it's ease comes about. The idea of the second entrance, ingress/egress, was based on that future property and with, what you were saying, with people driving through and weaving through, in and out. We do believe that most of our members coming through on Union will probably use that Eastern drive up. However, once the development is made, we do believe that some traffic that will be going over there, will use that second entrance and exit, otherwise they're going to have to weave through, too. If they're going to try to go to the fuel station or the restaurant or something and they're coming from the east over, if they took that first entrance, they would have to go through the parking lot with our members walking through and all that.

We're looking at it as a safety issue. How can we keep traffic not coming to the branch, alleviating away from that? That's where the second one came in. That's a lot of what we're looking at is, how can we keep a lot of traffic not stopping there from that area? We felt like this entrance would help the future, as well as like Matt was saying, we don't know when that development will happen, but if we can get that put in now and have it there, so that way when it does get done, it's all ready to go, and traffic now will get used to using that. We're looking at it as just a safety and flow. As you can see, if they were to come in the first entrance to the east, they'll go up through the drive-throughs, and then they continue straight down. They don't have to go back through the parking areas at all.

During busy times, payday Fridays, however, if there's only one ingress/egress, there'll be a lot of circling traffic coming in, out, and other. We're trying to keep it just a flow of circle and ease for everybody. I hope that clears up a little bit of what we came up with.

Questions of this gentleman? Thank you very much.
Thank you.

Anyone else in your camp would like to speak to us? Any one of you wanting to speak in favor of this application? Anyone wanting to speak in opposition to this application? Commissioners, are you sure there's no further questions? Staff, back to the hot seat, please.

Yes, sir.

I have some questions, but I'll wait if anybody else wants to go first. Let's try and be clairvoyant here. Let's pretend for a minute that the variance does not get approved tonight. Can the variants be re-requested at a continued hearing, or is it off the table if it gets denied? I'm asking a procedural question here.

Can the variance be re-requested?

Right? Assume that it gets denied tonight, a gentleman mentioned they would like the chance to resubmit for the variance and try again at the continued hearing, if that's the disposition of the Commission. Can they do such a thing.

From a public notice perspective, the obligation of the city is to make sure that all of the public is notified, accurately, of what the hearing's about. The public has been notified that tonight's hearing is about a variance and a site plan. The variance was for two access points. As long as the hearing continues to only be about a variance for two access points, and you move this to a date certain, then the public has been adequately informed. They could show up at the next meeting and there'd be no surprises. If there's a change to what the variance is about, there would have to be a new notice, so that the public is adequately informed about what this hearing's about.

Understood. Thank you for that. Anyone else have questions of staff? Commissioner Nelson?

Yeah. First off-

Sorry. Excuse me.

I had a question on the bike parking and how that square footage determination... On all other projects, how do you determine square footage?

Well, Matt is correct. We do have a provision in Article 25 that does exclude areas like restrooms, elevator shafts, and similar areas within there. The only reason that I did the calculations the way that I did is, essentially, he didn't show the math. He gave me a number and I couldn't see how he determined that number, where he excluded the square footage, and how that penciled out. Just for due diligence’s
sake, I took the entire square footage of the building. I think that if they can show how they arrived at that number, I think that’s a perfectly reasonable ask.

And then that would just be done when they submit whatever site plan. And then I had another question.

Go right ahead.

I’m a little confused here. The question is, if you have, over on the east side, one way and over here, one way, is that allowed under our-

No.

Coffee stands that might have that, or previously, they’ve taken those out, then?

Well, this requirement is really specific to arterials and collectors. I can’t speak for every coffee stand in the city as to what the street designation may be and how they got approved for that. But the restriction of the access is really outlined for arterials and collectors specifically.

Okay. And so, then that... Because I think there’s a coffee stand on Union Avenue down the road there a little ways with two accesses, if I recall correctly. That’s why I was confused when they put this request in, but that might have been previously approved, maybe that’s been changed.

Yeah. It’s hard to know without doing the appropriate research. Perhaps they were granted a variance, as well.

Oh.

What is the restriction?

That you only have one direct access point on an arterial or a collector.

Per parcel.
Yeah, per parcel. Correct.

Thank you.

