

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Minutes of Work-Study Session and Public Hearing
September 17, 2009
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners: Harris Atkins, Michael Fisher, Joyce Ninen, Jill Guernsey, Jim Pasin, and Jeane Derebey.

Staff Present: Tom Dolan, Jennifer Kester and Diane Gagnon.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Atkins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Approval of the August 6th 2009 minutes was moved to later on the agenda to allow time to review changes

5:00 WORK STUDY SESSION

1. Planning Commission representation on the Design Review Board

Chair Harris Atkins stated that Commissioner Jim Pasin had represented the Planning Commission on the Design Review Board and would like to step down, he went on to say that Michael Fisher has indicated an interest and asked if there was anyone else interested. Everyone expressed their appreciation for Mr. Pasin's service on the Design Review Board and for Mr. Fisher's willingness to serve.

MOTION: Move to recommend to the Mayor that Michael Fisher fill the Planning Commission seat on the Design Review Board. Derebey/Ninen. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Halsan Frey LLC – Carl Halsan, P.O. Box 1447, Gig Harbor, WA 98335 – (COMP 09-0004) – Sunrise Enterprises Land Use Map Amendment (TAB 5)

Mr. Atkins asked if there were any questions on this issue. Planning Commissioner Joyce Ninen noted that on page 5 of the staff report 3rd paragraph, last sentence where it says "the City of Gig Harbor had not previously considered commercial development on the west side of Highway 16" and there is a statement that the Pierce County zoning code under community center says its focus is a significant traffic generator (on page 4) Keeping that in mind, she stated that she felt that keeping it B-2 with a development agreement would be appropriate. Mr. Atkins asked staff, noting that in first bullet of the criteria, capacity evaluation is required for rezone or comprehensive plan or zoning amendments, I understand why it's difficult to do that but do we still need to establish that the criteria is met. Senior Planner Jennifer Kester referenced Senior Engineer Emily Appleton's memo and said that was her capacity evaluation. She continued by saying that when they are looking at these different zones (ED, C-1 and B-2) there is a great variation in uses. Commissioner Fisher asked if there was a way to quantify the

peak of C-1 without a development agreement. Ms. Kester said that they would have to pick the highest peak trip in the ED and then the highest peak trip in C-1, guessing that they are similar and that Emily didn't find that it was terribly unbalanced. Mr. Atkins wanted to point out that he felt that the criteria is incorrectly stated and suggested that perhaps they should state that it cannot be determined at this point. Mr. Pasin said there is a concurrency requirement in the city and he thought it was irresponsible to make a recommendation of approval without knowing that they have concurrency especially given that they had been told previously that the interchange is already at capacity. Commissioner Derebey said that she understood the desire to have more information but also felt that they had to understand that sometimes there are no answers and the traffic engineer is telling us that it is basically the same. Commissioner Fisher said he felt that the only answer was to pick the highest use and calculate it. Mr. Atkins stated that it made more sense at the rezone or project level rather than at the comprehensive plan level. Ms. Kester said that she would go back to Ms. Appleton and see if she could make some more concrete calculations. Mr. Atkins also asked what the county considered as the traffic capacity for that interchange.

Ms. Derebey asked if there had been a discussion of limiting it to B-2 along with a development agreement. Ms. Kester said that was a suggestion from staff and she did not know how the applicant felt about that. She said that if they felt that there needed to be a limit on the comprehensive plan amendment then that can be included in their recommendation. Ms. Ninen asked if there was any traffic data on 112th and the applicant's agent Carl Halsan replied that he didn't think they had that data. Walt Smith estimated that there were approximately 100 trips per week to the gravel mine. Ms. Ninen asked if the facility was open to the public and Mr. Smith said no it is for contractors. Ms. Kester asked if his intent was to develop the lower property and he said no he did not intend to at this time. Mr. Pasin asked if the Boys and Girls Club had to buy concurrency. Ms. Kester said they needed one trip through BB16 so there was a trip transfer ordinance adopted which allowed people who had excess trips to transfer them to non profits. She also noted that since then our traffic model has been upgraded and we have found there is more capacity.

