

- The parking arrangement, continued Mr Walgren, was based on the 7 or 8 employees. Ten parking spaces had been provided in the back, added Mr Walgren, and 3 parallel parking spaces on the drive and room for overflow to provide for the daycare parking flow which would be a staggered drop-off and pick-up.
- The playground area was not practical at the back, advised Mr Walgren, therefore the playground was moved to the front and would be fenced with an open vision/wrought iron type of fence.
- Mr Walgren considered the proposed daycare would be a good fit for the area.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe, Mr Walgren** advised the daycare and the pre-school were more or less one and the same, with the toddlers and infants in the daycare and the pre-school 3 and 4 year olds in the preschool area.
- The opening hours, added Mr Walgren, would be approximately 6:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Planning Director Holm:

- Holm reviewed the history of the rezone application to from RS to RD and Conditional Use Permit application for a commercial daycare/preschool for the subject property/applicant.
- City Council, added Holm, had now approved the Rezone to RD for the subject property.
- No public comments from surrounding property owners or residents had been received regarding the conditional Use Permit application, stated Holm.
- At the time of the Rezone hearing, continued Holm, there had been some concerns regarding water service from the shared well and it was now the understanding the applicant had agreed to connect the subject property to City utilities, both sewer and water.
- The other concern had been parking, stated Holm, and the applicant had now addressed that issue with the plan submitted for the expanded parking plan for approximately 15 off-street parking spaces.
- Holm reviewed the Staff Report and recommended conditions of approval.
- In response to a question from **Kropp, Badger** stated the sidewalk was a discussion point with the applicant and a Deferral Agreement had been recommended. At the present time, added Badger, there was sidewalk to the east of the subject property but nothing continuing to the west.
- **Rodriguez** inquired if there would be a requirement for signage and crosswalk for the preschool/daycare.
- **Badger** advised a daycare would not constitute a school zone sign and noted there was an existing school zone sign to the east near the high school. Greenhurst Rd, continued Badger, was a 35 mph road and there would be no additional signage required for a daycare.
- **Myers** inquired about the driveway access and **Badger** replied that Elder St was considered a local roadway and therefore the proposed access driveway located 60 ft from the intersection would meet the requirements.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

No public comment forthcoming.

Kropp motioned and Keim seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Kropp motioned and Sellman seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a commercial daycare/preschool for 50 children at 1012 E Greenhurst Rd for Jennifer Temple subject to:

1. **The owner obtains and maintains the required licensing with State of Idaho department of Health and Welfare.**
2. **The outdoor yard area, playground area and landscaping shall be maintained in a neat and orderly manner.**
3. **The outdoor yard and playground area shall be continuously fenced in order to retain children from wandering out of the area.**
4. **The size and type of any advertising signs shall not exceed that permitted by the City of Nampa Sign Code.**
5. **The Conditional Use Permit shall be granted only to Jennifer Temple and shall not be transferable to any other owner/operator or location.**
6. **All requirements of the Nampa Building, Fire and Engineering Departments regarding Commercial Daycare/Pre School for 50 children shall be satisfied as per State Law prior to occupancy.**

7. **Access points shall meet City of Nampa's Access Management Policy – Section 105.2 Driveway Spacing and Design Standards.**
8. **Paved driveway and parking areas shall be designed by either a professional engineer or a licensed landscape architect to retain all storm-water runoff on-site in accordance with the City of Nampa's Storm water Policy.**

Motion carried.

Conditional Use Permit for a Non-Commercial Kennel for 3 dogs in an RS-6 zoning district at 1929 W Moose Creek Drive. (A .13 acre portion of NW ¼ of Section 32 T3N R2W for Lot 23 Block 14 of Fall River Estates No. 3 for Tonya Ouckama. (CUP 2132-16).

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing.

