



SUMMARY MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION HELD
JUNE 4, 2025

Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion.

1. **CALLED MEETING TO ORDER– By Michael P. Griffith at 6:15 P.M.**
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Those present: Michael P. Griffith, Andrew Gay, Tim Knapp, Tom Aljinovich, Eric Doner, Steve Hannan

THOSE ABSENT

Brandon Figliolino

4. It was moved by Mr. Griffith, to excuse Mr. Figliolino from the meeting.

Those voting Yes: Doner, Hannan, Knapp, Aljinovich, Gay, Knapp

Those voting No:

Those absent: Figliolino

The motion carried 6-0

ALSO PRESENT: Rob Smetana, Manager of City Planning and Development; Kelsy Sargent, Sr. Ass't. City Attorney; Josie Suk, Development Systems and Administrative Manager; Rozalynne Thompson, Principal Planner; Patty McCartney, Long Range Planner, Dixielee Rodriguez, Development Technician II, Heidi Van Gieson, Recording Secretary

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

May 7, 2025. The minutes stand approved as printed with amendments

6. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

None

7. **WORKSHOP**

W 64th Avenue Sub Area Planning.

Mr. Griffith stated that there will not be any public comment in regards to the workshop but that

there will be a Public Hearing at a later date that would allow public comments.

Ms. McCartney presented the project.

8. REPORTS

None

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no one wishing to speak. Public Comment was closed.

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Griffith reviewed the rules of what will be presented and what the role of the Planning Commission is, that they only have the authority to make a recommendation to the City Council on the Code Amendment topics and that they are not the final body in this decision.

Mr. Griffith noted that the City Staff has provided a packet of Redlines that will be presented to the City Council to note the changes that are being proposed and in what sections they reside. City Staff has provided a summary and is available for questions from the Planning Commission. At the close of this meeting, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to City Council based on the approval criteria of either to Deny, Approve or to send to the City Council with conditions.

Mr. Griffith stated that after the presentation, the public will be allowed to provide public comment and each member of the public will have three minutes to speak. If questions are asked during comment, they will not be answered directly, but will be considered as something that the public has asked. Additional comments are not allowed to be asked unless approved by the Chair. The Commission asks that the public speakers speak to them, not the staff or other speakers.

Mr. Griffith Swore in the public speakers.

Mr. Griffith asked if there were any posting notification requirements for this case.

Ms. Thompson stated that since this meeting was continued from the May 7th meeting, the posting notifications from that meeting still stand for this one.

Mr. Griffith asked if there were any additions or corrections to the staff report?

Ms. Thompson stated that there were not.

Mr. Griffith asked if the minutes for the May 7th as well as the minutes from this meeting will be passed on to City Council so that they have a full review of this presentation?

Ms. Suk stated that yes, both sets of minutes will be sent to Council for review.

Mr. Griffith stated that the following items have been submitted and will be made a part of the permanent record: Staff Report, (1) public comment of recommendations for the LDC Amendments. Mr. Griffith stated that this will require an application from the applicant and that no action will be taken at this time.

Mr. Griffith questioned the public comment.

Ms. Suk stated that public comments will be put through as such and that if they would like these amendments to be addressed they would need to submit an application to do so. These public comments will be pushed through as they would normally but they will not be addressed as is.

Ms. Gardner clarified that looking into this information takes staff time and this is why they need to process it as a Development Application if they would like it addressed. It would be handled by City staff and if it met the qualifications, it would be brought to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Knapp asked if we get back to the people that provide public comment or do we leave them hanging?

Mr. Smetana stated that he did indeed email the person back.

The public hearing was opened.

10.A. LDC Ordinance Amending the Land Development Code, of the City of Arvada Code

Ms. Thompson presented the Amendments from the May 7th meeting and why we continued the meeting. She stated that a spreadsheet was created to review the Amendment changes the City is proposing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

IN FAVOR

None

IN OPPOSITION

Gina Hallisey, Maple Valley stated that in regards to Amendment 17, staff references the need to delete warehousing and replace with the storage of products prior to their distribution to wholesale and retail outlets.

Points of confusion: Section 3-1-3-7A references industrial processing, recycling, storage, and disposal standards, with A being brewery, winery, and distillery.

Section ? states warehousing is prohibited in the MX-S zoning district, but the new definition is only changed in certain sections, lacking clarity.

Worries about distilleries near residential areas due to combustibility; questions appropriateness of zoning (MX-S vs. IL' zone).