**3. Robert Glass, P.O. Box 156, Gig Harbor, WA 98335 –
(COMP 09-0005) – Haven of Rest Land Use Map Amendment (TAB 6)**

Chairman Atkins then asked if there was any discussion/question on this proposed amendment. He noted that they have proposed a development agreement that would limit it them R-2; however, Ms. Kester noted that they have not indicated whether they intend to keep the property for cemetery use or change to residential. Therefore, she stated that perhaps the commission may want to add to the development agreement a condition that it remain a cemetery. She also noted that they could recommend to the council that they allow cemeteries as a conditional use in the R-1. Ms. Derebey asked if on the development agreement the period of time is left blank. Ms. Kester said that the current code allows them to extend 5 years; there is a new ordinance that does not take effect until December 1st that would allow them to extend 20 years. Mr. Atkins asked

what staff considered the use when they analyzed the traffic and Ms. Kester said that they considered it residential because it was a higher use than the cemetery use.

4. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St., Gig Harbor, WA 98335 -
(COMP 09-0012) – 3700 Grandview Street Land Use Map Amendment (TAB 9)

Ms. Kester pointed out that the commission had been provided copies of the written comments received. She went over the staff report and the items included. She noted that the Planning Commission would need to limit their review to what is in the development agreement. Mr. Pasin said that in looking at the aerial there is a trapezoid looking piece and he wanted to note that it is a power station not a building. Ms. Kester said that Mr. Fisher had asked for the size of the Civic Center she noted that it is 35,000 square feet and the Bush Polen building is approximately 14,000 square feet. Mr. Pasin asked about where in the staff report it mentioned that there is a code interpretation on the downhill 27' measurement. Ms. Kester said the request is how will the height on the interior facades be calculated given the parking garage entrances and can the upper floors be stepped back 8' so that the 27' is met on the garage façade. Mr. Pasin asked if that was measured from natural grade and Ms. Kester said they have to be 27' from the finished grade. Mr. Pasin then asked if this interpretation request is from the property owner/agent and Ms. Kester said yes. She then noted that the development agreement does not hinge on this decision.

It was decided to take a recess at 5:45 p.m. until 5:55 p.m. Chair Harris Atkins called the meeting back to order at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Atkins went over the process for the public hearing.

Public Hearing

1. Halsan Frey LLC – Carl Halsan, P.O. Box 1447. Gig Harbor, WA 98335 –
(COMP 09-0004) – Sunrise Enterprises Land Use Map Amendment (TAB 5)

Ms. Kester noted that this comprehensive plan land use amendment is a request from the owner of the property Walt Smith to change the land use designation of 15.5 acres at Burnham and 112th from ED to C/B. She noted it's location on the screen and stated that this request is to make the land use designation more consistent with the previous County zoning and that the Planning Commission is required to address the criteria in it's recommendation to the City Council. She explained the relationship between the comprehensive plan and zoning. Ms. Kester stated that the applicant has indicated that they intend to request a rezone at a later date to B-2. She went over the comprehensive plan designation for commercial business and then turned it over to the applicant.

Walt Smith, P.O. Box 720, Vaughn WA - Mr. Smith stated that the property is owned by himself and Norma Smith. He noted that they have buffers on the property and are trying to restore the property from it's previous mining operations. He stated he would

volunteer to change the zoning from C-1 to B-2 and went over the utilities serving the property.

Carl Halsan, P.O. Box 1447, Gig Harbor - Mr. Halsan stated that Mr. Smith has owned the 66 acre block of property for over 35 years and that the rezone has been the plan between the City and the County all along. He noted that the entire infrastructure has been built for commercial development of the property and they are just asking that Mr. Smith get his zoning back that he has had for 15 years in the county. Mr. Halsan said that he had looked at the setback and buffers against the residential to the north and the ED zone has a 50' setback and 35' screening buffer and the zone transition would be the same either way it was zoned. He further stated that it would be fine if it remained a 50' buffer. Mr. Halsan stated that they had a traffic study done and it was submitted with the application and had talked about that when all the analysis was done for BB16 the traffic engineer would have gone to the county zoning maps and so the analysis would have been done as commercial zoning. He noted that there is probably a criteria problem in that this should not be required at the comprehensive plan stage.

Mr. Pasin stated that they received comments from Mr. Pittman and asked which property was his and Ms. Kester pointed it out. Mr. Halsan said that he had talked to Mr. Pittman about his concerns. Mr. Pasin asked if he chose to develop his property are we doing overkill from a buffer standpoint. Mr. Halsan noted that there are other commercial uses in the area and Ms. Kester stated that she did note that in her staff report. Mr. Atkins asked why ED zoning didn't work. Mr. Halsan said that at the time Active Construction was there and ED was chosen because the Planning Commission just matched the comp plan to the use. He also noted industrial did not make sense as the calls that they receive to develop the property all are for B-2 uses.

