

**CITY OF CALISTOGA
PLANNING COMMISSION**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

**Wednesday, February 13, 2008
5:30 p.m.**

**Chairman Jeff Manfredi, Vice-Chairman Clayton Creager
Commissioners Carol Bush, Paul Coates, and Nicholas Kite**

“California Courts have consistently upheld that development is a privilege, not a right.”

Among the most cited cases for this proposition are Associated Home Builders, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek, 4 Cal.3d633 (1971) (no right to subdivide), and Trent Meredith, Inc. v. City of Oxnard, 114 Cal. App. 3d 317 (1981) (development is a privilege).

1 **Chairman Manfredi** called the meeting to order at 5:45 PM.
2

3 **A. ROLL CALL**

4 Present: Chairman Jeff Manfredi, Vice-Chairman Clayton Creager, Commissioners Carol Bush
5 and Paul Coates. Absent: Commissioner Nick Kite. Staff Present: Erik Lundquist Assistant
6 Planner, Kathleen Guill, Planning Commission Secretary. Absent: Charlene Gallina, Planning
7 and Building Director.
8

9 **B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

10
11 **C. ADOPTION OF MEETING AGENDA**

12 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested changing the order of the agenda Public Hearing items as follows:

- 13 • Item 1 ZI 2007-03. Consideration of a determination of similar use;
14 • Item 3 DR 2007-16. Consideration of a Design Review application to paint a mural;
15 • Item 4 U 2007-08 and DR 2007-10. Consideration of Conditional Use Permit and Design
16 Review application; and
17 • Item 2 Consideration of a request submitted by Peter E. Turner to amend the terms of the
18 affordable housing obligation.

19 There was motion by **Commissioner Coates**, seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to adopt the
20 agenda as recommended. **Motion carried: 4-0-1-0.**
21

22 **D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

23
24 **E. TOUR OF INSPECTION**

25
26 **F. COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE**

27
28 **G. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

29
30 1. **ZI 2007-03.** Consideration of a determination of similar use requested by Jim Mayfield, on
31 behalf of Rainbow Ag, to determine that tractor sales and services are an allowable use within the
32 "CC", Community Commercial Zoning District under Section 17.22.060(B) of the Calistoga
33 Municipal Code (CMC) pursuant to Section 17.02.190 CMC. This determination of similar use is
34 exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

35 *Follow-up report regarding expiration date for legal non-conforming use located at 1856 Lincoln*
36 *Avenue. (This item was continued from the Planning Commission regular meeting of January 23,*
37 *2008.)*
38

39 **Associate Planner Lundquist** recalled the January 23, 2007 Planning Commission actions when
40 it was determined that agricultural sales, rental and repair is a similar use and allowed within the
41 Community Commercial Zoning District "CC", and froze the timeline to allow for continued
42 discussion to allow time to clarify the expiration date for the legal non-conforming use located at
43 1856 Lincoln Avenue. Staff was directed to work with the applicant and return with clarification.
44

45 Based on reassessment of the issue, Staff is recommending the clock for the 180 day time line
46 started, after ceasing of legal non conforming use, determining that Jimmy Vasser Ford closed
47 business on 08/02/07, creating a time line of 117 days; and the clock for the 180 day timeline is
48 recommended to resume February 14, 2008. This calculates to sixty-three remaining days for the
49 applicant to obtain a certificate of occupancy. With concurrence of these dates the legal non-
50 conforming use for 1856 Lincoln will expire on April 16, 2008.
51

52 **Jim Mayfield**, Rainbow Ag, thanked the Commission and Staff for working through the process,
53 and for their understanding. He stated they were excited about the opportunity to move ahead and
54 concurred with the 63 days to make this happen.
55

56 **Commissioner Coates** provided a statement, noting he wanted his position to be very clear with
57 regard to the Urban Design Plan "UDP". He did not want to hear the Urban Design Plan was
58 being administered in any form or fashion. He did not want it presented as if the Urban Design
59 Plan has been approved, and wanted it clarified that it is not relevant prior to the Plan formal
60 approval. He concluded stating there is no reason someone cannot go through the process and
61 he heartily supported Rainbow Ag.
62

