

**CITY OF CERES  
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**October 29, 2018**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** 6:00 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairperson Smith.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Commissioners: Condit, Del Nero Johnson, Kachel,  
Chairperson Smith

**ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Director of Community Development Tom Westbrook, City  
Manager Toby Wells, Senior Planner James Michaels, City  
Attorney Robin Baral, Planning Consultant Marjorie Blom,  
Administrative Secretary/Deputy City Clerk Ann  
Montgomery

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION:**

None

**CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS:**

- Dave Pratt, Ceres Citizen

Mr. Pratt made brief comments on two of the measures on the upcoming ballot.

Mr. Pratt also noted that the roads in his neighborhood were slurried and he feels it was shoddy work.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

1. Clerk's Report of Posting. The Agenda for the Special Meeting of the Planning Commission of October 29, 2018 was posted on October 18, 2018.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Commissioner Condit; seconded by Commissioner Del Nero to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion passed by the following vote:

**AYES:** Commissioners Condit, Del Nero, Johnson, Kachel, Chairperson Smith  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

## **CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR**

None

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

2. Hearing to consider a proposal for the Whitmore Ranch Specific Plan (14-10 WRSP). Rezoning (14-09 PZ) and Annexation (14-08 Annex) to guide development of 94 acres, including the certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR, SCH #201702063) under CEQA.

Director of Community Development, Tom Westbrook stated that this evening we are considering recommendation from the Planning Commission to the City Council regarding the Whitmore Ranch Specific Plan and certification of the Environmental Impact Report. Mr. Westbrook explained that we will start by introducing Matthew Gerken with AECOM, who is going to provide a short PowerPoint presentation, outlining the overall project, and then he will follow up with some comments before we answer any questions that the Commission may have, followed by opening up the Public Hearing.

Mr. Gerken thanked the Planning Commission and staff for their time and stated that he is here to answer any questions there may be and proceeded to provide a brief overview of the project, the Environmental Review process, the Findings from that process, the Public Review that occurred and then the Final EIR, responses to comments and considerations.

### Commission Questions:

- Commissioner Condit asked how many houses are in this project.

Mr. Gerken replied that they are assuming up to 441.

- Commissioner Condit continued, and that would be a population increase of about 1500?

Mr. Gerken stated 1485 or so.

- Commissioner Condit inquired, and the traffic increase is about 5%?

Mr. Gerken explained that it depends on where you're talking about.

- Commissioner Condit clarified, on Whitmore Avenue.

Mr. Gerken remarked that he did not have that percentage off the top of his head, but he did bring all the documents and can get that information for him.

- Commissioner Condit inquired about the mitigation options for schools, noting that it didn't have any listed in there. Mr. Condit asked if that was something that he was going to continue working with the School District on.

Mr. Westbrook interjected, suggesting that perhaps he can answer some of these questions for Commissioner Condit and the Commission. He went on to explain that as Mr. Gerken indicated in his presentation, and as the Commission may recall, the City adopted its General Plan latest update in May of this year. As we were going through the land use diagram portion of that, Whitmore Ranch was kind of in its planning processes. What we did or what we had the benefit of doing was to include those land use designations as you see them in the Specific Plan. A lot of times what happens when you do a Specific Plan update, the City of jurisdiction has to change the land uses accordingly to match the General Plan after that action is taken or in conjunction with that. The other thing that's interesting to note about the Whitmore Ranch Specific Plan is that it's in the primary sphere of influence. So there's the primary sphere of influence, which is something that is adopted by LAFCO, which assumes that a property within those would be annexed within 10 years or so. This property and all of those down to Roeding Road out to Faith Home Road have been in the City's primary sphere of influence, actually since 1997. That was the previous General Plan Update, so it's been in here for a quite a while; just wanted to mention that.

