

# Minutes of the Veneta Planning Commission

## July 2, 2007

Present: Chairman James Eagle-Eye, Jim Bruvold and Keith Hartley

Absent: Len Goodwin and Lily Rees

Others: Marion Esty, City Councilor, Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Margaret Boutell, Community Services Director; Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder Jerry Elliott, City Engineer; Thomas Harrison, Louis Johnson, Joan Mariner, Mona Linstromberg, Michael Remboldt, Alan Guess, Doug Schwin, Brad Wechner, Jeremy Welcome, Devon Trottier, Perry Burdon, Brad Young and Nathan Stapleton

---

### 1. REVIEW AGENDA

Chairman James Eagle Eye reviewed the agenda and called the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

### 2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

June 4, 2007 Planning Commission, and June 4, 2007 Joint Work Session of the Veneta City Council and Veneta Planning Commission.

**MOTION: Keith Hartley made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2007 Planning Commission and the June 4, 2007 Joint Work Session of the Veneta City Council and Planning Commission. Jim Bruvold seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 3-0.**

### 4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. ASPEN HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION - TREE FELLING PERMIT (S-4-05)  
Assessors map 17-06-36-34, tax lots 600/700

1. Call to Order: At 7:08 p.m. James Eagle Eye called the public hearing on the proposed Aspen Heights Subdivision/Tree Felling Permit to order:
2. Staff Report (Margaret Boutell)  
The initial tree removal permit was applied for in May 2006 and was approved by the City Administrator with conditions of approval in June 2006. At that time the City did not require tree removal permits be concurrent with the tentative plan. This permit was granted only for the Right of Way (ROW) and Public Utility Easements (PUE) and a few additional trees that were likely to be severely impacted due to the proposed improvements. The entire property has since changed ownership and is now owned by a builder/developer team. On May 4, 2007 a second tree permit was submitted in conjunction with the public improvement plans. This plan calls for nearly total tree removal due to the extent of grading on the site for purposes of building single family residences. Of the 437 trees (129 for streets, 280 for building pads and 16 hazardous trees) only 12 are slated to remain. Essentially all lots are to be

re-graded with cuts and fills tapering the existing grade to the property lines. Because so many trees were requested to be removed, the City Administrator referred the permit to the Planning Commission. The Commissions' decision will be based on Veneta Municipal Code (VMC) 8.10.080(2)(a-c). The Planning Commission did approve the tentative subdivision.

A review of the first geo-technical report shows that the trees and other vegetation were factored into the analysis of slope stability. The report was prepared in conjunction with the initial subdivision plan and did not account for the extensive clearing that is now proposed. A subsequent geo-technical report was requested and received by staff but has not been reviewed prior to tonight's meeting.

An issue to consider is erosion. The proposed development is on a hillside and water runoff may make erosion control difficult as the applicants are proposing to grade the entire site. Lots would not be developed for at least one year or possibly several.

Margaret said erosion control measures will be required and staff recommended requiring a bond if grading the entire development is approved. Margaret said it is important that the most recent geo-technical report is reviewed prior to granting the tree removal permit. Staff recommends allowing time to review the developer's geo-technical report and/or hire another geo-technical expert to review the developer's geo-technical report to make sure all issues are addressed. At that point, staff would still need to write findings and the Planning Commission would need to approve those findings before tree cutting could begin.

Keith Hartley confirmed with staff that the existing tentative subdivision was approved as well as the tree removal permit for the PUE. At tonight's meeting the Commissioners need to decide whether the developer can remove all the trees requested in the second tree removal permit to allow them to grade the entire seven acre parcel at one time rather than in sections. He said he is concerned about ground stability and erosion.

Margaret said reviewing the amended geo-technical report is important and should be done prior to approval.

3. Declaration of Conflict of Interest or Ex-Parte Contacts: None

4. Proponents

**Brad Young, 1241 Oak St., Eugene, OR**

Mr. Young is one of the applicants for the proposed development. He said it would create less truck traffic and the site development would be consistent if the grading and falling of all trees were done at the same time. He said the City Engineer approved the grading plans which conform to the original tree cutting plan. The approved plans address the rights of way and a small footprint of the lots. Nathaniel Sperry was hired

by the City to review the tree removal permit and recommended removing more trees because of potential windthrow. He said that they could preserve trees on the back of lots 2 through 4.