Suggests lack of definition between "warehousing" and "logistics center," even though warehousing is referenced in light industry (section 5A).

Advocates for clearer, specific definitions regarding warehousing, distribution centers, and logistics centers, as current codes only provide setbacks.

Amendment 19 – Agricultural Community Uses

Section: ? (agricultural standards)

Concerned about replacing "community supported agricultural farms" with "agricultural community uses."

Requests clarification:

Why broaden the definition and what uses are included?

Are marijuana and mushrooms excluded from "agricultural community uses"?

Importance for neighbors to know what's permitted.

Asks if legalization of certain crops (marijuana/mushrooms) affects inclusion in community agricultural use.

Amendment 46 – Pedestrian Lighting

Proposed change: Clarify that "an average one foot candle of illumination" must be provided for pedestrian lighting.

Seeks the rationale:

Why specify "average"?

What prompted this change?

Will it enhance safety?

More generally questions:

What is prompting all these amendments?

Whether they're developer-driven or for another purpose.

Requests greater transparency for the community and City Council.

Cites the requirement that code changes should support Arvada's comprehensive plan.

General Suggestions

Recommends syncing specific amendments with the overall plan amendment process for clarity and consistency.

Requests more detailed justifications for each proposed code/change.

Reiner Gerbatsch; 6872 Juniper Ct stated that in regards to a staff proposal (Section 2-1-3-1) to add public facilities as allowed uses in the " district," and broadly expand the list of facilities permitted in zoning districts, including public (government) facilities.

Amendment would allow public facilities in zones previously restricted to recreation facilities only (e.g., park/open space).

Argues public facilities are not appropriate as "open space" uses, especially when intended for consumptive use.

Cites City Charter, Chapter 13.2: Park property cannot be sold/conveyed without a vote.

The 2016 Park, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan works big picture positions and funding priorities to ensure that the City's park system meets the needs of the community, change in the demographics, developing patterns and outdoor recreation needs. The subcommittee of EPAC is currently working through a refresh process as to any coordination on the purpose or needs

or add public facilities. He feels it is necessary and prudent to add the definition of open space to preclude arbitrary efficient maintenance. Further, in the event the City of Arvada really needs to add public facilities to open space, nuance of its owning trove is required. Rather than sliding under open spaces, open space is critical. It needs to be expanded in a biodiverse manner in the effort to mitigate climate change in urban islands, not curtail the additional proposed users are not open space or park uses and are not necessarily publicly owned or operated facilities. He opposes this amendment.

Mike Rawluk; 18735 W 59th Dr, Golden, Ralston Valley Coalition, states that with psilocybin you're allowed to amend the state law. Time, place and manner of CRS 4450302 says thousand foot setbacks for child care, preschools, schools, residential daycare. He doesn't see that this is in our code. Asks us to follow the lead of Parker and Castle Rock. Also for Residential Healing Centers -Monday through Friday 8 to 5pm only doors and windows of carbon screen to prevent you from inside the public area. All storage must be in permanent buildings. Air filter and vent for odor control over property lines. Also consider the spore size 3 microns. You need spore control, You need a very good HEPA filter, usually 8 or better. Secure disposal of natural meds and byproducts. Use of hazmat in processing tubebutene and carbon dioxide is prohibited. No flow from any facility into adjacent ground, storm sewer, et cetera is allowed. 8 to 5pm People could be getting treatment and leaving. Requirement for practitioners to be licensed to prescribe medicine. Right now the state requires only 150 hours and actually asks them to be licensed for basic life support. That should ring an alarm bell. Prohibit bacterial and synthetic production. Since 2019, bacterial strain Psilo 16 has been studied and used for production. Not just mushrooms. There are eight native species of Psilocycle mushrooms in Colorado, so I support that. In regards to Alkaline hydrolysis. he wants to be sure that people know that it is basically a fast process to decompose bodies and put them into the storm system. Arvada, as I understand, has an agreement with Denver Wastewater. Denver Water treats and recycles water being used by the zoos, parks, schools, golf courses and now an edible crop pilot project.

In regards to alkaline hydrolysis. You are now putting human remains into the system. That system now has recycled water and you're going to find that in these things. Edible Crop Project right now is the Colorado Water Conservation Board is partnering with Denver Water to research. They're growing crops with recycled water to include kale, tomatoes and roots. They're looking at things like select pharmaceuticals and inorganic contaminants like metals and nutrients. One thing that's discussed with alkaline hydrolysis, is what to do with the mercury in someone's teeth after they die. Are the Edible Crop Project people aware that human remains

are now going into the system? Mr/ Rawluk supports the LDC amendment submitted by the Citizen.