Tonya Ouckama of 1929 W Moose Creek Dr – the applicant:

- Ms Ouckama stated she had applied for the Conditional Use Permit for 3 small Shih Tzu dogs and advised she had up to date veterinarian records and vaccinations.
- The three dogs, continued Ms Ouckama were AKC registered pure bred Shih Tzus and were licensed with the City.
- To her knowledge, advised Ms Ouckama, there had been no neighbor complaints.
- Ms Ouckama indicated some letters from neighbors in support of keeping her three dogs.
- **Kehoe** inquired if there would be any dog breeding involved with the three dogs.
- **Ms Ouckama** replied she did want to breed the dogs and advised there was a litter last autumn and they were all sold before they were 3 weeks old.

Assistant Planning Director Hobbs:

- Hobbs noted some years ago the City adopted an Ordinance that would allow for persons to have more than two dogs on their property, through the Conditional Use Permit process.
- Hobbs reviewed the Staff Report and noted the subject property was enclosed by a fence.
- No complaints, continued Hobbs, had been received from the Code Enforcement Dept, Police Dept, or neighbors.
- **Kehoe** inquired about the applicant's statement that she planned for the dogs to have puppies.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

No public comment forthcoming.

Kropp motioned and Rodriguez seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for three (3) dogs subject to conditions.

Motion did not proceed.

- **Holm** noted the applicant's statement regarding the breeding of the dogs would put the application into a commercial dog breeding status - even though the puppies would be sold off before they were 6 months old.
- Holm referred to the Ordinance that, "Keeping of more than two (2) dogs for business purposes (e.g. breeding and selling the animals) is defined as a 'commercial kennel'. Non-commercial kennels may be considered in residential zones like RS-6; whereas, commercial kennels may not".
- Discussion followed regarding the commercial breeding aspect of the Conditional Use Permit application for 3 dogs in an RS-6 zoning district.
- **Holm** considered with the breeding of the animals it would put the application into a commercial status.

Ms Ouckama:

- Ms Ouckama stated she had two females and one male dog. The intent, added Ms Ouckama, was to have a litter or so a year.

Kropp motioned and Keim seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Myers motioned and Kehoe seconded to deny the Conditional Use Permit for a Non-Commercial Kennel for 3 dogs at 1929 W Moose Creek Dr for Tonya Ouckama. Motion carried with Kehoe, Kropp, Myers, Miller, Rodriguez and Sellman in favor and Keim opposed.

Modification of Annexation/Zoning Development Agreement between Timbercreek Development LLC and the City of Nampa recorded 08/07/2014 as Instrument No. 2014-028508 amending the original approved conceptual layout and common areas with no increase in the number of structures or four-plexes for Timbercreek Subdivision (41 four-plex buildings or 164 dwelling units on 11.01 acres, 17.90 dwelling units per acre – A portion of the NE ¼ of Section 34 T3N R2W BM), for Horrocks Engineers/Wendy Shrief/Evans Trust (ANN 2130-16)

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing.

Wendy Shrief of Horrocks Engineers, 5700 E Franklin Rd, Ste 160, Nampa- representing the applicant:

- Ms Shrief noted the subject property had changed hands since the annexation and development agreement two years ago, and the new developer proposed a new building footprint.
- According to Ms Shrief, the applicants would be meeting all conditions of the existing Development Agreement, and the number of units or buildings would not be increased.
- Ms Shrief indicated the new site plan for Timbercreek Subdivision, with 34 four-plex buildings, for a total of 136 units.
- The original site plan indicated two units above and two ground level units for each four-plex and the proposed units would now be side by side four-plex units.
- With that change, added Ms Shrief, the open space would be moved and would in fact be larger.
- According to Ms Shrief, all of the original landscaping and berming would remain exactly the same.
- Ms Shrief noted the interior lots/open spaces were changed because the buildings had been changed from the original plan.
- Ms Shrief indicated the building elevations and materials proposed and advised the units would be larger and higher end than originally proposed. Ms Shrief noted the four-plexes would have partial stone fronts.
- In response to a question from **Keim**, Ms Shrief stated there would be the same number of garages as originally proposed.

