

MINUTES – 8.20.2019

BONNER SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Community Center, Honeybee Room – 200 E 3rd Street – Bonner Springs, KS 66012
Tuesday, August 20, 2019 -- Regular Meeting -- 7:00 p.m.

=====

JOINT STUDY SESSION REVIEW

PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

Community Center, Honeybee Room – 200 E 3rd Street – Bonner Springs, KS 66012
Tuesday, August 20, 2019 -- 6:30 p.m. – Open to the Public

Rachel Clyne, City Planner, began the joint study session around 6:35pm and noted all members of the Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals were present. Attendees included Jason Krone, Tyler McMahan, Lloyd Mesmer, Merle Parks, Sherri Neff, David Pierce, and Craig Stephan.

Clyne announced the following Planning Commissioners terms were expiring at the end of August 2019: **McMahan, Pierce, and Stephan**. The term for one member of the Board of Zoning Appeals was expiring at the end of August 2019: Stephan.

Clyne thanked all members for serving the Bonner Springs community and suggested discussions began. Commissioners McMahan, Pierce, and Stephan all advised they would not seek reappointment for their position(s) with the Planning Commission and/or Board of Zoning Appeals.

All members present provided suggestions of potentially interested individuals, as well as suggestions for notifying the public that Planning Commission board members were needed. The meeting adjourned at 6:50pm.

=====

1. Meeting **CALLED TO ORDER** by Chair Merle Parks at 7:02 p.m. who then requested roll call.

2. **ROLL CALL**

Rachel Clyne, City Planner called roll.

Planning Commissioners Present: Jason Krone; Tyler McMahan; Lloyd Mesmer; Sherri Neff; Merle Parks (Chair); Dave Pierce; Craig Stephan

Absent: --

Quorum Established

3. **CONSENT**

Item #1 -- Approval of the June 18, 2019 BSPC Minutes

Chair Parks introduced Item #1. Commissioners were awarded time to comment or ask questions. Parks indicated a scrivener's error to staff. Clyne stated the minutes would be updated to reflect the correct name.

Motion to **APPROVE with amendment** made by Mesmer, seconded by Pierce, Chair Parks called for a vote.

AYE – Krone, McMahan, Mesmer, Neff, Parks, Pierce, Stephan

NAY – None

MOTION PASSED 7 – 0

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

5. **Item # 2 – Election of Officers**

Chair Parks introduced Item #2. Following a brief discussion of a replacement for Pierce, the outgoing PC Vice-Chair position, led to the suggestion that Messmer would be a good replacement. Mesmer agreed to serve in the Vice-Chair role.

Motion to **NOMINATE Mesmer** as the **Vice-Chair** of the **Planning Commission** was made by Stephan and Seconded by Neff.

Parks asked for those in favor to state 'aye'.

AYE – Krone, McMahan, Mesmer, Neff, Parks, Pierce, Stephan

NAY –

MOTION PASSED 7 – 0

Motion to **APPROVE** the continuation of **Parks as Chair and Clyne as Secretary** of the **Planning Commission** was made by Stephan and seconded by Messmer.

Parks asked for those in favor to state 'aye'.

AYE – Krone, McMahan, Mesmer, Neff, Parks, Pierce, Stephan

NAY –

MOTION PASSED 7 – 0

Item #3 – ST-19-101– Site & Landscape Plan – Guest House – The Farms at Woodend Springs

Chair Parks introduced Item #3 and asked staff for a report.

Planner Clyne described the site and landscape application as the continuation of The Farms at Woodend Springs project with the construction of an accessory guest house and its accompanying garage. Clyne stated The Farms at Woodend Springs received a Special Use Permit (SUP-139) approval in November 2017.

The original SUP had anticipated the future construction of the guest house in its drainage and landscape calculations. The site work to comply with those requirements was done when the wedding venue/exhibition hall was being constructed. The accessory guest house is for staff use only. It will not be available for rent to the bridal party for pre-wedding preparation or for overnight stays for non-staff.

Clyne recommended approval of the Site/Landscape Plan for 14100 Woodend Road (ST-19-103) with the understanding of the following Site Plan Conditions:

- Changes or deviations from the approved Site Plan shall require resubmittal to the City Planner for review and approval. If the changes are substantial, resubmittal to the Planning Commission for approval shall be required;
- An approved Site/Landscape Plan shall be valid (remain) if a Building Permit is issued within one (1) year from the date of approval by the Planning Commission;
- Prior to construction, all occupational licenses, permit applications, and an Earth Change Permit application must be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Applicants Megan Tillman and James Tillman were present and available for questions.