Mr. Young received a 1200C Erosion Permit from the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for erosion control of the site. There were no public comments on the DEQ permit which included all locations of fencing and guidelines requiring hydro seeding, matting and erosion control. He said erosion will be a problem in the winter and that is why they are requesting approval now so they can complete the tree felling and grading this summer/fall.

He said at times when developments are done in stages, windthrow causes more of a problem. He said more windthrow could happen because the sewer easements run on the back side of the lots and the City required the streets to be 30 ft. wide. That leaves a wide open space for wind to travel in front of the homes as well as in back of the homes.

In response to a question from Jim Bruvold, Mr. Young said he received his Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering from Oregon State University. He worked in civil construction building steel bridges in Portland, Oregon, and San Francisco and San Raphael, California.

**Alan Guess, 24739 Dogwood Ln., Veneta OR**

Mr. Guess' is not against the development, however, his property borders the south side of the proposed development. The property line is difficult to ascertain and he is concerned that trees identified to be cut may be on his property. He said if Dogwood Lane is a primary corridor for future construction and equipment travel, there may be issues with stability of the road bed. He is concerned about the handicapped resident who frequents Dogwood Lane in a wheelchair.

**Doug Schwin, Poage Engineering, Inc., 990 Obie St., Eugene, OR**

Mr. Schwin referred to Mr. Guess' comment regarding property lines. He assured Mr. Guess that Poage Engineering is planning on posting the property lines prior to tree removal.

**Brad Young, 1241 Oak St., Eugene, OR**

Mr. Young is one of the applicants for the proposed development. He would limit the construction access to 10<sup>th</sup> St. with a limit of five trips per day. There would be no truck traffic on Nottingham. He said the amended tree permit has limited changes. He doesn't feel they should have to go back and start over from the beginning with the tentative subdivision. He said he didn't understand the comment Neighbors 4 Responsible Growth made that the lots are too small for four trees per lot when the average lot size will be 8000 sq. ft. He said the proposed retaining walls would look more natural if they were all done at the same time. If done in stages, they will be different and won't look right.

**Mike Rembolt, K & A Engineering, Inc. 521 Market St., Ste. B, Eugene, OR**

Mr. Rembolt reviewed the modified grading plan last week and felt there were pros and cons to this method of development in terms of construction ease and overall erosion control, which is a primary concern. The small cuts and fills on this project, based on his analysis and opinion, do not change the overall slope stability. He said erosion is an issue and they are emphasizing the project needs to be done in dry weather so the grading could be done on finished dry surfaces prior to winter rains. He said the fall season will bring major problems.

**Nathaniel Stapleton, 3294 Jayhawk Ct., Eugene, OR**

Mr. Stapleton is the owner/operator of Stapleton Timber and Excavating, Inc. and also is Mr. Young's partner in the Aspen Heights Subdivision. He said one reason there is standing water under existing homes in the area of the proposed development is because there is not adequate stormwater drainage. He felt that once the new streets and the installation of the larger stormwater pipe is complete, residents shouldn't have standing water under their homes in the winter months. He said retaining walls are planned to be put in at one time so they are consistent.

5. Opponents

**Thomas Harrison, 87972 9<sup>th</sup> St., Veneta, OR**

Mr. Harrison lives on the corner of 9<sup>th</sup> St. and Sherwood and is concerned about the fragility of the site and the native vegetation that will be destroyed. He provided Commissioners with an article from the July 2, 2007 Time Magazine that addressed erosion and land slope issues. He is hopeful the Commissioners will complete due diligence prior to development beginning and not jump into this project quickly. He provided Jerry Elliott, City Engineer with photographs of his neighbor, Mr. Eggert's, home. They had water drainage in their home after heavy rain and snow in 2003 where it enters the crawl space. He has measured up to 19 inches of water under his home and has since installed a french drain and sump pump. He said several large trees on his property could be lost due to windthrow and heavy rains if the tree removal permit is approved. He is hopeful the development does not exacerbate the situation that already exists.

**Lewis Johnson, 87984 Sherwood St., Veneta, OR**

Mr. Lewis lives on the corner of Sherwood and Nottingham and read a letter to the Commissioners. He said the removal of more than 400 trees is in violation of the City's Land Development Ordinance. He said the trees should be preserved to the fullest extent possible because the removal of the trees could cause erosion and flooding. He had measured two feet of water in his sub-basement of his home. He asked the Planning Commission to request an adequate bond from the developer that no additional flooding will happen.