Commissioner Coulter?
If we were to do a one-way, just to make sure I've got it right, we could recommend that on a site approval tonight, if we approve the variance, correct? Am I correct? If we approve the variance, we go to the site plan, we could do a one-way as a Condition of Approval, correct?

We could. I would recommend, considering the applicant's testimony tonight who asked for a continuance, to give them a chance to play with the site plan and come back-

Well, yeah. But he actually kind of said, "Yeah, that might be feasible." Your thought is we got to have it more in concrete?

Yeah. I think staff's recommendation would be to-

Continue?

... permission actually see what you're approving, the revised site plan.

Gotcha. Okay. Thank you.

Other questions of staff? Mr. Nelson?

My understanding is that the sidewalks elsewhere are five foot?

That is correct.

This would then have a six foot, or is being requested?

That is being requested by Public Works. It is the standard in the code, as of today. As to how that sidewalk configuration is five feet with the five-foot plant strips, I couldn't speak to that. But in talking with Wade Elliott from Public Works, I did ask them if they would be allowed to match the existing configuration, as it would match the rest of the development along Union Avenue. But Wade Elliott did request that they adhere to today's standards, which is that six-and-a-half-foot sidewalk and the seven-foot planter strip.

Other questions of staff?

I guess a follow-up.

Mr. Nelson.
Why was it changed? If the whole Avenue is five, why did we change it to six?

That's a fantastic question.

Yeah. I don't think either Gabby or I would [inaudible 00:52:46] to take some research. The city, obviously, at some point changed the design standards so that the adjacent sidewalk for a collector and arterial became six feet. But we would have to look exactly at the date of construction of Union and the date of construction of that sidewalk and see. We can only assume that five foot was the standard at the time that it was constructed, and standards changed, so-

The sidewalk would be all the way equal all the way down Union, right?

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

But it'd be a foot over here next to the property that would be added?

Correct.

Interesting.

This is a Public Works standard, we just want to say that. I think you would need to include in your decision, if you wanted to agree with the applicant's request, exactly why you would want to change that standard.

We do, as a Commission, have to have analyze this project based on today's standards.

True.

Any other questions of staff? Thank you very much.

Thank you.

You did great. Commissioners, I will entertain a motion so that we can begin to deliberate. Commissioner Nelson?

Well, I'm going to move for the continuance, and then I'd like to discuss with the Commission some of these things that I just brought up and why we would be doing that. If we want to change that now, I think it's best to have that in the discussion so at the continuance, next time they bring it back, they know how we're going to feel about that. These, I guess, would be motions to be put forward on the continuance.
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The first one, I guess, would be, because I think it probably doesn't need even a motion on, is the bike parking, is that correct, because you have the plan now?

I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?

Well, I was going to put in a motion to be forward for the planning to limit the bike parking, not to require the overhead.

Yes, if they could just indicate on the revised site plan how they got to the square footage.

I'm not worried about that.

Fantastic.

And then the other one was, I'm inclined, and I'll make the motion to see how you guys feel about this, to approve this, as to an egress and an entrance. One way going on the east side, one way going west side, because it makes no sense to have this two-way, because you could have confusion going around the wrong way.

Are you making a motion about a variance-

That's up for discussion.

Well, I think he's trying to get a motion on the floor to discuss, but if you continue-

The first one's going to be the continuance.

Well, then we end the meeting.

That's right, so that's why I want a discussion for- [crosstalk 00:56:29], to know what to do on the continuance.

You need to make some kind of motion and the motion would be to approve the variance with that condition. We can always vote it down.

Sure.

That allows discussion to continue.

Okay, I will do that then.
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Go right ahead. You’re going to make a motion regarding the variance request.

I approve the variance with condition that they have only one way going in and one way going out.

I second.

Okay. I'm going to throw a wrench into this. Staff did just tell us that the in and out will require a future variance request, as well. You're aware of that, yeah?

I don't think we can do Condition of Approval on a variance, it's got to be up or down. That would be a recommendation on a site plan if we approve the variance, not the variance with the Condition of Approval, but we're

Right. But we're not doing a variance. I'm talking about the conditions.

No, it's got to be up or down on, on a variance. That's it.

I agree with Commissioner Coulter, we need a motion for the variance to either be approved or denied, and then we can go into discussion.

Right. I'll withdraw.

I make a motion to deny the variance and I'll give reasons why in discussion, lots of them.