Mr. Westbrook continued, in terms of the area itself, as the Commission knows, La Rosa Elementary and Cesar Chavez Junior High are both schools within the annexation area. Both of those schools had gone through our process some number of years ago. He thinks for La Rosa, maybe 2005, and Cesar Chavez, 2009, but for an Out of Boundary Service Request. What that was, was the school district asking the City on their behalf to allow connection to water and sewer services. Those were both requests approved by LAFCO back in the day, and as part of that, the City is required to have the school district sign an Agreement to Annex. And so, if reorganization was ever considered at some future point, which it is now, the school district would be on board with the annexation. Furthermore, earlier this year, there was a gentleman who lives within the Specific Plan Area, and his well failed. It was going to be too costly to try to dig a new well, so he got an Out of Boundary Service Request because his well had failed and connected to City water. So, he has that same type of agreement to annex.

In terms of the Mitigation Agreement that Commissioner Condit brought up, that has kind of been an ongoing thing. So, with the West Landing Specific Plan that was annexed back in 2011, the school district and the project proponents worked independently. The City wasn't involved in that. That agreement was done just prior to the Planning Commission meeting. West Landing Specific Plan does have a Mitigation Agreement in place with the School District and the project proponents for Whitmore Ranch have also engaged in the Mitigation Agreement discussion. At this point, they're not completely done, but they're working towards resolution and hope to have that shortly, prior to the consideration of any action by the City Council. So, the Mitigation Agreement is in process.

A couple other things Mr. Westbrook wanted to point out, specifically about Whitmore Ranch and some of the improvements that are going to be made:

- As the Commission may be aware, the City was able to secure a Safe-Routes-to School grant, and so that he believes is going to be under construction next year, which will make improvements to Whitmore Avenue. What was holding it up was, (we've had the grant for quite some time), was getting the necessary right-of-way from the property owners to put in those improvements that will widen Whitmore Avenue on the south side to four lanes with a sidewalk so the kids can get to and from Cesar Chavez and La Rosa Elementary on the south side of Whitmore Avenue.
- The last thing Mr. Westbrook wanted to mention, with any residential annexation, there is sometimes a deficit in the amount of revenue that needs to be collected. What he means by that is when a new residential development is proposed and ultimately constructed, the City will receive property taxes from that home at some future point; the residents there will buy goods and services in Ceres; they'll pay sales tax which includes the Measure H tax as well. And then what's unique to this area and all of Eastgate and some of the other residential developments that have happened since 2000, is they're required to annex into a Community Facilities District. So this is another assessment that is placed on their property taxes yearly. We anticipate that that amount will be approximately \$780, and those funds collected will be split between Police, Fire and Park Maintenance. So those will pay for kind of an ongoing thing. He believes the percentages are 55% for Police, 35% for Fire and 10% for the Parks component. So, if you assume the numbers that Mr. Gerken has indicated, that's kind of the maximum amount. It would probably generate around \$325,000 per year at full buildout.

Mr. Westbrook reiterated that he just wanted to mention those items and specifically address Commissioner Condit's question about the Mitigation Agreement. That is in play and he believes there's a representative from the School District here tonight to speak on that as well.

- Commissioner Condit stated he wanted to be clear that \$325,000, once all the houses are built...

Mr. Westbrook clarified that's correct at buildout; that's only assessed once the homes are built. And that would assume that they built that higher number. If the development is a little less dense and they only build 385 houses, it would fall below that.

Mr. Westbrook stated that he and Mr. Gerken are now available for any questions there may be.

- Commissioner Kachel commented, in following up on that same thought pattern, there's a shortfall in the parks open space, about 7/10 of acre in this thing, based on the General Plan standard. It's proposed to be addressed through an impact fee collection process. What was the thinking behind that as opposed to providing the extra 7/10 of an acre?

Mr. Westbrook explained, just the mechanics of it all. The parks; basically, we attempted to design that, (and Matthew can jump in and correct him), to kind of be somewhat equitable across all property owners, so that it wasn't a significant burden or

impact to any one of the property owners. So, everybody kind of proportionately shares in the amount of park planned and by doing that it showed us just under the 7/10 under.