Parks asked for public comments.

Ms. Brenner -- 139310 Woodend Road, Bonner Springs -- Voiced concerns about promises made but not kept by the owners; traffic; noise; unsupervised events; beer cans littered along Woodend Road. Requested the site and landscape plan permit not be granted until the applicants adhered to the verbal promises made to the City.

Ms. Taylor -- 13750 Woodend Road, Bonner Springs -- Voiced concerns about increase in traffic since the venue opened, specifically the safety issues from traffic traveling too fast. Voiced concern about beer and soda cans litter and about lit cigarettes and the potential for fire. There is not a water line on her property.

Ms. Kreider -- 13933 Woodend Road, Bonner Springs -- Voiced concerns about the volume of music; the limitations of the Specific Use Permit (SUP), which only noted hours; volume of traffic; people traveling on Wooden Road instead of turning west to 142nd Street. Stated her unhappiness.

Commissioner Krone requested follow-up questions.

Parks stated a motion was necessary before discussions and questions began. Commissioner Pierce asked if the applicants wanted to speak.

Parks asked the applicant to speak to the issues raised in public discussion.

Applicant Megan Tillman (MT) stated that the application for which they were applying would not address the concerns of the public. Stated applying for a guest house for staff use only; not for rental and not for use by the wedding party. Stated happy discuss other issues at a different time.

Parks stated that it was not technically a public hearing but he would allow the public to speak.

Peirce made a Motion to approve.

Commissioner McMahan seconded the motion.

Parks asked the Planning Commissioners for questions or comments.

Parks asked the applicant about the use of the house and whether it would have full-time or part-time occupancy.

MT replied the guesthouse was a place for owners to stay after an event to avoid 45 mile drive home at 1:00AM. Stated guesthouse was for staff only, not for rent and not for guests.

Parks asked the applicant to address the comments about no owners on site during events. MT stated every single wedding was staffed; venue was never left unattended.

Comments from the audience were audible but unclear.

Parks stated it was the Planning Commission's opportunity to ask questions and discuss.

Pierce asked the number of events.

MT replied approximately (40) and the venue was booked through November.

Pierce asked about days operation -- weekdays or weekends.

MT answered occasionally weekdays but mostly weekends.
Pierced inquired how the resonation of sound could be reduced.
MT replied the music was played only during the established timeframe.

Pierce stated recollections of past discussions about sound barriers, putting up trees, something to stop the noise from traveling. Also commented that local business, Kobi's, had noise limitations set years ago.

Clyne stated the City Council had previously addressed these questions of the of the public comments.

Parks asked about the presence of an attendant at the gate directing people to travel west.
MT replied the venue had security last year but security was no longer required. Advised a right turn only sign was displayed at the gate.

Parks asked why security was no longer required.
Brenner stated the SUP did not include security
Parks, Brenner, Commissioner Stephan discussed the previous dialogue about traffic and having a guard on site.

Commissioner Stephan recalled promises from the business (applicants) that "everything that could be would be done". Stated his uncertainty about business's current activities. Commented it was not the time to discuss but hearing these complaints didn't sit well with him.

Krone asked questions of Brenner who responded.

Parks stated he had recollections of conversations on these topics and concerns.

Stephan asked how the issues were not included the SUP.

Clyne advised that upon direction from City Council, she had reviewed minutes when the SUP was reviewed but nothing definite was in the discussions recorded in the minutes. Advised a motion to approve with conditions was passed with no comments in the minutes. Opined limited conditions were placed on SUP and could recall 11:00 or 11:30 p.m. as a specific condition.

Parks stated long detailed discussions had occurred and promises made about a guard near the street (Woodland Road) to direct traffic to 142nd Street.

Parks and Krone discuss previous conversations about Google maps.

Commissioner McMahan asked if the owner could direct traffic.
MT answered yes but it was difficult due to limited staff and because people are leaving at different times. Stated cones (traffic) could be placed in the parking lot.

McMahon suggested the DJ could announce the right hand turn requirement.
MT agreed.

Krone verbally empathized with the neighbors but questioned the Planning Commissions role in dealing with issues.

Parks stated the application before them required a vote of yay or nay but that vote didn't directly involve the raised concerns.