Chairman Atkins opened the public hearing at 6:20 p.m.

John Pittman, P.O. Box 2461 Olympia WA 98507 - Mr. Pittman stated that he was not opposed to the rezoning but had concerns about his property which his uncle purchased in 1946. He stated that his uncle sold 30 acres to Mr. Smith and at the time his uncle thought that his property was rezoned as well and just found out that it was zoned residential while three sides are zoned employment district. He stated that he can't visualize wanting to live there and so his hope was to have it rezoned. He continued by saying that Mr. Smith has been a good neighbor but had concerns that if he sells what kind of problems may be created.

Mr. Pasin asked the zoning of the two lots owned by Mr. Pittman and Ms. Kester said R-1. Mr. Fisher asked what it was zoned with the county and she stated that it was SF with an Urban Sensitive Resource Overlay. Ms. Guernsey asked what the limits of the annexation were and Ms. Kester displayed the map of county zoning and the annexation.

Dave Morris, 6018 106th Ave NW, Gig Harbor - Mr. Morris stated that he was the property owner almost adjacent to this property. He said that his property has been in

the family since the 1950's and it was zoned CC in the county and is now B-2 with the city. He stated that he is speaking in support of the Smith property being rezoned and that B-2 along that corridor with the access and infrastructure is a more practical zone.

Mr. Atkins closed the public hearing on item #1 at 6:30 p.m.

Mr. Atkins asked if someone wanted to be included in a proposal what would they have to do and Mr. Dolan stated that it had been determined that because that property wasn't included in the SEPA and hearing notification Mr. Pittman would have to apply separately and he invited Mr. Pittman to come in and discuss the process.

2. Robert Glass, P.O. Box 156, Gig Harbor, WA 98335 –

(COMP 09-0005) – Haven of Rest Land Use Map Amendment (TAB 6)

Ms. Kester gave her staff report stating that this was a request to change the land use designation from residential low to residential medium of 3.4 acres of property north of Rosedale Street. She stated that the applicant has proposed through a development agreement to rezone this property to R-2. She stated that the Planning Commission has limited their review to the potential impacts of R-2 zoning and that it is the only zone that conditionally allows a cemetery. She noted that if it were developed as residential it could be 6 dwelling units per acre. Ms. Kester stated that the applicants have indicated that this property is part of their 50 year cemetery master plan and this site would be the only vehicular access available to the expanded cemetery. She went over the traffic impacts and that it was determined that the increase was not significant. She stated that the zoning around this area is not consistent currently and went over the surrounding zones noting the neighboring R-2.

Katherine Jerkovich, Haven of Rest - Ms. Jerkovich stated that she was speaking on behalf of Haven of Rest and they have been in the community since 1955 and are here to stay. She went over a slide show of their property noting that you could see that there is a significant amount of land that is already developed. She noted that as you go toward the Cushman Trail the topography changes significantly, therefore; there is no access from the west side to the east side and Tacoma Power won't grant access so the only access is down off of Rosedale. She stated that the funeral home is in the northwest corner and their plan is to have an additional funeral home and crematorium down below closer to Rosedale. She went over the slides on the current comp plan designations and noted that this 3.46 acre piece was already in the city when the rest was annexed so that is why this little piece is not zoned the same as the rest of the property. She noted that it was the city's desire to have cemeteries allowed only in the R-2 zone and that is why they are asking for R-2. They have submitted a draft development agreement to limit it to the R-2 zone. She stated that she didn't feel that it was warranted to restrict the property to only cemeteries as the rest of their property does not have that restriction. She then illustrated their conceptual master plan. She expressed that they were excited to be annexed into the city and wanted to be a good member of the community. Ms. Jerkovich stated in closing that she hoped that they

would support this comp plan amendment noting that they will still have to go through a rezone and a conditional use permit.

Ms. Guernsey said that she was surprised that they would object to the restriction on the cemetery use if that is their plan because they could still reserve an access easement and sell this piece. Ms. Jerkovich stated that the rest of their parcel doesn't have this restriction and the lower portion is not developed and it came into the city with no use limitation.