Assistant Planning Director Hobbs:

- Hobbs noted the proposed change to the layout, as well as the buildings themselves.
- Hobbs reviewed the Staff Report and recommended conditions of approval.
- According to Hobbs, there had been an interested party come to the office earlier in the day stating there could be some form of Deed restriction on the property that may encumber the property, however, that would probably be a private matter.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe** regarding ADA requirements for four-plex complexes, **Hobbs** responded there would be requirements and those were administered and enforced by the Building Department. Hobbs noted the parking spaces would be calculated for ADA compliance at the time of Building Permit review.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

Jennifer Yost with the Community Development Division, City of Nampa:

- Ms Yost stated the proposed type of project would bring much more variety of housing stock to the City which was very much needed - and actually called out in the Comprehensive Plan for the City.
- The City of Nampa, added Ms Yost, needed more variety and more rental options.
- More rentals were needed, continued Ms Yost, because an analysis of housing needs in the community had been done about four years ago and at that time it was identified that 5000 rental units were needed to meet the growing needs of the City.
- **Rodriguez** considered additional houses would be more beneficial to the City.

- **Ms Yost** replied that houses and multi-family units serve a different demographic of the community, as there were people that want single family and people that need apartment complexes that did not require taking care of a yard or maintenance of the building. Additionally, stated Ms Yost, there were working people in the community that could not afford home ownership.

Mark Pridgen of 1223 E Iowa Ave, Nampa:

- Mr Pridgen stated he represented the neighbors that previously worked with the original application regarding the conditions in the Development Agreement.
- Mr Pridgen questioned the notification regarding the public hearing, as he had received notification about another item on the agenda and nothing about the subject application.
- Mr Pridgen noted the ownership had changed on the surrounding properties within 300 ft since the original application went before the Commission and questioned if the property owners had received notification of the proposed changes.

Wendy Shrief:

- Ms Shrief stated their client was intending to go ahead and re-plat as townhome lots which could be owner-occupied.

Myers motioned and Rodriguez seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Rodriguez motioned and Kropp seconded to recommend to City Council Modification of Annexation/Zoning Development Agreement between Timbercreek Development, LLC and the City of Nampa recorded 08/07/2014 as Instrument No. 2014-028508 amending the original approved conceptual layout and common areas with no increase in the number of structures or four-plexes for Timbercreek Subdivision (41 four-plex buildings or 164 dwelling units on 11.01 acres, 14.90 dwelling units per acre, subject to:

1. Applicant(s) shall comply with all applicable requirements [including obtaining proper permits – like a Building Permit, etc] as may be imposed by City agencies appropriately involved in the review of the request (e.g. Nampa Fire, Building, Planning and Zoning and Engineering Departments/Divisions, etc) as the entitlements granted by virtue of the City’s approvals of the requested Development Agreement Modification(s) do not, and shall not, have the effect of abrogating requirements from those agencies in connection with [re]entitlement of the Property.
2. The Applicant, as Owner/Developer, [shall] enter into a Modified Development Agreement with the City of Nampa. The Agreement(s) shall contain such conditions, terms, restrictions, representations, exhibits, acknowledgments and timelines as necessary to facilitate development of the Property as contemplated by the Applicant and agreed to and conditioned by the City through its Council or executive departments or outside agencies properly involved in the review of the Applicant’s request for the Property to be reconfigured for residential use in an RML Zone versus its original entitlement(s). Inclusively, the Agreement shall contain any/the concept development plans proposed by virtue of this application submittal as ultimately accepted, or accepted with required changes, by the City’s Council.

Motion carried.

Conditional Use Permit for an Ice Cream Store in an IL zoning district at 1604 1st St S. (A .14 acre portion of the SE ¼ of Section 22 T3N R2W BM, Tax 1 of Lot 18 Block 24 Young Tax 1 of Lot 12 Block 9 Original) for Javier Barron Campos (CUP 2135-16).

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing.

Javier Barron Campos of 1604 1st St S – the applicant:

- Mr Campos stated he wanted to sell ice cream from the premises, both inside, and outside at tables.
- In response to a question from **Keim**, **Mr Campos** stated it would not be a mobile operation on the premises.

- The hours of operation, continued Mr Campos, would be from 10:00 until whatever time at night the store would close.
- **Rodriguez** inquired if Mr Campos would be selling anything else other than ice cream, and **Mr Campos** replied he would be selling nick-nacks, soda, snacks, etc, but ice cream would be the focal point.
- **Keim** inquired if **Mr Campos** lived on the subject property and Mr Campos replied that he did.