Lynn Clemens 6202 Kilmer Loop #102 states that she is concerned about the Director Discretion areas. There are five amendments giving the Director of CED more discretion. This is objectionable as the Director, an unelected official, already has immense power in the LDC to approve and modify almost any aspect of development criteria. The Director is mentioned at least 457 times in the LDC, of which 114 are related to the Director's power to approve and exercise discretion in what amounts to granting variances to the prescriptive aspects of the LDC. Variances or modifications would require notification of the surrounding residents. This allows neighbors to keep informed of any changes in their area. The City Council member about two years ago in a hearing on amending the LDC stated that they had likely gone overboard in granting such broad powers to the director when the LDC was adopted. This power does not seem justified. More effort needs to be given to adopting language to eliminate broadening the Director's already immense discretionary freedom. It is better to add language that clarifies the LDC regulation so everyone, developer and residents alike understand the expectations. I urge rejection of these changes. I have some other concerns. Number nine in your spreadsheet is a revision to clarify the 25% maximum roof area coverage and that does not apply to rooftop decks. Actually, I think this would be an amendment and I'm going to apply for this amendment. I believe that this should not be an exception. I think rooftop decks should only occupy 25% of the roof area because many new homes are putting in rooftop decks and they might overlook a smaller home next to it.

She is also concerned about number 10, this change specifies the height transition requirement. She is asking the commission not to amend this section by removing all projects abutting a project or property in RA and RN zoning. She is open for mixed use commercial and light industrial projects if they should abut a residential neighborhood. Many properties abut older neighborhoods which can be mainly one story or one and a half stories. This site transition is important. And number 13 is a revision of the table to allow hotels and motels as conditional use in MXS zoning. MXS zoning is defined for neighborhood and community serving centers. And as we've seen, with the addition of VRBO's in neighborhoods, there's no control over who will occupy a commercial hotel or motel. Conditional use would alert the community to the possibility. But we have plenty of areas that are MX-U and MX-T, areas where hotel and motel use is allowed and these hotels could be located. So I don't think it's appropriate for MXs use.

Madhvi Chittoor 6499 Poppy St stated that she is a 14 year old Eco Warrior, youngest human child advisor, 2024 time to be your honoree, 2024 People Magazine Earth Day featured person voted best upcoming peacemaker by 14 Noble Peace Prize warrants and founder of 501c3 nonprofit Longing for Eco ethics and the Ecoethics global movement. She stated that she fights to make cities for all living beings, humans, flora and fauna. And she wants cities like here in the city of Arvada to implement equitable land use policies that support people to live, work and thrive no matter where they come home and also coexist with Flora and fauna and be climate friendly. I'm here to present my suggestions to be included in the proposed Arvada land use code revisions. She humbly requests that the city of Arvada impose front side back setbacks of at least 100ft for multi dwelling units from the busy streets which will protect not only the physical health but also the mental health of the residents of Arvada. Her considerations for this request are air quality and noise where more setback helps reduce air impact from traffic noise and emissions. Pedestrian comfort with wider sidewalks, landscaping and buffer zones. Visual buffering, buffering where setbacks can include trees, walls or elevation changes for privacy and aesthetics and also safety with extra space for emergency vehicle access and safer pedestrian crossings. She also feels that a the city should have a setback of at least 500ft for residential units. Mandate at least one evergreen tree to be planted at the periphery of single family, home or multi dwelling units or businesses or even industries as part of the landscaping to increase visual appeal as well as increasing oxygen levels even during fall or winter. 5. When approving any development mandate that mature trees be uprooted and move to a different place like a park instead of cutting them down. She asks that the city kindly change language in the land development code rules from man made to human made so that it includes all genders. She states that in regards to sensitive areas that include natural and human made hazards with specifics like radioactive contamination, toxic chemical contamination like pfas, abandoned oil wells, the rock yard or, an abandoned coal mine. In Article 41 Environment quality; she asks that it must also include human made hazards, must change to mitigate natural hazards and human made hazards. And finally to handle industrial stormwater appropriately so that it won't affect the water quality.

Phil Lankford 16878 W 65th Circle states that number 40 (snow storage) is a requirement and is required. Snow is pushed onto the local roads, the city should require the developers to have

snow storage. He asks, where does the snow go especially during fast melt? Removing this seems like a concession for developers. This is not a minor detail, this needs to be in the LDC.