We have a motion on the table to deny the variance request. Do we have a second?

I'll second it.

With a second by Commissioner Collier,

No, Nelson.


Okay. During the replication, I didn't hear any discussion from the applicant about the safety of their customers getting back out onto Union Avenue. Ms. Arthur said a little bit about it when there were houses down there, now there's everybody down there. There's the Volvo rebuilder, there's Cartwright's, which I just went by today to take a
look at this whole thing. Anybody's tried to get on Union Avenue, for whether it's Les Schwab, whether it's Toyota, whether it's a complex on Safeway, all up and down Union Avenue, it's a struggle left and right. The proposal from the applicant tonight is four lanes, two going in, two going out, which shows me that they are not recipients of any partial engineering discussion about the traffic flow on Union Avenue. I almost feel sorry for the applicant, engineers from Ashland and Medford, having a look at Union Avenue and put four lanes onto Union Avenue with that in-complex, when you've got all these people driving in and driving out, and then saying, "Oh, by the way, we're doing this for future development on the lot next to it."

As I sat here, I couldn't almost contain myself from shaking my head and saying, "You have no concept of the traffic flow on Union Avenue." Union Avenue is begging for a four-way traffic light up there where the Verizon building is. This is right in between it, and they say, "Yeah, let's go four lanes. And then we didn't even think about why we need four lanes, we really only need two lanes." You talk about Redwood Avenue, access to Redwood Avenue. We all know that's a nonstarter, it never was. The applicant said, "People want to zip in and zip out." Well, guess what? Nobody's going anywhere. They're not going to zip into those ATMs and then come right back out. They're going to be clogged up, backed up all the way around. I've never seen anything so smashed into a sandwich that just shows... Even with a new traffic engineering study, it ain't going to get any better. This will not get any better. Whether you go from one in, one out, people don't pay attention to that. You can't stop traffic left to right going in that.

If you sit out in front of the Laughing Clam, it clearly says, "You cannot turn left onto G Street," yet everybody does. As I sat through this, and I made all these notes, I haven't even covered them all, but this isn't even close to all the reasons why staff indicated why this should be a no. Then the traffic engineer, then Public Works says no. Then you got future development in the front, which even compounds it even further, and this guys in the back. I didn't even drink coffee before I came here tonight, but this is nuts. That's why I'm saying no.

Mark, a big criterion, if I hear you talking, is Criteria Number 3 is uh-uh (negative), it doesn't meet it whatsoever, correct? Just wanted to clarify that.

On every facet that [inaudible 01:01:07] has said no, they've made their case. Staff has made their case, Public Works made their case, traffic flow has made their case. An engineering study on traffic won't make the case. This ain't going to get any better. Nobody coming back from spring break is going to make the traffic flow on Union Avenue less, to make this look any better. Sorry.

Commissioner Arthur?

I'd like to speak to one very positive aspect of this, my first thought... By the way, Replinger has a strange error, I would say, in the report where he says they're going to have future building on the north end. I got stuck on that and tried to look at arrows for direction and all, and said, "What? It looks to me like your buildings at the north
end. "My first thought was, "Why are they building in the back instead of the front?" Anybody who's ever gone over to WinCo and tried to get into anybody's drive-through, we made a real mistake on that one. No queuing distance, absolutely, totally insufficient queuing. That is what this does accomplish, by putting the drive-throughs all the way to the back, you at least stand a chance of not having traffic backing up out on Union Avenue. The basic use of the property for that purpose is really pretty good, and to have that kind of length is wonderful. We don't want to make that mistake again. I think it's salvageable.

But again, I came back to my original things, I don't see why you need in and out on both. If you were sharing long range with that property to the west, they have a way to get in, where that red thing is, whatever that is, and they could use the same out-point. They don't have to have another endpoint, necessarily. Well, he said that the 150 foot was where that red square is. Yeah. Anyway, I think it's workable. My reason for preferring the two, one in, one out, is exactly what Mark was talking about. I run into it all the time coming from the hospital to get out onto Williams Highway, and you have to turn into center lane. If you ever want to get out, you have to turn into the center lane and wait until the southbound traffic or the northbound traffic comes by you. But at least you have a chance to do it. If you had people turning in and out both directions in that little section in front of there, they could easily be running into each other in the middle lane.