Planning Director Holm:

- Holm advised the subject was zoned Commercial previously and then rezoned to IL a few months ago by the previous owner, and with that rezone, the ice-cream shop required conditional use permit approval.
- Holm advised that no comments or correspondence regarding the application had been received from surrounding property owners or residents.
- According to Holm, research had found that at one time the subject property had been the location of Herb's 24 Flavors Ice Cream Shop, and since that time there had been other retail uses on the subject property.
- Holm reviewed the memorandum from the Engineering Division with conditions of approval.
- The parking, continued Holm, would be reviewed at the time of Certificate of Compliance.
- Holm reviewed the Staff Report and recommended conditions of approval.
- **Myers** inquired if there was direct access on to 16th Ave S from the subject property. **Holm** stated there was no direct access on to 16th Ave S.
- **Kropp** questioned if the location at the intersection of 1st St S and 16th Ave S was a good location for the ice cream shop, considering the traffic pattern.
- **Badger** noted that was the existing traffic pattern and it had been that way for a number of years. Badger considered the proposed business was more of a pedestrian oriented business and noted the bicycle path running next to the subject property – currently under construction.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

No public comment forthcoming.

Keim motioned and Kehoe seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Keim motioned and Sellman seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for an Ice Cream Store in an IL zoning district at 1604 1st St S for Javier Barron Campos, subject to:

1. All City Code requirements of the Nampa Planning, Building, Engineering, and Fire Departments as well as applicable State or Federal agencies regarding use of the property for an Ice Cream Store shall be satisfied prior to occupancy.
2. If additional paved parking is required, the owner/applicant shall have prepared a grading and drainage plan in accordance with City Policy for the containment and retention of any storm water runoff.
3. The Conditional Use Permit shall be issued for an Ice Cream Store only.
4. The Conditional Use Permit is granted only to the property owner for the requested perpetuity of time, and shall not be transferable to any other operator or location.

Motion carried.

Conditional Use Permit for a Non-Commercial Kennel for 3 Dogs in an RD zoning district at 1115 S Elder Street. (A .42 acre portion of the NE ¼ Section 34 T3N R2W BM, Lots 10 and 11, Lot 9 less S 34.2 ft, S 15 ft of Lt 12, Bk 146 of Kurtz Addition), for Carolyn Greener (CUP 2138-16).

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing.

Carolyn Greener of 1115 S Elder St, Nampa – the applicant:

- Ms Greener stated she and her husband previously lived on property that had been purchased by Mission Aviation and therefore had just recently moved into the Nampa City limits.
- According to Ms Greener, she has worked as a Veterinary Technician for Caldwell Veterinary Hospital for 17 years so was fully aware of the licensing requirements, and she then found out there was an Ordinance limiting the number of dogs inside the City limits.

- All of their dogs, added Ms Greener, were current on vaccinations, all spayed or neutered and they did not intend to get more dogs, or breed the dogs, or become a rescue organization.
- One of the dogs was 6 to 8 years old, was a third time loser, stated Ms Greener and finally found a home with herself and her husband.
- In response to a question from **Myers, Ms Greener** stated their property was almost ½ an acre and was completely fenced.

Planning Director Holm:

- Holm stated the applicant was requesting approval for three dogs and noted there was no intent to breed the dogs.
- Holm indicated the e-mail received from Elizabeth Grinstead owner of 1112 Fern St, stating as long as the 5 conditions in the Staff Report were enforced, those conditions would be adequate to protect the neighborhood.
- According to Holm, the .42 acre property was completely fenced.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.
No public comment forthcoming.

- **Sellman** inquired the breeds of the three dogs.
- **Ms Greener** stated two of the dogs were Jack Russell crosses approximately 21 and 28 pounds, and one was possibly a wolfhound cross, about 70 or 80 pounds.