Pierce commented that everyone was trying to help.

McMahan suggested neighbors could reach an agreement together.

Krone voiced concern that City Council was not receiving messages from the Planning Commission at City Council meetings. Opined the Planning Commission did not have jurisdiction or authority.

Parks commented that the Planning Commission had some "bully pulpit". Stated representations made in the past that were used in determining approval but current application doesn't directly deal with the issues.

Parks suggested the Planning Commission pause; hold off on the application and address some issues--including addressing the neighbors' concerns, which are issues thought to be resolved originally.

Krone stated "We" has to include the City Council, not just this board.

Parks asked if these issues were not in the application and not included in the SUP that perhaps the City Council was positioned to take steps.

Commissioner Neff questioned the possibility of tying concerns to the site & landscape, "this" permit.

Stephen opined no.

Parks stated there must be a vote on the site & landscape plan but not tonight at this meeting.

Pierce and Brenner discussed a beer can presentation at previous City Council meeting.

Parks asked about buses specifically, who contracted with them.

MT stated the busses did not contract with the business. Stated when provided with the bus company name, contact was made to be proactive by providing route to travel.

Applicant James Tillman (JT) stated booking events for people from other cities and states made traffic coordination more difficult than if all attendees were from Bonner Springs. Stated the first twenty or so weddings had security on staff. Business was advised by the City that security was no longer required, which explained reason for no security in the small staff. Advised company abides the contract for 11:30 p.m. that the music complaint was a result of guests moving in and out of the doors all night; that activity allows the music to spill out. Stated that staff is there every night.

MT stated the staff continuously shuts doors and windows as they're opened.

Krone voiced that these were concerns from the beginning. Opined the feeling that applicant said what was necessary to "convince" the Planning Commission. Commented enough time had passed to address these things and then expressed uncertainty of the appropriateness of his comments.

Neff opined the noise came from the facility; the facility was owned by the company and they could set and enforce a volume limit.

JT stated the nature of the wedding includes people continuously moving in and out of the venue. Advised the company adheres to the contract and that DJs or bands were not allowed to perform outside.

Parks recalled c, earlier in the meeting, comment about the use of PA system. MT replied the outdoor space was sometimes utilized for brief outdoor wedding ceremonies. Explained speakers and the mic were allowed but no music. Parks consulted with Brenner who confirmed no music on PA.

Pierce asked if someone from the City could be at the venue. Clyne stated that some of the City Council members, both on and off duty police officers, and staff members had been to the venue in the evenings. Opined the consensus was the noise levels had not been enough to prompt the City Council to take further action.

Pierced stated the desire to fix the traffic concerns.

McMahan opined that weddings are fun and that neighbors could communicate. Brenner stated mother cannot sleep and opined if the owners stepped outside, the noise would be heard. MT stated that noise is heard when stepping outside. Stated staff drives up to the houses at 11:00 and can't hear the music.

Clyne interjected to request clarification of a statement for the minutes. Different stories were coming from the applicants and from Brenner. Advised writing down applicant's comment about driving up the street at 11:00 to see if we can hear music. Clyne confirmed language for minutes.

Clyne asked the applicant to continue speaking. MT stated multiple times at night, staff drives up to the houses. Stated desire to not impose on the neighbors but trying to run a business. Advised staff has traveled up Woodend Road, turned off vehicle engines, and could not hear anything. Opined that staff does what it can to keep the noise contained inside the building.

Parks asked about upcoming events, website postings, and availability calendar. MT advised there were upcoming events but events and availability calendar were not on the website.

McMahan asserted the traffic concerns were great due to the narrow road (Woodend) and people from out of town in an unknown area. Stated the guest house would allow staff to stay on site. Opined staff is available to direct traffic since they are staying on-site. MT stated inability to guarantee staff availability throughout the evening. Advised staff could be sent (to gate) at end of the event when majority of people are leaving.

McMahon asserted the need for staff at the gate - especially with heavy traffic flow. Encouraged applicant to agree. Mentioned safety of guests and neighbors. Acknowledged arriving at the venue as different than when leaving. MT agreed heavy traffic flow needing someone to direct Suggested placement of traffic cones in place prior to end of event.

JT stated happy to meet later and have another meeting to discuss further how to better mediate traffic since Woodend is a public road. Stated would seek City approval on cone placement. Expressed small staff made it difficult to direct traffic every evening.