**Joan Mariner, 25712 Cochran Ct., Veneta, OR,**

Ms. Mariner is concerned that although the City approved the first tree removal permit, the City's tree ordinance is still being developed. She said trees hold back storm water and once the trees are gone there will be more water. Removing all the vegetation and trees at once will create a huge problem in the future. She said even if the site is re-seeded, trees won't grow in clay. The proposed streets don't need to be 30 ft. wide. She quoted Brian Issa from the June 4, 2007 Planning Commission meeting that "homes should be designed to adapt to the land, to reduce the stormwater damage, instead of making the land conform to the homes." She asked the Commissioner to deny the developer's request to grade the entire site all at once and suggested allowing development in stages.

**Mona Linstromberg, 87140 Territorial Rd., Veneta, OR**

Ms. Linstromberg provided written comments to the Commissioners. She asserts that the proposed changes to the subdivision necessitate the obliteration of trees on the hillside. The changes constitute a major amendment to the plan. The map dated August 1, 2005, used in the first consideration by the Commissioners, showed underground stormwater detention pipe in the diameter of 4 ft. by 154 ft. long. The initial tree removal permit from the first owner accompanied a map showing much smaller pads than what is now being proposed and showing fewer trees to be removed. The map dated May 2, 2007, from the new owner, shows larger pads and result in the current tree removal permit. The map dated June 11, 2007 indicated a stormwater drainage detention pipe of 5ft. in diameter by 154 ft. long. The pads are now larger, more trees to be removed and more stormwater drainage issues and more infrastructure. The changes in drainage result in a major amendment and require the applicant to start the process from the beginning. New plan, new fees and a new approval should be required. She also argued that consideration of a new plan by the Commissioners would require that the plan be decided concurrently with the tree removal permit. She is not opposed to development on the site but she is opposed to irresponsible development resulting in the decimation of a large amount of trees. City staff and the applicants have insufficiently addressed the Veneta Municipal Code. She said trees help in retention of water and aid in the replenishing the City's aquifer. Water supplies have been a concern for the City for quite some time. It's only a matter of time before mandatory water conservation measures will be in effect. If this development is approved, it will exacerbate the problem and become a public health and safety issue. She encouraged the Commissioners to use the tools available at the time the proposal was approved to support responsible development. Staff provided the Commissioners with an option of denying the application. She felt her comments supported that option.

**Brad Wechner, 97985 10<sup>th</sup> St., Veneta, OR**

Mr. Wechner lives on the downhill side of the project. He is opposed to the development because of the grading plan. If trees in his development were saved, trees in the proposed development could also be saved. After

a few days of rain he observed water flowing down 10<sup>th</sup> St. to Dawn Ct. toward 9<sup>th</sup> St. He also has a sump pump under his home. Removing all of the trees and vegetation will create more water problems. He was surprised at the number of trees slated for removal and he also referred to Brian's comment "to build houses to fit the land, not make the land fit the house". He said regardless of what plan is used the offsite damage and repercussions need to be explored prior to approving the second tree removal permit and allowing all grading to take place at once. He would like to see the City apply the best methods and not the minimum when addressing the mitigation and replacement of the lost trees. He thanked the Commission for reviewing the policies on this issue.

**Jeremy Welcome, 87950 Sherwood St., Veneta, OR**

Mr. Welcome moved to Veneta last week and is concerned about the number of trees being removed and how that may affect the trees on his property as well as his neighbors.

**Devon Trottier, 24733 Dogwood Ln., Veneta, OR**

Ms. Trottier, said the amended geo-technical report was not received until Friday, Planning Commissioners and the public didn't have an opportunity to review it prior to tonight's meeting. They should not make any decision until it has been thoroughly reviewed. She said decisions on individual developments cannot be made without looking at the impact it may have on nearby residents. If trees above and below the site are removed it will cause a major problem. She is concerned about mudslides. She said her neighbor, Mr. Demers did "brush control" on his property. Erosion control and hydro seeding were done but water runs down the road and erodes it. She said there were endangered species on the Demers property and the City did nothing about it because a subdivision development plan was not submitted at the time. Species of birds and animals that used to frequent the area are no longer here. She had windblown problems with her trees after the brush control. The staff report only researched the impact to adjacent property lines. Outlying areas need to be included in the impact study.