Richard Bohling; 14991 W.70th Ave is looking to address the 68 amendments, and thinks that there could be some improvements to it. He is concerned about 28 of the items that were presented. Additional info, why, and what are the changes for? Number 31-bituminous could mean black viscous asphalt and could be several grades, which one are we referring to? He would like to have Engineering specifications and what Additives are in it? There are also several other areas where it needs to be clarified.

Karen Gerbatsch- 6872 Juniper Ct. stated that she wants to do whatever LDC changes that are needed in order for there not to be changes to the status of 6800 Kilmer. What are the 2 uses, what is the definition?

Mr. Griffith closed public comment.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Ms. Thompson stated regarding No. 2, these are already allowed. They are not being added as they are already allowed in the OS district. It is just adding the uses that are allowed as part of the list

It terms of the Bituetous asphalt, that was added to specify the type of binder that was used. When it comes to technical terms, there is a provision in the code that states "Technical and non-technical words and phrases not otherwise defined in this code shall be construed according to the common and approved usage of the language, but technical words and phrases not otherwise defined in this code that may have acquired peculiar

No. 9 That was mentioned revised to clarify that 25% maximum area coverage does not apply to rooftop decks as it's written as explained in the justification. It's not quite clear whether rooftop decks are accepted the way it's written. If the planning commission feels that rooftop decks should not be excluded. That's part of this discussion.

No. 10 Specifies that the height transition requirement applies to projects within the R6, R14 and R24 zoning districts of abutting property in the RA and RN zoning districts and also including PUDs. So as currently written.

No. 13 Retail, medium or higher density hotels are in the MX-S with a conditional use permit. The explanation for 13 is that under the comprehensive plan, MX-S, MX-U and MX-T are all zoning districts that are in the mixed use or land use designation under the comprehensive plan. The purpose is to promote a wide range of land uses including retail, office, light industrial, live work and medium higher density residential. Since hotels and motels are in the MX-U and MX-T zoning districts, they're also envisioned for all mixed use zoning districts. That's why hotels and motels are included or proposed to be included as part of the MX-S zoning district but with a conditional use permit. It still would have to go through a public hearing process and ultimately be approved by the city council.

No. 15 distinguishes vehicles from vehicle equipment and clarifies that sales and rentals apply to both vehicles and vehicle equipment. So in the justification it refers to vehicle/equipment sales or rentals and that's in the definition section that slash means or so it's vehicle sales or rentals or vehicle equipment sales or rentals. In the table 3-1-2-8, it's not written the same. So in order to align that definition of vehicle slash equipment sales and rentals, it's vehicle and vehicle equipment that's added to table 3-1-2-8.

No. 17 Delete warehousing and replace the storage of products prior to the distribution to reuse wholesale and retail outlets. The reason why warehousing is deleted is, the explanation of storage of products prior to distribution to wholesale diesel outlets is not to conflate breweries and distilleries with being warehouses. That's the reason why that's stricken from there. You can't have the storage of products prior to their distribution there at a brewery or distillery. Then it becomes something else, a warehouse.

No. 19 agricultural is a use classification. It will replace community supported agricultural farms as agricultural community uses. So agriculture community uses is a use classification and community supported agricultural farms are a sub classification within the agricultural community uses. The intention is not just to limit permanent facilities to community supported agricultural farmers, but to add agricultural community uses in that classification. That's the reason why community supported agriculture farms are replaced with agricultural community uses.

No. 28 all driving surfaces must be paved, not just the alley.

No 40 Snow storage was never in our previous versions of the LDC and this was something added by our consultant. It sounds like it is something that we did not request, but they added to the code. We haven't really had to apply that section, that's why we're proposing to remove it from the code.

Regarding crematorium and cemeteries, that is in the definition section. It's to acknowledge and recognize that this is a legally recognized method of cremation here in Colorado. Also, crematoriums and cemeteries require conditional use permits, any kind of environmental impact that they may have will be evaluated at the conditional use permit stage during that application and during the public hearing process.

In terms of natural medicine, we can put in place, time, place and manner restrictions, but we have to be careful not to conflict with state law. which basically says that healing centers are like medical offices, so they should be regulated as such. And any kind of production or distribution is like a light industrial use, so they should be regulated as such and not run afoul of Colorado state law.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr. Griffith asked about medical mushrooms. He asked staff if home rule plays any role in whether or not we can say no to health or healing centers that have mushrooms?

Ms. Sargent stated that we cannot fight this.