Keim motioned and Kehoe seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Kropp motioned and Kehoe seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for three (3) dogs at 1115 S Elder St for Carolyn Greener, subject to:

1. **The applicant maintains the yard free from the accumulation of dog feces.**
2. **The applicant prevents the dogs from excessively barking so as to constitute a nuisance to the neighbors.**
3. **Three or more citations issued against the applicant by Animal Control officers be considered sufficient grounds to revoke the Conditional Use Permit and that such will be considered null and void upon receipt of the third citation.**
4. **The dogs be restricted so as to not run at large off the property. This shall include completion and maintenance of adequate fencing at a condition and height to keep the dogs from getting away when outside.**

Motion carried.

A Conditional Use Permit for a Duplex in an RS-6 zoning district at 322 Smith Avenue. (A .46 acre portion of the NW ¼ of Section 21 T3N R2W BM – Westview Tax 1 Lot 23, less Tax 02746 less road), for David Kendall (CUP 2139-16)

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing.

David Kendall of 4221 Montgomery Ln, Nampa – the applicant:

- Mr Kendall stated he had purchased a piece of property on the north side of Smith Ave, south of Davis Ave and would like to construct a duplex on the property.

Assistant Planning Director Hobbs:

- Hobbs indicated the history of the subject property, approved for a duplex in 2006 and an extension on that approval received in 2007. After that, continued Hobbs, a new Conditional Use Permit application was received and that was for two, two-unit townhouses, approved in 2008, and that approval had also expired.
- Hobbs noted the applicant's conceptual site plan and concept elevation for the duplex.
- The RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq ft minimum lot size) zoning of the property required a Conditional Use Permit application for a duplex, reported Hobbs.

- Hobbs reviewed the Staff Report and recommended conditions of approval.
- Hobbs indicated the aerial view of the property, with the canal to the west, the multi-family housing to the immediate south and single family dwellings to the north.
- **Kehoe** noted the applicant would have to come back to the Commission to get approval for another duplex if the property were to be split.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

Rachid Boussata of 6271 E Lemhi Ct, Nampa:

- Mr Boussata stated he was not speaking in opposition to the requested approval for a duplex on the subject property.
- Mr Boussata stated he owned the property located two parcels to the west, closer to the canal.
- According to Mr Boussata, his only concern was the fact Smith Ave has not been improved in that area and it was his understanding it would be at least another 10 years before the road was on the list for improvement.
- Mr Boussata questioned if Smith Ave could be improved so the subject property and the two properties to the west could be developed.

Linda Nicholson of 401 Smith Ave – opposed:

- Ms Nicholson stated she, and many of the neighbors were concerned homeowners.
- Ms Nicholson stated she had 18 letters signed by residents of the area in opposition to the requested Conditional Use Permit for a duplex.
- The Conditional Use Permit approval for a duplex, continued Ms Nicholson, would set a precedent for the area and open the door for more and more duplexes.
- Ms Nicholson advised she lived across the canal from the multiple housing unit on the south side of Smith Ave and stated sometimes she had to go in her house to get away from the vile language coming from parents to their children.
- If the duplex were to be approved, continued Ms Nicholson, she would have to look at it every day, as well as the increased traffic and population density.

Linda Christensen – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Nelson Perry of 319 Davis Ave – opposed.

- Mr Perry stated his property touches the canal.
- According to Mr Perry he did not know the total impact on the neighborhood of what was being proposed.
- Mr Perry stated he would like to know more about what was planned for the subject property.

Michael Lovette of 300 Smith Ave, Nampa:

- Mr Lovette stated his property was right next door, to the east of the subject property.
- Mr Lovette reported the applicant had talked to him about eventually putting in two duplexes, which would mean four families.
- Mr Lovette stated he would like to see a privacy fence all the way down between his property and the applicant's property.

Troy Sickels of 272 Smith Ave, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Sickels questioned if there would be sufficient turnaround room for an emergency vehicle/fire truck, if there were to be a fire on the property.
- Mr Sickels also questioned if there would be a privacy fence along the property line of the subject property in order to keep cats and rubbish out of his garden.
- Mr Sickels questioned if animals/dogs would be permitted on the subject property.
- Mr Sickels referred to the fact the applicant had indicated he intended to put another duplex on the property in the future.
- According to Mr Sickels, the traffic was very dangerous at the corner of Smith Ave and N Stanford St.
- Mr Sickels considered that Nampa was becoming a bedroom community for Boise which meant there was more crime involved.