Kind of grim, but I need to tell you, the first funeral I went to in my life was for an eight-year-old boy who lived across the street from there and got killed on his bicycle on Union Avenue. There were no sidewalks or anything in those days, but it's always been a busy road.

Mr. Coulter?

I think Mark presented the case, I agree with him, very well, as far as the variance is concerned. I don't think in good conscience at this particular point... One of the things that's kind of an unwritten rule, always, is we're looking at safety. Safety, safety. This is one of those that the collector street, in this particular case, is almost a collector street on steroids. It's huge. It's big and not only... Well, make it simple. In this particular case, I do not see that the variance meets criteria. I think just by that, we voted down, my recommendation.

Anyone else have anything they would like to say?

I do. I do appreciate that safety and hazard issues that they were trying to address within the confines of the building, the customers, your clientele. I appreciate that, but I don't think it came forward to the arterials and the collector street, which is, in and of itself, a hazard on its best day already. I do like what Commissioner Arthur was saying about, perhaps, another way of addressing that in one way, ingress/egress. Future plans, that's going to be a daunting task, but we're not speaking to that at present.
Anyone else? Commissioner Nelson?

Well, I'm not sure what the traffic flow would be, but the reason I was concerned is, as you have these, 1, 2, 3, various cars that are going to be coming here. One possibility, you have two released at the same time coming down here. If this isn't here, then they'd either have to come across this way, with all the people trying to get into the bank, I'm assuming this is the front door here, and cars pulling out here and using machines in this location. I was trying to visualize how this is making it safer by only allowing one, whereas if this was a flow out, then at least it flows out and would be a greater safety to the people and parking in this area. That was my big concern is you're... If this is what they describe as a right of way or an easement, and you have traffic now coming here and going across, we've increased that load into that banking parking lot even more. I guess if we vote for the denial of variance, they'll have to come up with something, but I don't know what they're going to do.

No, I know. Hang on. Anyone else have anything to say? Great, that means it's my turn. Can I borrow your pointer, please?

Oh, certainly. [crosstalk 01:08:38].

Okay, there it is. Okay. Before I get to the pointer, I want to tell you a couple things I'm uncomfortable with. In my mind, a variance is used when there's a topographical challenge. We're not seeing that here. A variance is used when neighboring property owners are enjoying something that you're allowed to. We're not seeing that as a case here, except maybe for this building next door. If that was approved yesterday, there's a problem. If it was approved 10 years ago under different standards, probably not an issue. When I first saw the site plan and I noticed they were proposing a shared access easement agreement to the west, I thought, "What a great idea. I love shared access." Here's what makes me nervous about that, at this point. Where I was once in favor of it, now I'm not so sure. I think it's really dangerous for us to look at approving this parcel based on a site plan that is just a concept in somebody's mind. I don't think that we should be doing that.

I thought, "Well, this is great. These two parcels can share an access," but after hearing all the testimony tonight, I also believe two two-way entrances are a mess. In my mind, before I came here, great minds think alike, I'm thinking, "Well, why don't we do it one way in and one way out?" I, too, was going to ask the question, "Can they do that?" And staff says, "No, not without a variance request." I am leaning, then, at this point to denying the variance, based on what we're looking at tonight with two two-way entrances. Would I be more inclined to approve a variance that has a one way in and a one way out? I'm not sure about that right now, either. I'm seeing a wrench with this. Let's assume this is one way, and this is one way out, people come in this way, and they discover there's no parking here, so they go around this way, which way... Do you think they're going to back up and turn around and come back around this way?
No, they're going to drive right into the cut lane, go up here to look for more parking up here. I see that as a potential problem. Is it a for certain problem? Don't know. Having said all that, applicant, I feel bad for you. This is kind of a nightmare. We want to make traffic circulation here as safe as possible, but I see us just pouring more water into a bucket that is this far from overflowing, no matter what you do. Whatever decision that we make on these accesses, I think that we have to be careful. Staff, question. Does the code recommend any access spacing standards? Is there a minimum distance between access points along an arterial on a collector?

Yes, there is. Shooting off the cuff, I think it might be 100 feet, but if you want to hang tight, I can look in the code and confirm.