Chair Harris Atkins opened the public hearing for item #2 at 6:45 p.m. and there being no testimony he closed the public hearing for item #2 at 6:46 p.m.

3. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview St., Gig Harbor, WA 98335 -
(COMP 09-0012) – 3700 Grandview Street Land Use Map Amendment (TAB 9)

Ms. Kester gave her staff report noting that the amendment was being sponsored by the City of Gig Harbor City Council. She stated that the owner of the property is MP8 LLC and the request is to go from Residential Low to Residential Medium for two acres of property at the confluence of Pioneer, Grandview and Stinson. Ms. Kester explained why this was being sponsored by the council and that the Planning Commission reviewed a similar application but without as detailed of a development agreement. In 2008, The council looked at one that was more specific and since there was a lack of opportunity for the commission to review this version of the development agreement, the Council decided to sponsor this amendment. She noted that the City Council specifically stated that in initiating this comprehensive plan amendment it is in no way a recommendation and it will be treated in the same manner with no special consideration. Ms. Kester added that the property owners had provided all the images. She stated that the applicant has agreed to limit the ultimate rezone of the prop to RB-2 and they would also not request any rezone or change to the lower property which is also within their ownership. She continued by saying that the development agreement (DA) would require that tree retention be 38% on the upper area, the lower area 41% and they have proposed to provide a 25' buffer which will achieve complete screening on the north boundary. Ms. Kester noted that of the 125 parking stalls they propose that 73 exist in garages underground to limit garage wall facades. Further, the DA limits development to two buildings with the garage on the lower level with the street level being businesses and the top floor being residential condos; staff estimates up to 11 units. She stated that the building nearest Stinson would be 11,900 square feet on the first level and 9,200 on the second level. She went on to say that the Pioneer Building would be 14,500 on the first level and 10,400 on the second floor. Ms. Kester stated that the DA proposes a 30' setback along Stinson and Grandview and 25'-40' along Pioneer and that the lower development will be limited to a single family subdivision. She noted that the Planning Commission did deny the application previously but did not have this specific of a development proposal. She went over the comparison chart that she had prepared showing the performance standards between the existing and proposed zoning.

Ms. Derebey stated that it had been mentioned that there would be 16-24 units and asked if that was the southern piece of property and Ms. Kester said yes, that is correct and they have not said they intend to limit the number through the development agreement. Mr. Pasin asked about the site plan and if the line indicates where the area is that would be rezoned to RB-2 and asked where the actual lot lines are that are zoned R-1. Ms. Kester illustrated the zoning map and the affected lots, noting that the applicant will be doing a boundary line adjustment to match the parcel lines to the land use designations. Mr. Pasin clarified that the trapezoid lot will need a rezone. Mr. Pasin then stated that even though the applicant states that they could build 5 buildings if the Planning Commission does nothing they will have to do more in order to build 5 buildings and they would have to do a Boundary Line Adjustment.

Carl Halsan, the agent for the property owner directed the Planning Commission to the copies of the slides that had been handed out. Mr. Halsan stated that he felt there were two questions before the Planning Commission; first, should the comprehensive plan be amended, second is this project a better use of the land than what would be under the existing designation. He stated that under a normal land use designation change you don't know how the property is going to be developed, but in this case you don't have to guess what is being developed. Given the limitation they have put on the project through the development agreement, it should make the decision easier. Mr. Halsan noted that the comprehensive plan is a living document that is supposed to change and the Growth Management Act requires us to be continually evaluating our plans and review them. He pointed out that the municipal code sets forth the ten criteria, four of them address concurrency of the facility and no one has claimed that this project burdens those services and residential capacity will not be negatively impacted. He stated that there are two criteria requiring policy consistency and he had provided that analysis. There is one that asks does it increase pressure to change other sites and in this case the properties surrounding this site are already more intensely developed or they have a higher designation already and the fourth side to the north is the parcel owned by these applicants and they have agreed to limit it to single family. He further stated that there is a criterion to address the cumulative impacts and he pointed out that there are no other amendments. The final criteria asks if the site is physically suitable and given the surrounding uses are office buildings and a day care it is compatible and is physically suited for this project. Mr. Halsan said if the Planning Commission agrees with their analysis then the amendment is warranted. He stated that last year they asked for the lower property as well, the height was unknown and they weren't as detailed on the building sizes, location, tree preservation and the buffers were all smaller. He added that they hadn't known where the curb cuts would be and that on the southern portion the required trees retained is 54 and they are showing 103 through increased setbacks. He went over each side and it's increased setbacks adding that 62 ½ % of the parking stalls will be underground and they are proposing 46% impervious, less than is allowed under current zoning. He stated that the Hearing Examiner denied their request to be removed from the height restriction and rather than fight that they have modified the building height to meet the height restriction. He asked that the Planning Commission let them know if there is something that they feel needed to be added to the development agreement. He went over the development agreement and