Shauna Sickels of 272 Smith Ave, Nampa

- Ms Sickels noted there was no street to the left of N Stanford St and Smith Ave and no stop sign, which made for a dangerous intersection.
- The additional duplex or duplexes could make a serious safety issue with the increased traffic, added Ms Sickels.
- Ms Sickels reiterated previous statements regarding requiring a privacy fence for the subject property if the duplex were to be approved to stop any debris or construction rubbish being blown in to the 272 Smith Ave yard.

David Kendall:

- Mr Kendall advised he had planned on coming back in 4 to 5 years and applying for a permit to build a second duplex.
- **Vice Chairman Gunstream** inquired if the applicant could respond to the request for a privacy fence.
- **Mr Kendall** replied that he was not completely opposed to that request, however, the property length of 300 ft would make it a substantial expense to be added to the duplex.
- **Myers** inquired about the access to the property on Smith Ave.
- **Mr Kendall** stated it was his understanding he would have to pave Smith Ave to City standards up to his property line and then properties to the west would have to pave the road to their property line.
- Regarding fire/emergency vehicle access, stated Mr Kendall, he had attended the Conceptual Plan Review meeting and considered he would meet the Fire Department requirements.
- In response to a question from **Vice Chairman Gunstream**, **Mr Kendall** stated he was in agreement with no cats or dogs on the property.
- **Myers** inquired about the 40 ft “no build” area on the north side of the property.
- **Mr Kendall** stated it was his understanding it was for a possible future roadway extension.

Kropp motioned and Kehoe seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Staff Engineer Badger:

- Badger considered it would be unlikely for Smith Ave to ever cross the canal to the west.
- The improvement of Smith Ave extending west towards the canal, continued Badger, would be the adjacent property owner’s and/or developer’s responsibility.
- According to Badger, discussions had taken place with Mr Kendall regarding the City entering into a curb/gutter/sidewalk deferral agreement for the full roadway improvements, and at the present time there was not a full right-of-way available to improve that entire area.
- The applicant, continued Badger, would be required to improve the asphalt in and to the west boundary of his property for his access.
- The Fire Department, added Badger, would review the subject property for access and whether a turnaround of some type could be accommodated.
- The right-of-way had previously been dedicated for the south half of Smith Ave, stated Badger, along with a Deferral Agreement.
- Discussion followed regarding possible placement of stop signs at the intersection.

- **Kehoe** inquired if there would be a limit on the number of dwelling units that could be constructed on the subject property.
- **Hobbs** replied the applicant would be limited by the RS-6 (Single Family Residential-6000 sq ft minimum lot size) zoning district, the Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance.
- **Rodriguez** noted the 18 petition letters from property owners in the neighborhood submitted by Ms Nicholson, in opposition to the duplex.
- **Kehoe** noted some of the petitioners lived on the other side of the canal and would not be effected traffic wise by the proposed duplex, and their property would be further than the 300 ft notification area.

**Rodriguez motioned to deny the request for the Conditional Use Permit application for a duplex at 322 Smith Ave, within an RS-6 zoning district, for David Kendall.
Motion died for lack of second.**

Kehoe motioned and Myers seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a duplex in the RS-6 zoning district at 322 Smith Avenue for David Kendall, subject to:

- 1. Owner/Operator/Applicant(s) shall comply with all applicable requirements (including obtaining proper permits and making requisite site improvements) as may be imposed by City agencies appropriately involved in the review of the request (e.g. Nampa City Clerk, Fire, Building, Planning and Zoning and Engineering Departments, etc) as well as State or Federal agencies/departments that may be involved in this matter as the Conditional Use Permit approval does not and shall not have the effect of abrogating requirements from those agencies/departments.**

Motion carried with Kehoe, Keim, Kropp, Miller, Myers and Sellman in favor and Rodriguez opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.



Norman L Holm, Planning Director

:sm