Ms. Thompson stated that this was a citizens initiated ballot measure that was approved by the voters of the state of Colorado.

Mr. Griffith asked if we were also looking at pot in these facilities?

Mr. Smetana stated, no, just natural medicine.

Mr. Griffith asked if we have ever enforced snow storage in the past?

Ms. Thompson stated that up until 2020 when a consultant had added it, we had not.

Mr. Griffith asked if we have ever enforced it?

Ms. Thompson stated that the city asks them to designate it on their plans.

Griffith asked Mr Smetana if it affects the plans or the amount of parking?

Mr. Smetana stated that it is usually designated in landscape areas.

Mr. Griffith asked about the Director Discretion and how often it comes into play?

Mr. Smetana stated that when it is in regards with a minor modification the City asks for input from the neighbors. Bigger projects are done through a DA and City Council can have a call up if there was concern.

Mr. Griffith asked how educated do you feel the public is in regards to a call up process.

Mr. Smetana stated that it is in the LDC and they have the ability to call staff.

Mr. Griffith asked what buildings are considered Open Space?

Mr. Smetana stated that Apex rec center, Apex field house are considered open space and that it is not any kind of private infrastructure.

Mr. Griffith stated that it would be good to clarify Open space vs. Park?

Mr. Smetana stated that he will look into that.

Mr. Gay thanked staff for the additional information. In regards to item # 2, he thinks that what was stated at the May 7th meeting was that adding public facilities to the list doesn't change the fact that the LDC already allows public facilities and open space.

Ms. Thompson stated that yes, it is just listing the items allowed.

Mr. Gay stated that he does not like item 13. In a previous project, the hotel was allowed because there was inadequate consideration of the removal of sight lines.

Mr. Hannan stated that in number 17, they don't want it to become a distribution center with trucks coming in and out?

Ms. Thompson agreed.

Mr. Hannan stated that he was also concerned about #13 But as it is a conditional use, will it go through the entire approval process?

Mr. Smetana stated that, yes it would.

Mr. Hannan stated that in the past the Director Discretion has worked.

Mr. Doner asked about #10 if we have any zone districts that are in the RA or RN that are not in the R6, R13 or R24? It seems like if we did, then all of a sudden we've removed any height setback of requirements from those districts.

Mr. Smetana asked for clarification of the question. So you're asking if there are other zoning districts besides R6, R13, R4, R24 that are above RA and RN like IG or IL? I don't believe so.

Ms Thompson stated that the transition requirement is based on those. For Example, when there's an MXN, it's 25ft. When it's MXS, it's 35ft. When it's MXU or MXT, it's 45ft. So when it's a more intense use, there is a greater distance.

Mr. Doner stated in regards to #13 There was a discussion about changing restaurants to limited. He is curious about this.

Ms Thompson stated that because there are limited use provisions in the code. There's an inconsistency between the table and what's written in the code and those limitations. So the chart is changed to limited to be consistent with the provisions that limit those restaurants.

Mr. Doner asked about #51, he is curious about configurations where you have two corner lots but their frontage is the primary streets rather than that side street. How does this impact that? Does that reduce people's ability to occupy their backyard in that case?

Ms. Thompson stated that side yard setback standards for that zoning district restrict too many structures on the street side facing setback. So you don't have a structure looking like it's encroaching into the front yard. That's, that's the purpose behind this because it's not clear in the code as is.

Mr. Knapp thanked staff for doing the spreadsheet. One of the things that troubled him was the loose term Structure vs. building. He didn't see a clear definition of this.

Ms. Thompson stated that there are definitions for both of them.

Mr Knapp asked that if we have those clearly defined, why are we reinterpreting them throughout the LDC?.

Ms. Thompson stated that if that is the case, they can take a look at it.

Mr. Knapp asked about why we are restating the definition of Government facilities on Public land or Open space if it is already defined somewhere?

Ms. Thompson stated that every zone district is going to have a purpose statement which states what uses are allowed in each zone district.

Mr. Knapp questioned number 18 director discretion, why do we need to change it?

Mr. Smetana stated the one reason in particular we did want to give the director that discretion was because we heard what the concerns were as part of the LDC development in 2018-2020. We're now able to evaluate those concerns based on what the issues were. We felt we could then do that at the director approval level versus having to bring that as a major modification.

Mr. Knapp also questions # 40 snow storage.

Mr. Smetana stated the cost vs. benefit is that he's seen the snow ending up in the landscaping. The detrimental impact seems to be more than what we're benefiting from, considering we have. We didn't have this requirement for the first hundred years.