Parks stated that Clyne indicated the City Council had investigated the noise issue. Clyne confirmed.

Clyne stated the City Council meetings in which these issues were raised, concern was always shown. Stated the problem was with the SUP. It was written, discussed, recommended, and approved but it didn't contain limitations. Advised that Brenner had requested revoking the SUP but the City Attorney reviewed the file and stated no conditions (of the SUP) had been violated. Commented the only condition was the time restriction. Nothing about traffic or security was mentioned.

Stephan stated he recalled discussions with the applicants. Stated an agreement was never put in black and white.

Clyne commented on the truth of the simple explanation.

McMahan asked about the possibly rewriting permits (SUPs).

Clyne and Stephan both replied no.

Parks and Stephen discussed 5-year expiration of SUPs.

McMahan asked about adding a traffic requirement after 5 years.

Stephan stated some things could be added.

Clyne advised there was no time limit on the SUP.

Stephen stated time limitations were by ordinance. Stated he recalled previous applications with time limitations imposed.

Parks stated he didn't know how the City could yank away an SUP when there had been thousands of dollars invested. Agreed that the 5-year limitation existed.

Pierce stated that the Planning Commission was looking for good faith efforts.

McMahan stated that the applicant had agreed their staff would direct traffic when there was heavy flow.

MT clarified that the time when staff could go out was 15 minutes before the event ended.

McMahon suggested announcing it (exiting to the west).

MT stated that every Sunday or Monday the ditches were checked for the previously mentioned beer cans and staff picks up litter. Commented many beer cans are a brand not served at the event. Stated that the desire for clean ditches and the intent to continue with litter pickup.

McMahon asked if the applicant could communicate with the wedding party about travel directions.

MT advised wedding parties are provided with the information but not sure what was expressed to the guests by the wedding parties.

McMahon suggested placement of a sign, maybe near the door with directions for exiting. Expressed concern about the narrow road (Woodend Road).

Neff stated that at a previous meeting, the applicant had said a security guard would be present but now the applicant stated there is no security guard. Stated the City may not require you need it. Opined a security guard was something a business supplied.

MT clarified that when the City required a security guard, they had one and on January One (2019) the City advised a security guard was no longer required.

Neff stated she didn't recall the application stating the City required the security guard and had assumed that the company was providing security.

MT stated because the City required security, they (the applicants) had stated security would be there.

Stephan asked the reason for the City removing security. Commented security was a requirement when renting City facilities.

Clyne stated awareness of a change effect January 1st 2019 but unable to recall the reason.

McMahan asked the applicant if they would agree to a security guard at every event.

MT replied they would comply if city required it.

McMahan asked an open ended question, "If they didn't...?"

MT replied that weddings booked since January 1 had not been provided security information. Commented that if the City passed something the company would comply.

McMahon asked about providing security just to be neighborly. The asked the applicant, if they were willing to do that (provide security) from here on out.

Clyne asked if anyone present would be willing to stand for 5 hours and direct traffic. Commented it was a business.

McMahan stated he was talking about a security guard.

Clyne questioned McMahan, amended mistaken notes, and asked for confirmation. McMahan confirmed correction.

MT stated the inability to say yes or no (to McMahon's question) as there were other people that factor into such a decision.

JT expressed willingness to have further discussion on traffic and security at a follow-up meeting.

Pierce, Brenner, and McMahon discussed the cost of security guards.

Parks stated that safety issues could be discussed but not economics.

McMahan asked Clyne to have City Council check into security guard requirements.

Clyne advised of her awareness of the change but not the reason.

Stephan stated that such an issue was handled by the City Council. Opined that board members must act as citizens and ask the City Council about the change.

Parks asked Clyne to confirm she was writing down questions to take to the City Council. McMahon requested the same confirmation.

Clyne advised the information relayed to the City Council is through staff recommendations that are sent through the city's website. Advised attachments, such as a staff report, were provided to the City Council, which are similar to those attached to the Planning Commission agenda.

Parks opined that small communities should be able to talk.

Clyne advised it was not known how many City Council members read the agendas just as it is unknown if Planning Commission members read their agendas.

Parks stated the City Manager should be advised the Planning Commission has concerns. Clyne explained these concerns had been expressed the City Council. Advised when she is directed to do something by the City Council, it is done but cannot speak to activities or discussion taking place during meetings that she did not attend.