63 There was motion by **Chairman Manfredi**, seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** concurring with
64 the expiration date for the determination of legal non-conforming use. **Motion carried: 4-0-1-0.**
65

66 3. **DR 2007-16.** Consideration of a Design Review application to paint a mural designed by Carlo
67 Marchiori on the north wall of the Bank of America and the south wall of Miguel's Restaurant (the
68 walls forming the private alley between the two buildings). The subject property is located at 1429
69 and 1437 Lincoln Avenue (APN 011-205-007 and 011-205-006) within the "DC-DD", Downtown
70 Commercial - Design District. The applicant is Calistoga Vitality Group, Inc., the Art Center and
71 the Chamber of Commerce. The property owners are Bank of America and Patricia Citaku. This
72 proposed action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section
73 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines.
74

75 **Commissioner Bush** recused herself from discussion due to potential conflict of interest.
76

77 **Assistant Planner Lundquist** summarized the proposal for a mural on the exterior walls of Bank
78 of America and Miguel's Restaurant. He reported the proposal mirrored the general plan tone for
79 a small rural community, but due to the location, subject matter, and size of the mural it has been
80 presented for design review, although findings have been made and conditions provided. He
81 further recommended adding one additional condition that requires ongoing maintenance of the

82 mural in perpetuity by the building owners. He reported the Citaku's were very approachable
83 about this condition, but the Bank of America was a little concerned about the risks.
84 **Commissioner Coates** asked if the permissions/approvals were in writing.

85
86 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported the conditions are in writing and signed by the property
87 owner.

88
89 **Susan Hoffman**, on behalf of the Calistoga Vitality Group, and spearheading the application for
90 this mural, stated the application was self explanatory and the desire was to retain our historical
91 background. She reported all the buildings rendered are directly from our historic resources.

92
93 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported receipt of favorable correspondence.

94
95 **Dieter Deiss** reported this idea was inherited from Sue Mauro from the Chamber of Commerce
96 just before she retired. Together this project took over two years while they worked to persuade
97 Bank of America, and many people were diligently involved. He stated he hoped for the final
98 stamp of approval this evening.

99
100 There was motion by **Vice-Chairman Creager**, seconded by **Chairman Manfredi** to file a Notice
101 of exemption for the Design Review pursuant to Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines. **Motion**
102 **carried: 3-0-1-1.**

103
104 There was motion by **Commissioner Coates**, seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to adopt PC
105 Resolution 2008-04 approving Design Review (DR 2007-16) to allow the painting of a mural
106 designed by Carlo Marchiori on the north wall of the Bank of America and the south wall of
107 Miguel's Restaurant (the walls forming the private alley between the two buildings) located at
108 1429 and 1437 Lincoln Avenue (APN 011-205-007 and 011-205-006) within the "DC-DD",
109 Downtown Commercial - Design District. **Motion carried: 3-0-1-1.**

110
111 **Commissioner Bush** resumed her seat on the Commission.

112
113 **4. U 2007-08 and DR 2007-10.** Consideration of Conditional Use Permit and Design Review
114 application to use the existing structures on the property for a mail order wine distribution office
115 and a wine retail sales and tasting business located at 965 Silverado Trail (APN 011-050-043)
116 within the "R3", Residential/Professional Office District. The mail order wine distribution office will
117 be located in the two story principal structure and the wine retail sales and tasting will occur in the
118 single story accessory structure or "barn". The applicant is Joseph Cabral of Lava Vine Vineyards.
119 This proposed action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under
120 Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines.

121
122 **Associate Planner Lundquist** provided an overview of the proposed application for a Wine
123 Tasting facility going through the Planning Commission in July for a determination of similar use
124 within the R3 Residential/Professional Office Zoning District, and through the City Council for a
125 Public Convenience and Necessity determination. Therefore the applicant was presenting his
126 Conditional Use Permit and Design Review Application to the Planning Commission at this time.