She felt the City should be paying attention to aquifer recharge. Residents are already asked to conserve water but are charged more for usage. The problem is not existing residents but allowing more homes to be built and cutting more trees. She said the entire area around the site is slated for development. If the proposed trees are removed there will be less recharge of the aquifer. How does staff know air quality, fish and wildlife will not be effected by approving the tree removal permit or that the trees slated to be removed have no significant scenic value? She said there will be an increased amount of pesticides and herbicides runoff which trees filter. There will be sewer overflow, which is already happening downstream and in the flats of Veneta. The bigger picture needs to be looked at not just individual developments.

She said the tree ordinance should not allow homeowners to remove trees

on their property. She is concerned about the replacement species that will be used. If native trees are not specified for habitat, quality of life and animal habitat will be compromised. The City needs to work with nature and not against it. Discussions should be done on a lot by lot basis on how they will be placed. If the proposed subdivision and tree removal permit is approved, the site will be virtually a clear cut with retaining walls but the placement of a house could be decided by a future homeowner. If this is the case, how will the applicant decide where the retaining walls should be? She suggested building fewer houses that are more than one story to retain more trees. Less trees create more evaporation. Dogwood Lane is not constructed for multiple log trucks. If the road requires widening, and removing the mailboxes, who will be reimbursing land owners for loss of property or if mudslides occur? Who will be held responsible for it and repair it? The existing trees should be maintained in a greater amount than what is requested.

**Perry Burdon, 24733 Dogwood Ln., Veneta, OR**

Mr. Burdon thanked the Commissioners for taking the time to hold a public hearing. He asked why the proposed site is not on the map at City Hall. Developers should provide site maps that show the contours of the land. The DEQ map should also be provided. The lot size minimum is 8000 sq. ft. Why is there not a maximum lot size set? He asked why the developer couldn't build five houses on larger lots. The City could require a larger minimum size lot which would be less of a problem for everyone. He said we should take care of the people that are already here. He has a map from Florence to Monroe which shows many small fault lines in several areas of Lane County. He asked a geologist from Hayden Homes if they consider the small faults when planning subdivision and he replied "no". In the heavy rain, retaining walls will shift and it won't matter. The proposed site should be considered if an earthquake should happen during the rainy season. He is concerned about who will pay for the damage if the houses slide down the hill. The slope faces the north and when the trees are gone, the site will stay moist through the fall and winter. Trees help stabilize the earth. He felt the applicants' map is not complete. It just shows how many lots can they get out of the property. He felt it's greed by the developers to get as much out of property as they can. He suggested the City buying it and creating a park or a pond and let it be for residents. There is nothing aesthetic about the proposed plan. The new streets will force other neighbors to comply with more traffic. He said a typical tree provides several thousand dollars worth of ecological benefits in the form of oxygen, air cleaning, soil fertility, erosion control, water recycling and humidity control and wildlife habitat. The same tree cut down and sold as lumber is worth \$590. The long term economical benefit of forests is undervalued to be exploited just like Mr. Young wants to do for an understandable reason. Build five houses or less.

**Brad Young, 1241 Oak St., Eugene, OR**

Mr. Young, a proponent, responded to public comments made by

opponents. He said the development slated for this area would eliminate the water run off issue. If someone has two feet of water under their house, they should be contacting their builder. He said if trees are left close to sewer easements and streets, they will be subject to windthrow. The sewers need to be placed in certain places for proper flow. The City required the streets to be 30 feet wide to allow for parking and emergency vehicles. The City hired Nathaniel Sperry to review the tree removal plan. He recommended leaving some trees along the boundary of lots 2 through 4 and the applicant will comply with that recommendation. He felt future subjection of windthrow to existing residents as well as future owners would increase if the trees are left in place. Mr. Young responded to reasonable manner and non standard construction methods: There is nothing in the tentative approval that addresses non-standard construction methods that they would have to use in order to develop the site and felt it would not be a reasonable use of the site nor are they reasonable for him. He realized there will be a difference of opinion on this issue but he also wants to build homes that are affordable. If he is forced to use non-standard construction methods, not only will the cost of the home increase but he will be exposed to legal issues as a result. He said the site is not a cliff on sandy materials and slopes. His engineer was present to provide information to the Commissioners.