it's contents and illustrated the photoshopped photos and how the project is viewed from various points below. Mr. Halsan stated that they have had 5 public outreach meetings, sent out mailed notifications to the neighborhood and answered lots of questions. He pointed out that there are many other steps that will have to be accomplished and many more chances for restrictions and public comment; noting that approval of this project will achieve greater tree preservation, larger buffers, larger setbacks, a mixed use project, only one curb cut and better buffers than they would otherwise get. He stated that they have had the architects design the site for five buildings and it is possible. He then addressed the 40' dense vegetative screen, where they had been proposing 30', stating that the easiest way to fix it is to move the rezone line 10' to the north squeezing the single family development to the north.

Chair Harris Atkins opened the public hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Mr. Bill Fogerty, 3614 Butler Dr., Gig Harbor - Mr. Fogerty said he is the second house in on Butler and that there are hardly any trees on their property near his house and he would like a buffer between any new single family homes and his neighborhood. Ms. Kester said that there would have to be a 25' dense vegetative buffer. Mr. Fogerty stated that the Planning Commissions comments in the past had been that the size of these buildings was inconsistent with surrounding neighborhood and that the comprehensive plan states that buildings should not dominate other buildings. He expressed that he felt they needed to keep it the same size and that that's why we have 5,000 square foot limitations. He stated that this is the fourth time he has had to come and testify and we should limit their applications.

Bill Coughlin, 8904 Franklin, Gig Harbor - Mr. Coughlin stated that he thought the development of Gig Harbor has been appropriate for the character of the village, that this parcel is a gateway to the harbor and to put a nearly 50,000 sq ft set of buildings was out of scale. He stated that the size does not fit the neighborhood. He referred to section 2.2 of the comprehensive plan noting that this is abutting a residential neighborhood and putting this next to 5,000 sq ft homes is really a violation of 2.2. He continued by saying that the comprehensive plan states very clearly what we value and we are starting to creep down the hill. He also stated that he felt it violated sections 3.6.1, 3.6.3 and 3.6.7 and that this is potentially the most important property. He urged the Planning Commission to reject this plan. Ms. Derebey asked if he had thought about the fact that the footprint of the building is 10,000 sq ft. and that the Bush Polen building is 9,000 sq ft. He stated that you only see a portion of the Bush Polen building.

Kae Paterson, 7311 Stinson, Gig Harbor - Ms. Paterson stated that this is her neighborhood, this is the entry to town and she cares about how this parcel is developed and the retention of the trees. She stated that she was on the Planning Commission when all the property out to the highway was zoned R-1 and they dealt with the development of the gas station noting that they wrote the RB-1 zone for the triangle that is Stinson, Pioneer and Grandview and they decided that the street wasn't the best zoning delineation; however, she stated she was not on the Planning

Commission when the triangle zoning was changed. Ms. Paterson said that if she looked at the logic she can make a case for that being a step down to Residential Medium. She said she wanted to save as many trees as possible and to have an attractive entrance into town with low impact buildings. She said she could support this application with the proposed agreement. Ms Paterson stated she didn't agree with having the smaller buffer and would not have gone for it with the original proposal. She would really like to look at color and likes the Peninsula Gateway building because it is screened and has a muted color. She said she is not sure how she feels about cottage homes on the lower parcel but is inclined to feel that we would get more of what we want with this proposal even though the buildings are large.

John McMillan, 9816 Jacobsen Lane, Gig Harbor - Mr. McMillan stated that he was concerned about this project as it redefines the scale of the view basin. He said he would like to talk about the view from the harbor and wanted to restore this waterfront to increase the diversity of the working waterfront to keep the vitality of the downtown. He stated that any large building in the harbor compromises this effort and we start to look like other communities who haven't watched these things. Mr. McMillan read from several ordinances about limiting height and size of buildings. He said that he felt that this was just about the wants of the developer to build the biggest building possible. He then stated that any large building in the view basin is a theft of character and it's permanent. Mr. McMillan then commented for Guy Hoppen and said that he favors controlled growth but is not in favor of buildings out of scale for Gig Harbor.