Mr. Knapp asked why the fence height for city buildings is different? Why do they not need to go through the same approvals as a private/public project?

Mr. Smetana stated that they would look at it on a case by case basis. It came into play for facilities that the City really needs to secure such as Public safety and communications facilities that need to be pardoned in a sense. We want to allow the director to have that discretion on those rather than coming through as a Major Modification. The city can still be very selective about them but they wanted the ability to have that security.

Mr. Knapp stated that it makes sense but that he doesn't see and guardrails being put on this provision with examples like Mr. Smetana provided.

Ms. Gardner stated that we can try to put some guardrails around it to better confirm it.

Mr. Aljinovich thanked staff and the public for their work on this. Stated that the handout that was given to the commission should've been given to the staff as well.

Mr. Griffith asked Mr. Smetana about the question on Open Space again?

Mr. Smetana clarified that the section about selling properties is actually in the City charter and states that real property owned, purchased or granted for use and used for park purposes by the City shall not be sold or conveyed without a majority vote. The city could not sell the land to a developer for a private project.

Mr. Griffith asked if that goes for open space as well.

Ms. Sargent stated that, yes it does.

MOTION:

It was moved by Mr. Hannan, that the LDC Ordinance Amending the Land Development Code, be recommended to City Council for approval. This motion is based on the finds of fact and approved criteria on Page 5 of the staff report.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Mr. Gay makes friendly amendment to remove Section 13 from recommendation of approval to Council.

Mr. Gay's comment is sole subject of conditional use process, why not leave it subject to rezoning process. Mr. Gay doesn't see any need for it on basis we could address in zoning process.

Mr. Hannan asks if there are any other friendly amendments.

Several members discuss being in agreement with this suggestion.

Mr. Griffith asks members to cast their votes on the friendly amendment to A-6, Item 13 and asks if there is other discussion as to the friendly amendment. No further discussion seen. Mr. Griffith then clarifies we are voting on amended form of original motion to exclude #13:

Those voting Yes: Griffith Knapp, Ajinovich, Gay, Doner
Those voting No: Hannan
Those absent: Figliolino
The motion carried: 5-1

Mr. Smetana notes that because its friendly amendment, don't need to vote on the friendly amendment itself so what the Commission just voted on the entire motion to recommend the ordinance amending the LDC to Council.

Mr. Knapp then asks if that is it or if they are going to discuss not recommending other provisions of the LDC amendments to City Council. Ms. Sargent and Mr. Smetana indicate the vote has already been cast.

Ms. Sargent notes that member on prevailing side of prior vote may move for reconsideration previously considered prevailing motion.

Mr. Knapp puts forward motion to reconsider the prior vote of approval to allow further discussion.. Mr. Griffith asks commission members to cast their votes:
Those voting Yes: Knapp, Ajinovich, Doner, Hannan
Those voting No: Griffith, Gay
Those absent: Figliolino
The motion carried: 4-2

Mr. Griffith notes we will reconsider friendly amendment and asks if there is other discussion or friendly amendments the Commission want to make. Mr. Hannan asks if there are other items people would like removed. There is discussion of process.

Ms. Sargent notes there is only one motion of consideration allowed so this vote will be last, recommends including all sections at issue if there are more than item 13.

Commission then discusses if there are any other items they want to remove, the result of discussion is that Item #13 is the only item not being recommended to approval.

It was moved by Mr. Hannan, that the LDC Ordinance Amending the Land Development Code be recommended to City Council for approval with the exception of item number 13 . This motion is based on the finds of fact and approved criteria on Page 5 of the staff report.

Those voting Yes: Knapp, Ajinovich, Doner, Hannan, Griffith, Gay
Those voting No:
Those absent: Figliolino
The motion carried: 6-0

Mr. Hannan thanks staff noting that year ago they asked all amendments be brought together and that staff has done that work.

Mr. Griffith states this will be on Council agenda for July 2, Ms. Suuk clarifies it scheduled for Council July 15.

8. **OTHER ITEMS**

It was moved to cancel the June 18, 2025 meeting

Those voting Yes: Knapp, Ajinovich, Doner, Hannan, Griffith, Gay

Those voting No:

Those absent: Figliolino

The motion carried: 6-0

The next meeting will be July 2, 2025.

9. **ADJOURNED** at 8:44 P.M.



Michael P. Griffith, Chair



Tim Knapp, Secretary



Heidi Van Gieson, Recording Secretary