5. Questions from the Veneta Planning Commission

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Jerry Elliott said he had reviewed the geo-technical report that came in Friday, June 29, 2007 and based on the previous geo-technical report, he didn't see a significant tree removal issue and the existing conditions of approval, however, he agreed with City staff that the most recent geo technical report should be reviewed by a third party geo technical engineer.

Keith Hartley said discussing grading of land is not a popular topic, however, the tree permit issues require approval and a process to follow. If removing the trees will contribute to erosion and the windthrow issue is perpetual, reviewing the geo-technical report needs to be done. He said if there isn't a stable base to build on, the trees won't matter. Should the Commissioners expand the tree permit or just allow the applicants to go with the tentative plan? And will the development lessen water flow? He wants those questions answered in materials provided from staff for the Commissioners to review. In response to the public comment "the City's system is flawed", he felt the Commissioners are continuing to work on the system. He said the narrow issue is if Commissioners are going to expand the tree permit for development that has already been approved.

Jerry Elliott said the upgraded stormwater system will be installed at the bottom of the development. It is a 5 ft. diameter pipe running 150 ft. long which will hold a significant amount of water at a controlled rate so large amounts of water flow consistently. Based on the geo technical report, borings were made on the profile of the hill which show portions of the hillside consists of a top layer of clay, some show a small and narrow

gravel layer and they show silt stone or bed rock. Jerry felt one scenario of the flooded crawl spaces is water moving into the narrow gravel layer and moving laterally down the hill. When it hits a cut in the hill from a foundation, the water surfaces because it breaks through the silt stone layer below and the clay layer above and surfaces out in the crawl space. He said this seems to be a pattern. Several years ago he looked at houses on Dawn Ct. and they had huge amounts of infiltration water coming into the sewer system. He believes the hill has always yielded water back through the crawl spaces. He felt old sewer pipes pick up the water and move it down the system.

In response to a question from Keith Hartley, Jerry said if uphill development occurs they may experience the same issues but if custom footings are designed, the builder may want to look at getting the sub-terrain material into the system without routing it through the crawl space.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Margaret said mitigation for the loss of 425 trees could be compensated by the developer planting more than the four trees required per lot and suggested the Commissioners re-visit the issue and replace 50% of the 425 trees with native species.

Keith Hartley felt the bonding criteria needs to be met prior to developing the entire site. He said the property is within the City limits and should be developed the best way it can.

James Eagle Eye suggested staff speak with Nathaniel Sperry about windthrow and the effects it would have on neighbors. He understands the pros and cons to grading the site as a whole as opposed to in stages, but the plan that accompanied the first tree removal permit now shows leaving more trees and an option for development per lot and the option of deciding which trees per lot should be removed.

Jim Bruvold suggested doing some fact finding and/or requiring a bond from the applicants to limit the City's liability if something happens. He felt the applicants need to present to the Commissioners how they will reduce the runoff of stormwater.

James Eagle Eye and Keith Hartley said they would continue the public hearing at the next Planning Commission meeting because they did not want to discourage public comment.

Margaret said next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 6, 2007.

**MOTION: Keith Hartley made a motion to keep the public testimony open and postpone the decision on Aspen Heights Subdivision/Tree Felling Permit until the August 6, 2007 Planning Commission meeting and directed City staff to collect geo-technical information before that time to provide to the Commissioners. Jim Bruvold seconded the**

**motion which passed with a vote of 3-0.**

7. James Eagle Eye closed the Public Hearing at 8:45 p.m.

**5. LIMITED LAND USE ACTIONS:**

**A. CARSON'S TURN SUBDIVISION (S-2-07)**

Assessors map 17-05-31-23, tax lot 1900

The application is for a combined subdivision and associated tree removal permit. The application was received on May 23, 2007 and deemed complete on June 1, 2007. The location is 25223 E. Hunter Rd. This is a medium density single family residential housing development. The minimum lot size would be 6000 sq. ft. The applicant is proposing to divide 1.85 acres into nine residential lots. Seventeen trees are requested for removal. Transportation is available from East Hunter which is a major collector but is not improved to City standards. Wastewater and water services are available at East Hunter Rd. Stormwater detention will be required for the extra impervious surfaces. No wetlands are on the site. All requirements have been submitted for the tentative plan. There is a street alignment issue. The applicant is proposing a street that is a bit off, due to the property location. This will require a street alignment or a jog in the intersection. If Pine St. were to go directly across, the applicant would be proposing panhandle lots rather than a cul-de-sac. City code prefers cul-de-sacs. There is a 90 ft. difference to align Carson's Turn Ct. and Pine St. The maximum footage allowed in the code is 200 ft.