Carol Davis, 3312 Harborview Drive, Gig Harbor - Ms. Davis pointed out that every plan for Gig Harbor has a statement about maintaining the small town scale of this community and this plan would not contribute to that goal. She stated that the criteria specifically states that it must be consistent with the goals and policies and she didn't see that this proposal was consistent with the comprehensive plan. She expressed that she felt we needed to maintain the small town scale and buildings should not dominate and she felt this project would over power the small town scale of this city and that it is an encroachment into the view basin. Ms. Davis went on to say that the size and scale was too large for this area of town, this is one of the first properties that you see when you enter our town. She then stated that underground parking garages are ugly and the first thing you would see along Grandview would be an underground parking garage and she urged the Planning Commission to deny the proposal.

MOTION: Move to extend the meeting past 8:00 p.m. but no later than 8:30 p.m.
Ninen/Guernsey – Motion carried

Marty Paul, Applicant - Mr. Paul stated that on the issue of scale and size, there is at least a dozen or more buildings inside the view basin that have a larger footprint than our proposal, the St Nick church, the History Museum, and the Methodist church. He stated that the tree preservation with this project will be extensive and the Methodist church and the Gig Harbor Historical Society have no trees. Mr. Paul noted that he is a third generation Gig Harbor family and he would have never taken the time to improve

this project if he didn't care. He added that this will be significantly more expensive to provide the buffers and plant the trees.

Applicant representative from BCRA - The representative presented 3D images illustrating that even though the footprint is larger the combined footprint is the same as if they did five 5,000 sq foot buildings and therefore they are able to retain more of the trees and limit the surface parking. He noted that the residences would actually sit higher than the commercial buildings.

Mike Paul, 3720 Horsehead Bay Drive, Gig Harbor - Mr. Paul stated that their proposal is for 26,000 square feet of commercial space. He stated that currently they can build 25,000 square feet with surface parking noting that this is only a 1,000 square foot difference. He stated that in the best case scenario they could have 11 residences but in reality they can probably only get 6 to 7. Mr. Paul then said that without question people want tree preservation. He noted that the Uddenberg building sits ten feet off the property and the asphalt would be the same. Mr. Paul emphasized that this is heritage issue for his family, they want to do what is best and they will do what the Planning Commission decides. He pointed out that the adjacent properties across the street are in a B-2 zone and there are no size restrictions so what they do will help decide what happens across the street. He also stated that 60% impervious coverage is allowed under current code and they are proposing 46% of impervious.

Mark Hoppen, 8133 Shirley Avenue, Gig Harbor - Mr. Hoppen stated that it seemed that as this has been discussed the issue of the development agreement had taken the Planning Commission off task and their task was to look at the surrounding neighborhood and look at the goals in the comprehensive plan. He noted that most of the goals speak to vegetation and some of them speak to bulk and scale. Mr. Hoppen said that there is one set of relationships to the buildings to the west and a different set to the east. He cautioned the Planning Commission to not be misled in their consideration and to look at this in comprehensive plan terms and not in terms of building a project.

Chair Harris Atkins closed public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Guernsey stated that she will not be here the next two meetings. Mr. Atkins reminded everyone that they are scheduled to start at 4:00 p.m. at the next meeting and to look at each of the criteria and come with their opinions. He then went over how he would like to conduct the next meeting.

Ms. Ninen asked how big the Kindercare was and how big the buildings along Soundview were. Ms. Kester stated that the Kindercare is 6,000 square feet. Mr. Dolan stated that he also received an e-mail from Barry Jeroslow and Mr. Jeroslow asked that the Planning Commission be provided a copy of his e-mail regarding the hearing examiner meeting. Ms. Kester then stated that 5801 Soundview is 38,000 square feet

in three stories, the new Rush buildings are 38,000 and 66,000 and the Soundview Plaza is about 10,500 each. She then went over the zoning in the area at the top of Soundview.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move to approve the minutes of August 6th, 2009 with two spelling corrections. Ninen/Fisher – Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Move to adjourn at 8:20 p.m. Ninen/Guernsey – Motion carried.