127
128 **Associate Planner Lundquist** provided a review of the components, provided history, noting the
129 project was consistent with the commercial character. He reported initially the business would

130 consist of two employee's and overtime employ other individuals, using the tasting as a marketing
131 tool, with the ancillary used for barrel storage, tasting and sales. He reviewed potential traffic,
132 storm drainage, landscape berms, tree's and tree protection measures, water and sewer, and
133 connectivity to Lincoln Avenue with relation to the Bicycle Transportation Plan. He recommended
134 incorporating an additional condition that was neglected with relation to the potential for events,
135 noting events could have a dramatic impact.

136
137 **Dennis Kelly**, 4377 Silverado Trail asked what the water use would be and asked if there will be
138 limits in gallons. He also asked if they will hook up to sewer later and would need to get a Napa
139 County Environmental Health determination on the impact.

140
141 **Bob Fiddaman**, 1700 Mora Avenue, highly recommended Joe Cabral, stating he will develop a
142 nice facility. He questioned one comment, stating he was not sure there should be a condition to
143 prohibit events, suggesting perhaps a temporary event permit requirement may be more
144 appropriate, noting that is how County controls that issue.

145
146 **Associate Planner Lundquist** responded to comments reporting the current water for this
147 property was 339 units. Consideration was given for future production, using 80,000 gallons, in
148 addition to the historic usage, and the sum still remained under the allowable existing baseline for
149 water usage. Relative to sewer, he reported when the property was subdivided a sewer
150 easement was required. In conclusion he reported the water and wastewater feasibility was
151 provided to the Napa County Environmental Health Department for review.

152
153 **Dennis Kelly** asked if we run out of water do we have a limit that we will make him uphold.

154
155 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported all commercial properties have a baseline and in the
156 event they go over the city has the option to fine or turn off the water.

157
158 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested there should be a provision for non-winery events, limiting them to
159 no more than four events per year. These events can create something more than the intended
160 use. There should be language to have larger events that are wine related by obtaining a permit
161 for that event.

162
163 **Vice-Chairman Creager** asked if the City currently has procedures for events.

164
165 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported the code is established, special events are those that are
166 temporary or ancillary to the allowed uses. It does become a management role and monitoring
167 usually is a result of complaints.

168
169 **Vice-Chairman Creager** asked if an event is held and you receive a complaint, how do you
170 currently handle the complaints.

171
172 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported different Use Permit processes for an event like Rock of
173 Ages verses a potluck at church, but if at anytime it becomes a serious problem the Use Permit
174 would be revocable. To do that a public notice would be issued and the topic would be forwarded
175 to the Planning Commission.

176

177 **Dennis Kelly** suggested guidelines/conditions be set for events. Get items out on the table and
178 deal with the issue up front for the applicant.

179
180 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested allowing up to 25 people for a winery related event, and
181 suggested strongly limiting other events to four events per year.

182
183 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated there may be a natural limit on size due to parking spaces.

184
185 **Chairman Manfredi** asked the applicant if he has read all the conditions and agrees he can live
186 with these conditions.

187
188 **Joe Cabral** reported issue with requiring paving of the parking area. He reported he would rather
189 not pave because of plans for building improvements in the future. He reported it was mostly
190 gravel now and the Fire Department does not require asphalt, plus there is an additional expense
191 with asphaltting.

192
193 **Vice-Chairman Creager** asked if Mr. Cabral was given the flexibility was he familiar with the more
194 permeable materials.

195
196 **Joe Cabral** reported there is blue shale or chip-seal, but they are both costly.

197
198 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported condition 14, is consistent and the Fire Department has
199 requested surfacing materials other than shale for drive and turnaround. Stone and chip-seal
200 were also called out. Fire access and handicap accessibility is the driver and the language is
201 specific to the language in the code.

202
203 The Commission concurred they wanted to require a condition to address special events, stating
204 this use permit authorizes winery events up to 25 people, events in excess will require a Use
205 Permit. Weddings, private parties and non-winery events shall be prohibited.

206
207 **Joe Cabral** confirmed the condition that weddings are prohibited.