I'm going to bet that if you find such things, they're probably going to be based upon the speed limit of the road and the ADT. But I appreciate you taking a look at that. I think that was all I wanted to say. Somebody have a question?

What is the width of the property? It is on here somewhere? [crosstalk 01:12:18].

There's probably a little, teeny, tiny number right here.

I know. I can't see it. Can I say something?

Yes, ma'am. Go right ahead.

Okay. I do want to disagree with Commissioner Collier on one point, and that is, I think people can follow instructions for in and out. The example would be next door at the car wash, nobody tries to go in the back end of the car wash. They can follow the signs telling you where to go to get where you need to be.

Commissioner Collier?

Okay, I get that. Nobody goes in the wrong way at a car wash. This is completely different, because the question here is, "Am I going left or right out of there, and someone's coming in." That's the problem. With a four, with two in and two out on both sides, it's just going to be a mess. People are going to come from all directions. I'm also with Commissioner Heesacker that I don't think this gets any better with the traffic flow. This whole thing, this whole premise on this whole project is, as they said, zip in and zip out. I just see so many cars coming in here that from my 10,000-foot view, I go, "There's no way you can pack all that stuff in there, and with four lanes or two lanes, make it any better." I'm just ready to vote for the motion on the variance and then go from there.

Anyone else, because I have one more thing to say? Did you find your answer to the access spacing?
Well, we do have a separation between driveways, and for commercial properties, that would be 22 feet. That 100-foot distance for collectors refers to the minimum distance from the intersection. [crosstalk 01:14:07]. No, that's for arterials.

Okay.

To answer Commissioner Arthur's question, the property is 208.69 feet.

Okay, the last thing I wanted to say. 99% of the time, I agree with you; people driving don't follow signs. Thank you very much for your pointer. People don't follow signage and they do whatever they want. I can think of one exception to that rule, that I witnessed right here in town. When you said the words, "In-N-Out," that's where it was. Those guys, that was a thing of beauty when they opened. That it could have been a potential mess up there, on Morgan, at the freeway entrance, for crying in a bucket. Those people followed directions, those first million customers on their first opening night.

We had already experienced the WinCo at that point and trying to get long enough queue distance there was a huge challenge. They managed to do it and make it work, so-

You saw what they did at In-N-Out, they had cones that said... They took them all the way down to... What's that street?

Morgan's the one right next to it.

No, it's further down, that's got the Dutch Brothers on it, from AllCare. [crosstalk 01:15:31]. Hillcrest. They took them all the way down to Hillcrest, brought them all the way back up and around, and then brought them in on the two entryways, so that was huge. But they have the traffic. I think this is maybe not on the level of In-N-Out, but this is meant to take people into those, like he said, zip in and zip out. That's a lot of traffic for Union and I just... That's why, anyway, same thing.

Understood. But as we've all agreed, it's going to be a traffic mess no matter what. I don't think I have anything else to say. We have a motion on the floor to deny the variance, it's been seconded. If there's no more discussion, I'm going to go to a roll call vote.

Can we have one more item of discussion, and that is what's the difference between voting to deny it now or just what voting not to deny it and continue? What are the choices for them?
I'll tell you my thought on that. What we're getting ready to deny is two two-way access points, because that's what's proposed. Anybody disagree with that? Are we ready for a vote? Mr. Coulter?

Aye. Yes.

Yes, to deny?

Yes, to deny.

Commissioner Arthur?

Yes.

Mr. Nelson?

Yes.

Mr. Collier?

Yes, to deny.

Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Yes.

And I'm voting yes, Heesacker votes yes. We're going to deny the request for variance.

MOTION/VOTE
Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to deny the variance. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss, Coulter and Arthur. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioners Aviles and Scherf.

The motion passed.

Procedurally, we are at a point now where we are ready to discuss the continuance. Commissioner Nelson?

I would move for the continuance to a date certain-
April 13th.

13th, was it? Yeah.

Second.

Commissioner Nelson has moved that we continue this hearing until April 13th, Commissioner Coulter seconded. All those in favor, say aye.

Aye.

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Anybody abstaining? Technical question, there's a picture of somebody up there. Is that Commissioner Scherf?

No, that's just the minimized Team's feature.

Okay.

Yeah.