Krone expressed concern because the Planning Commission must work with City Council. Commented about concerns and questions - feedback needs to be delivered to them (City Council). Opined he thought the Planning Commissioners had more clout. McMahon and Parks agreed.

Clyne advised that the relevant Planning Commission minutes were provided to City Council as an attachment with the staff report.

Krone stated he found Clyne's statement incredibly disconcerting.

Clyne attempted to provide suggestions for better communication. Stated that recommendations with conditions were a way to communicate with City Council. Stated when Planning Commission sends recommendation for an approval, the City Council takes that recommendation into consideration.

McMahan confirmed that certain conditions could be added.

Clyne clarified the Planning Commission has to place the conditions on the recommendation. City Council can approve the recommended conditions, add their own conditions, or not approve the recommended conditions.

McMahan asked if conditions could be placed on approval for the guest house.

Clyne explained the guest house could not have conditions placed on it because SUP had passed and the guest house was contained on the SUP application. Suggested a condition that could be placed on the application before them. For example -- not being rented could be added as condition for approval. Advised the Site and Landscape Plan doesn't go before the City Council, the deciding review was by the Planning Commission.

Krone asked when the application would go to the City Council.

Parks, Stephan, and Clyne all stated it would not go before the City Council.

Krone sought further input.

McMahan stated the Planning Commission was the final review (on Site & Landscape Plans).

Krone asked for clarification on the process of where issues, like those discussed at this meeting, go, if anywhere.

Parks stated it's approved, approved with conditions, or denied. That's the end of it.

Stephen and Parks clarified they were speaking about the application before them.

McMahan and MT had discussions. Clyne interrupted their conversation to state their discussions would not be in the minutes because there were implied promises and agreements, and she did not feel that they could or should be captured by meeting minutes.

Mesmer stated that he wanted to call issue. Stated calling for a vote is required. Reviewed the application before the Planning Commissioners and reminded everyone that there had been a motion and a second. Stated the law requires a vote because issue was called.

Parks stated the only thing that would supersede would be a motion to table.

Messmer agreed.

Parks opined the reason to table would allow time to seek answers, determine what was happening with City Council, and try to see if performance issues promised tonight were shown in the next two months.

Parks stated Mesmer had called a question on the motion on the floor and asked if there were any other motions.

Mesmer moved to table the application for a maximum 30 days. Commented that was enough time for the issues to be resolved, so the application could be passed and the applicants could have what they want.

Parks stated that something specific, in writing, was needed, as opposed to promises, to address these issues.

Mesmer stated the Planning Commission does not control such actions.

Parks stated there was a motion to table until next meeting in September and asked for a second.

Neff seconded the motion.

Parks asked if there was any further discussion. Stated no and thank you.

Clyne stated a need for understanding of the current conversation. Expressed concern about the current application having nothing to do with its SUP because that SUP was approved. Advised the application before them tonight was necessary for a building permit. Explained the guest house and its garage were on the approved SUP. Stated the landscaping, grading, and parking were all done with the intent of completing the project with a Site & Landscape application at a later time, so the application's technical contents have been approved.

Clyne stated that her professional opinion was not to place the application on hold because an SUP went sour. Expressed concern on the legality of holding the application. Explained she voiced her opinions because discussions had been opened to all present.

Parks stated a vote will occur whether it's this month or next month and whether the vote is for approval whether that vote is legal or not based on the consideration the PC. Stated questions have been raised but not making any final judgments if it's heard at the next meeting.

Clyne stated that was the motion on the floor.

Parks stated it's been moved and seconded. Asked the minutes reflect Clyne's position. Clyne assured the Planning Commission the minutes would reflect her position.

Taylor requested an opportunity to speak.

Parks stated no and thanked her for her input. Stated there had been enough discussion for the moment.

Parks stated there was a motion to table the application until September meeting and requested a roll call.

Mesmer stated the motion he made was to table the vote for 30 days. Stated that the vote was going to have to be taken when the Planning Commission meets again.

Parks stated, "The application..."

Messmer stated, "That it has to be understood."

Parks stated, "The application..."

Mesmer replied, "You can't kill the original motion."

Parks stated, "The motion is still there" – we are just moving it to the next meeting.

Clyne requested confirmation of the original motion and the current motion on the table.

Parks confirmed a vote on the original motion will occur after further discussion and hopefully with additional information.

Clyne requested direction on what additional information was wanted and Parks agreed.