208
209 There was motion by **Commissioner Bush**, seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to file a
210 Notice of Exemption for the Project pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines. **Motion**
211 **carried: 4-0-1-0.**

212
213 There was motion by **Chairman Manfredi**, seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to adopt PC
214 Resolution 2008-03 approving Conditional Use Permit (U 2007-08) and Design Review (DR 2007-
215 10) to allow wine related businesses, including offices, fulfillment, barrel storage retail sales and
216 wine tasting on the property located at 965 Silverado Trail (APN 011-050-043) within the "R3",
217 Residential/Professional Office District, based upon the Findings presented in the staff report and
218 subject to conditions of approval as amended. **Motion carried: 4-0-1-0.**

219
220 2. Consideration of a request submitted by Peter E. Turner to amend the terms of the affordable
221 housing obligation required in Condition 21 of Tentative Subdivision Map 95-2, which require the
222 construction of 3 deed restricted single family units. The subject properties are located at 1713,
223 1721, and 1739 Emerald Drive, Lots 10, 11, and 13 of the Centre Court Subdivision (APN 011-
224 032-013, -014, & -016) within the "R1", Single Family Residential Zoning District. This proposed

225 action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15303 of
226 the CEQA Guidelines. *(This item was continued from the Planning Commission regular meeting*
227 *of January 23, 2008.)*
228

229 **Associate Planner Lundquist** provided background noting the main consideration is this
230 subdivision has housing obligations and there was no impetus for the developer to meet that
231 obligation. The developer has proposed an in-lieu fee. Staff is seeking consensus of the
232 Commission to provide a recommendation to City Council.
233

234 **Bob Fiddaman**, Calistoga Affordable housing, noted he spoke in January and provided his
235 thoughts at that time. Stating he was available to answer any questions.
236

237 **Chairman Manfredi** requested an opinion on how this can be structured so that within a year's
238 time the City will definitely get their due compensation.
239

240 **Bob Fiddaman** recollected Mr. Turner had offered a second on his house, and the City should file
241 a second mortgage on these lots and Mr. Turner's house. He noted the City is in a position to
242 prevent anything from being done within the subdivision, but not able to require compliance by the
243 developer. The City was to get three houses and the City could consider going through a legal
244 action to accomplish this with a lot of money spent. Instead the cash money could be used for
245 development of any kind of housing project, maybe townhouses.
246

247 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated the language needs to be clear and provide a strong
248 commitment.
249

250 **Bob Fiddaman** noted it didn't include a second deed of trust, but it is definitely part of his
251 recommendation.
252

253 **Associate Planner Lundquist** recapped the recommendation should include recording a second
254 deed of trust and compensation was to be structured within a one year period.
255

256 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated in terms of timing he would like to give the City flexibility and
257 evaluate the second deed of trust.
258

259 **Commissioner Coates** stated consideration of this was really making a mockery of the system.
260 He noted the provision was the developer was to provide the housing and this has been known
261 and agreed to by the developer since day one. Mr. Turner was so well aware that he went ahead
262 and incurred monies against the properties. He stated he could not comprehend consideration
263 for getting whatever is left. The City has agreed we need a mixed use in housing. As a
264 developer, Commissioner Coates stated he personally has provided affordable housing exceeding
265 the requirements when he built a development, and he made the numbers work. Commissioner
266 Coates stated there is no way that he will support this and he wants Mr. Turner to build the
267 houses or turn the properties over to the City.
268

269 **Commissioner Bush** noted considering the circumstances maybe a compromise is the only way
270 to go.
271

272 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated there was a lot to learn from this and asked how we can do what
273 Commissioner Coates was suggesting.

274
275 **Commissioner Coates** noted this is what conditions are for and asked why we would not adhere
276 to and enforce the conditions. This is the opportunity to stand up and draw the line.

277
278 **Vice-Chairman Creager** again noted we have learned and we now have potential larger
279 developments where we are making our expectations very clear. He stated we are trying to clean
280 up this mess and cut our losses, although it is obvious Mr. Turner did not live up to obligations.
281 The question was shall we get what we can or punishing him. Vice-Chairman Creager stated he
282 shared the anger but this was a practical solution.

283
284 **Bob Fiddaman** provided additional rationale for the recommendation besides the risk and
285 expense of litigation. He reported there are undeveloped lots within the subdivision and the
286 developer did not notify the lot purchasers of the affordable housing. There are property owners
287 in the development that currently do not have the right to build. Then suggesting the most
288 important thing is Mr. Turner has put loans on these lots and in the event of foreclosure the City
289 could come up with nothing.