Thank you very much. We're continuing this till April 13th.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved, and Commissioner Coulter seconded the motion to continue this hearing until April 13th. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Nelson, Tokarz-Krauss, Coulter and Arthur. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioners Aviles and Scherf. The motion passed.

I forgot to ask, what's the agenda like? Do we have 10 public hearings on that agenda already?

You do not.

Okay, good. So, we're comfortable with this?

Yep. This would be the first item on that agenda.

Understood. Applicant, thank you very much for your time. We appreciate it. I encourage you to work with staff about your bike parking square footage. I encourage you, if you want to talk to ODOT about a planter strip, I hope you know
who to get ahold of at ODOT. Your easement question, timing of easement, it sounds like you need to take that up with either the Planning Department or the Building Department. I encourage you to do that during these next two weeks. One last question, KSW, is that Kistler, Small, somebody? Who's the somebody?

White.

White. Okay. Please say hi to Ray for me. He'll know who I am. Thank you very much for attending, and your presentation, and all your time. Appreciate that.

8. Matters from Commission Members and Staff:

Next item on the agenda, matters from commission members and staff. Staff, we'll start with you.

I don't think we have anything else for you tonight.


Welcome back.

Thank you very much. I'm going to say something about that in a minute. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

I want to say good job, very professional [inaudible 01:19:25].

Thank you.

I will second that. That was a good job.

Thank you. Motion approved.

Impressed. That was great. We'll make you sweat next time. In addressing Commissioner Collier's statement to me, the rumors are true, I did have a stroke about a month ago. It was really a miracle that I wasn't hurt any worse than I was. When the doctors took the CT and they saw the pool of blood on my brain, they didn't think I should be walking, talking, or doing much of anything. Like I said, I was very lucky. I did fall twice in the very first 30 seconds of the stroke, and then after that out, I knew something was weird, so I watched my legs as I walked. I really focused and made sure I told my leg to do what I was supposed to do. I went to the doctor and she had me do the FAST test, you guys are familiar. Told me to smile and hold up your arms, and I whipped through all that, because I'm telling myself, "I didn't have a stroke." By this time, there was not CT scan.
She had me do this one thing, "Stand up, close your eyes, put your arms out straight, and put your palms down." Okay, easy. No problem. She said, "Now turn your palms up." I did this, and this hand dropped halfway to my knee. She said, "Open your eyes," and I had no clue that this had happened. She said, "Yeah, you had a stroke. We're going to get you a CAT scan." And that's when they took the picture, they sent me down to Three Rivers, I sat there for hours. Then they came and said, "You know what? This is too..." Disastrous is not what they said, but "We can't handle this. You have to go to Medford. We're going to put you in an ambulance." I said, "Oh no, you're not. My insurance won't pay for that. I can drive myself." And they said, "Oh no, you're not." So, my girlfriend drove me over to Medford, I was in that emergency room for another couple hours. They threw me in ICU. Their neurologist looked at the CAT scan.

They came and talked to me a couple hours later, and they said, "Well, you have every right to be here in ICU, and we don't know why you're functioning the way you are, but we need this bed for someone who really needs it. We're sending you upstairs." I was in the hospital a total of not quite three days, they sent me home. The good news is a month later, the one month is a big milestone for strokes. I didn't have any more. I didn't get any worse. That's what everybody was hoping for. There was no surgery, no need for that. What happens to the pool of blood? I learned it goes away kind of like a scab on your skin, your body reabsorbs it. It takes a while. My worst symptom is that my left side is numb and there's some really funky differences. I can feel heat with the right side of my mouth, but not on the left side. The big victories that have come over the past few weeks, I get itches now on my left side. Yeah.

The other day, I bumped my elbow and said, "Man, it hurt." I'm going, "Ouch," and it's my numb elbow, so I'm starting to get some feeling back. I feel good. Like I said, there's been no pain associated with this, nothing debilitating, walking, talking. You'll see I'm riding my bike, it's been recommended I do that three times a week for now, and slowly build back up to where I was. But thank you very much, I appreciate that. I'm glad I'm here, too. I like rubbing elbows with you smart people. I love heckling the newbies, too, but you got off easy tonight because of my stroke.

Yeah. You [inaudible 01:22:37].

9. Adjourn
   Meetings adjourned.

Eric Heesacker, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commissioner
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