McMahan asked if the delay of the application decision was to find out about the SUP and the security guard.

Parks stated some checking was necessary. Commented that hopefully the applicant and neighbors could work together and determine a logical approach to address the issues.

JT asked for and received permission to question the Commission.

JT requested clarification on the topics discussed during the meeting that were not on the docket. Stated if application was moved to the next meeting, he sought to be 100% clear about what is required of the company. Voiced concern that verbal communications during the meeting. If discrepancy was noted by neighbors over the next four weeks it would reflect poorly on the company's verbal agreements. Requested more direction and clarification before leaving tonight – specifically if there's a requirement that something be in writing for the next meeting.

Parks stated his uncertainty about doing as the applicant requested. Commented about hopefulness that both parties would give consideration to concerns and the ability to address those concerns. The SUP permit approved by the Planning Commission and City Council had some changes in understood conditions. Stated he remained unsure of reasoning behind the removal of security guard requirement.

Clyne stated that security was not part of the SUP.

Parks stated further clarification was needed because the applicants thought it was a Council requirement.

MT interjected that the company thought it was the City's requirement as opposed to a City Council requirement.

Parks stated further clarification was needed. At the next meeting it would need to be determined if the applicant and the neighbors had addressed the issues. Commented indications for actions by the applicants have been verbal and that if the applicants' actions were in writing, the Planning Commissioners would have more assurance of what actions may be taken.

Clyne requested clarification for the record, and asked if the Planning Commission's approval hinge on whether or not the Planning Commissioners liked what they hear at next month's meeting.

Parks stated he wasn't sure we can say that.

Clyne opined that was indeed what was being said.

Pierce asked if the application was affected.

MT stated willingness to try to work with the neighbors but voiced concern that despite efforts whatever is done will not be enough by the next meeting.

Parks and Mesmer discussed narrow roads and road striping in the City.

Parks stated he was not asking for guarantees but looking for both sides to be more amenable; "It's safer for everyone."

McMahan and Clyne discussed living near areas with noisy events.

Krone asked to return to the motion made by Mesmer to call for a vote.

Stephan stated the motion was to table.

Parks confirmed the motion was to table, and explained a yes vote was to come back next month and discuss it further. To see if anything had occurred since tonight's (August) meeting.

Prompted by Pierce, Parks further explained a no vote meant the matter is voted down and we vote on the original motion to approve.

Parks called for the roll.

Clyne called for roll with the following responses:

Krone stated in the past the reasons why we were voting were noted but since that doesn't go anywhere at this point he voted a reluctant no.

Mesmer stated yes to table.

McMahan stated no, because it's already approved or going to check in the security issue but that doesn't concern the guest house.

Neff stated yes to table.

Parks stated yes to table.

Pierce stated no, both sides have made enough points tonight.

Stephan stated no.

Clyne stated motion fails.

Parks stated board members were reverting back to the motion that has been moved and seconded to approve the application, and it has been discussed.

Parks called for the roll.

Clyne called for roll with the following responses:

Krone stated he wanted to give many opinions but would simply say yes.

Mesmer stated yes.

McMahan stated yes, that's what we're here for tonight but the City needs to look into these issues.

Neff stated yes.

Parks stated based upon the application before us, yes because the other issues are not directly connected. I'm still concerned about the other issues.

Pierce stated we all have concerns but this project is to build a building and there is no reason not to, yes.

Stephan stated after hearing the residents it seems the Planning Commission got slapped in the face. Explained when the SUP was first approved there was an understanding that certain things would happen and tonight it was discovered that those things are not happening. Continued to explain reasons for tonight's discussion and why all concerns were brought forward. Slapped in the face and all members are trying to recover from that. Stated the reason for trying to table the application was to recover from that slap; it's unfortunate that there is no merit to deny the application since it was approved with the SUP. Continued with a vote to say yes but he is unhappy about the situation. Stephan further discussed his excitement with the venue and plans for visiting soon so he would have first-hand opinions. Opined that serious work by the applicants was necessary and encouraged applicants to consider how neighbors are affected while working on their business – "two-bits".

Clyne stated motion passed.

Parks stated the application doesn't go before the City Council, so it's approved.

McMahon and Clyne discussed options for the Planning Commission to communicate with the City Council.

Parks suggested sending communications to the City Council may not be legal.

Clyne shared an email received from a citizen. No action required.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Parks announced the Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:27p.m.