290
291 **Dennis Kelly**, stated he is a developer and very conscious that as a developer if there is an
292 obligation you don't fulfill or you build something inappropriately you will be arrested. Should we
293 let Mr. Turner off without punishment and let people do anything and or compromise. How can
294 the City just say "cut our losses". Mr. Kelly stated maybe we need to come up with something
295 other than saying it is ok.

296
297 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested we are saying it is not ok, bite the bullet and resolve this.
298 Chairman Manfredi empathized, but recommended it was prudent to try and get something that is
299 real and not money in a lawyers pocket. His recommendation was to make this as difficult as
300 possible to allow Mr. Turner to give us nothing; \$150,000 up front and the balance within one
301 year.

302
303 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated he was ok with leaving the deadline fixed.

304
305 **Commissioner Coates** stated this has to do with honesty and integrity, and the buck stops with
306 me. He stated he will try to make sure this does not go through.

307
308 **Associate Planner Lundquist** noted a consensus, other than that of Commissioner Coates to
309 pass on a recommendation to come up with an alternative that allows the payment of an in lieu
310 fee.

311
312 **Commissioner Coates** requested a role call vote: **Chairman Manfredi, Vice-Chairman**
313 **Creager, and Commissioner Bush: Ayes. Commissioner Coates: No.**

314
315 **H. NEW BUSINESS**

- 316
317 1. Confirm staff interpretation of the City's Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the definition and
318 measurement of lot coverage standards for buildings and structures within residential zoning
319 districts.

320 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported this matter was brought forward at the request of
321 Commissioner Coates to look at the lot coverage definition pertaining to buildings and structures
322 on residential lots. He recited the definition for building, “Anything constructed or erected for the
323 support, shelter or enclosure of persons.” ; and noted the term “structure” was not defined in the
324 Calistoga Municipal Code. Staff further provided the definition for “Accessory Structure”
325 referencing Section 17.04.020 noting it is applicable to both accessory buildings and structures.
326

327 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported lot coverage was measured from the outside/exterior of
328 structures and is only to cover so much land to allow and maintain a less intense physical
329 appearance. It has been the standard of the planning department to include any structure or
330 building over 18 inches in height when determining lot coverage, including decks, etc. He
331 referenced the Staff Report page 2, Table pointing out the different lot coverage allowances by
332 zoning district.
333

334 **Vice-Chairman Creager** questioned if there was an error in report on mobile homes @ 50%.
335

336 **Associate Planner Lundquist** confirmed there was an error, noting the State allows for 75%
337 coverage. Staff requested the Commission look at regulations to verify they are meeting the
338 current needs, maximize our space, and allow for different uses on our property. In addition he
339 requested the Commission discuss likely alternatives.
340

341 **Commissioner Coates** reported being approached with questions of why a homeowner cannot
342 put up a shaded structure because it exceeds the 30%. They have a nice back yard but cannot put
343 up a trellis for enjoyment. The theory is if you hit 30% you're maxed or it requires a variance. He
344 suggested creating a 5% flexibility for the purpose of lattice structures or something pertaining to
345 the enjoyment of a property. However he did not want to see lots covered in structures. He
346 requested consideration for a more relaxed approach or more flexibility.
347

348 **Vice-Chairman Creager** stated his interpretation is the standards are being correctly applied.
349 Although another issue maybe in part is this relates to impervious surface and lot coverage is
350 related to visual massing. This would still allow an arbor or cover but would not create more
351 impervious surface.
352

353 **Commissioner Coates** suggested providing a percentage beyond the 30%, with a capped
354 maximum.
355

356 **Chairman Manfredi** suggested limiting the flexibility not to exceed 5%.
357

358 **Vice-Chairman Coates** suggested 5 – 7% may be reasonable.
359

360 **Associate Planner Lundquist** requested direction on if they would like to pursue amending the
361 code allowing for an administrative use permit or minor permit to allow for those minor increases;
362 and bring the recommendations back as a zoning ordinance amendment.
363