In response to a question from Jim Bruvold, Margaret said the land swap between the City and St. Catherines' would not be affected by this subdivision.

Margaret said the alignment of Carson's Turn Ct. and Pine St. is one of the issues to look at. The small number of lots (9) doesn't appear to create a huge traffic issue with the streets out of alignment. The other issue is the additional easement dedication. Kyle Schauer, Public Works Superintendent, located the existing water lines at the edge of the easement on the western side of property. A proposal to extend the easement an additional six feet in width for a total of 20 feet may be required. It may make lot no. 5 too small for construction. The City may want to make a lessor dedication in order to build a home. There is an existing house on lot 9 which takes access from East Hunter. One condition of the final order is for that residence to take access from Carson's Turn Ct. The City's code dictates this. The applicant would prefer to take access from Hunter Rd. Staff also recommended approval with conditions for the subdivision and the tree removal permit. All remaining trees are on lot 4. Margaret suggested if the Planning Commission plans to save the remaining trees on lot 4, a conservation easement should be done now rather than allow a future resident to apply for a new tree permit to remove the trees at a later date.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Jerry said a not to exceed six ft. easement should give the applicant enough room to build on lot 5. Jerry speculated he may only need three ft. but would like to talk to Kyle to make sure he can physically locate the pipe to find out how wide the easement should be. He suggested including language addressing Lot 5 to give the City latitude to make that adjustment during the public improvement phase and/or a variance for

the front yard set back to provide the extra six ft. Lot 5 is at the back of the cul-de-sac with a 20 ft. setback. If the setback were reduced to 14 ft., it may make the lot large enough for the home planned for Lot 5.

In response to questions from Jim Bruvold, Jerry wasn't sure if the pipe was AC or iron pipe. If it's AC the locators aren't as reliable. The pipe is a main feeder out of the plant and is 14" pipe which is part of the original installation in 1962.

Jerry Elliott suggested making a condition of approval in 1(b) to include some workable language that would not box him, Kyle or the developer in, for the Lot 5 footprint. He suggested changing the wording to read "dedication of an additional easement for water lines not to exceed six ft. as agreed by the City Engineer and Public Works Superintendent." He said locating the pipe will determine how wide to make the easement. The City may not need the entire six ft. easement.

In response to questions from James Eagle Eye, Jerry said the easement would run the entire western strip to include lots 1 through 5. Jerry said according to the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials, not requiring the alignment of Pine St. to Carson's Turn Ct. makes the intersection a bit tight. He suggested the improvement plan should include a condition of a dedicated speed limit of 25 mph from the Funari development and eastbound traffic. This should slow traffic down and keep drivers alert. Jerry said that is one reason why he suggested removing the access of the existing driveway from East Hunter. There is a lot happening with all the streets intersecting on East Hunter at this area.

In response to a question from Jim Bruvold, Jerry Elliott said the condition for the existing driveway to come off of Carson's Turn Ct. is included in the final order and is a reasonable condition.

**MOTION: Keith Hartley made a motion to approve the tentative plan with the specified conditions of approval based on the proposed final order with the alteration specified as 1.b. Dedication of an additional easement not to exceed 6 ft. for the water lines on the west side of the property as agreed to by the City Engineer and the Public Works Superintendent. Jim Bruvold seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 3-0.**

## 6. OTHER

### A. ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

Margaret said two temporary use permits were approved in the month of June, one for the fireworks stand in the West Lane Shopping Center and for the Farmers' Market at East Broadway and Territorial Rd.

In response to a question from Joan Mariner, Jerry Elliott said construction on the Pine St. connection started Thursday, June 28, 2007, with cutting trees and taking measurements.

7. **ADJOURN**

Chairman, James Eagle-Eye adjourned the Planning Commission at 9:10 p.m.

---

James Eagle-Eye, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder  
(minutes prepared by dhenneman)