364 **Paul Knoblich**, 1019 Cedar St., suggested consideration to amend the ordinance establishing a
365 35% lot coverage for R1 and R3 and provided a handout to the Commission for review.
366 (Attachment 1). He pointed out in one city block there were two zoning types, so it may be
367 reasonable to amend R1 and R3 to 35% for single family and residential/professional. He

368 reported in his case the patio and walkway was 8ft wide and attached to the house. He
369 suggested a discount or bonus factor of two feet wide for attached walkways or patios. He noted
370 that two feet under the eaves doesn't feel as a covered structure, and doesn't look like an
371 enclosure. He further suggested a covered patio, walkway or trellis that is open on two sides
372 could be part of the discount on the "far" ratio.

373 **Bob Beck**, 1018 Cedar St., referenced the commercial provision of 60-80 % asking what good
374 does the 20% do anybody.

375
376 **Associate Planner Lundquist** noted Commercial is determined by floor area ratio and residential
377 is determined by lot coverage. He further noted there is always the ability to exceed the
378 coverage with Planning Commission approval.

379
380 **Bob Beck** suggested making this more visible and informative for applicants.

381
382 **Paul Knoblich** noted the 30% lot coverage in R1 is the least amount allowed in all zoning
383 districts. He suggested reducing R3 from 40% and increasing R1, making them both 35%, or give
384 a more liberal interpretation.

385
386 **Commissioner Coates** concluded it may be reasonable to entertain the 35% and have staff
387 come back with recommendations.

388
389 **Vice-Chairman Creager** suggested an attached sidewalk could come within a series of
390 allowances for various things that meet the spirit of the ordinance. Therefore given several
391 allowances the coverage may not need to be changed. However when looking at massing and
392 the visual affect he reminded the importance of keeping in mind storm water and run off when
393 high level density is allowed.

394
395 **Bob Fiddaman** expressed concern for reducing R3 from 40% to 35%.

396
397 The Commission concluded discussion and concurred Staff should bring back recommended
398 alternatives for their review.

399 400 **I. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSIONERS**

401
402 **Chairman Manfredi** reminded all Commissioners considering attending the League of California
403 Cities Planning Conference in March to contact staff.

404 405 **J. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS/PROJECT STATUS**

- 406
- 407 • Urban Design Plan Update #2
- 408 Associate Planner Lundquist provided a report from Director Gallina stating on February 5, 2008
409 City Council reviewed a presentation on the Urban Design Plan, noting the timeline has a deadline
410 for the UDP to be presented to the Planning Commission during two meetings in April. It was
411 noted the dates were not set in stone, but the hope is to get comments to the City Council as soon
412 as possible to attempt to meet deadlines and goals. Staff and committee are currently holding
413 weekly meetings on the Urban Design Plan.

414

415 **Vice-Chairman Creager** commented advising he understood the confusing situation relative to
416 the Urban Design Plan, stating the committee has provided guidance on the “emerging” Urban
417 Design Plan and performed a lot of outreach. Therefore it is understandable why staff was giving
418 guidance for a heads up to potential applicants on the Urban Design Plan. He reported they are
419 making great progress, but there is lots of time to change this, there are good ideas, and he
420 understands the concern about it. He urged people to please give it a chance before you react to
421 it.

422

423 • Palisades Apartments Update

424 **Associate Planner Lundquist** reported the application will be coming forward for a second look
425 at landscape and lighting during the February 27, Planning Commission meeting. The project
426 continues to move forward.

427

428 • Calistoga Mineral Water Update

429 **Associate Planner Lundquist** provided a status update on the geothermal and temporary use
430 permit for bulk transport, the quarterly reports on how much water is transferred, and how Cal Min
431 is moving forward on the sparkling water juice line.

432

433 **Associate Planner Lundquist** noted road repair work was scheduled for Kortum Canyon Road.

434

435 **K. ADJOURNMENT**

436 There was motion by **Commissioner Bush** , seconded by **Vice-Chairman Creager** to adjourn
437 the meeting. **Motion Carried: 4-0-1-0.** The meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.

438

439 The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, February 27,
440 2008 at 5:30 PM.

441

442

443

444 _____
445 Kathleen Guill,
446 Secretary to the Planning Commission

447

448

Attachment 1