Commissioner Kachel stated that it hadn't occurred to him that would be an issue with the different landowners and he could see that. But the Parks department is comfortable with handling it this way, but it does leave a little bit of a shortfall. He knows, in this day and age, recreation space, open space is difficult to find for sports teams practice and what not, since they can't use school properties any more, noting like when his kids were young, they would go down to the school and practice. So, we're comfortable that we're still having adequate standards given the situation?

Mr. Westbrook replied yes and noted, actually in our inventory, there are two parks, neighborhood parks that we have yet to develop; there's Neel Park in the north and Lions Park off of Central Avenue.

City Manager Toby Wells interjected, and Eastgate Park as well.

Commissioner Kachel remarked, in the same general area.

Mr. Wells added, and this is consistent with the public facilities program where basically if you were to build the full acreage of the park, that's creditable against your fee. You don't pay both. You don't pay a fee and develop parks. It's kind of six of one, half a dozen of another. The idea is to make sure it's consistent across the whole General Plan area. When you get into the Specific Plan, that's where you have these little bit of differences; one that's equitable across to all the property owners, but one that's also equitable across the City because it doesn't all develop in a nice clear, clean area. It comes in pieces, so when you have that ability, that mix and match allows us to, in this case, to get almost all of it and that differential is made up of with a fee.

Commissioner Kachel asked; so you're addressing the City's requirements and the reality of the land-owner situation.

Mr. Wells replied that's correct.

Commissioner Kachel responded thank you very much; he appreciates the answer.

- Commissioner Condit inquired, for the traffic increase on Whitmore Avenue, do we see any updates or anything that we're going to have to do to Whitmore Avenue; are we going to have to put in a stop light?

Mr. Wells explained that the 5% increase that Commissioner Condit referenced, the 5% over existing conditions. But, recognize that the General Plan assumes Whitmore Avenue, a 5-lane facility at buildout of the whole area. So, this increase is over what's developed today, but that doesn't see where the traffic would be at full buildout for the General Plan. So there are mitigation measures put into place in terms of traditional traffic signals, that are in the Specific Plan along Whitmore, so there are additional measures that are incorporated in this part of the project.

**The Public Hearing was opened at 6:21 p.m.**

- Dave Pratt, Ceres Citizen

Mr. Pratt stated that he is still pushing for a traffic signal at Moore Road and Whitmore Avenue and asked if that was in the plan.

Mr. Wells replied, no it is not.

Mr. Pratt noted that currently the traffic backs up there, turning south on Moore Road, and then once they get on Moore Road they just take right off. With building there, traffic is really going to increase especially with Hughson increasing their population. He sees that during the weekdays, there's a lot of traffic that takes Moore Road. They don't go to Whitmore, he means Mitchell Road, and a lot of times they take Moore Road all the way down to Service. Sometimes they'll turn at Roeding and most times they don't slow down. Just as this project keeps moving forward, he's going to keep pushing for a traffic light there.

- Patricia Cousins, 3831, 3841 & 3865 Roeding Road, Ceres, CA

Mrs. Cousins stated that she realizes it's pointless for her to be here. She realizes her minority position representing herself and her family, who are partly her rural neighbors, in opposition to the desire, it seems of all the developers to take away our City seal, if that's the right word for it; replace the cornucopia and all the produce that is so abundantly shown, with houses, apartments, cars and roads. She is against it. She continues to oppose it. She and her sisters have submitted opposition to the desire to pave over the land. Again, she recommends the alternative with the west side, West Landing, whatever the development there that was annexed is called, and that it might be developed first before more land is destroyed. Thank you.

- Dan Pangrazio, Assistant Superintendent, Business Services, Ceres Unified School District

Mr. Pangrazio stated that he is here to provide an update on the School District's position regarding the development, noting that Mr. Westbrook's characterization is pretty accurate. Mr. Romano, who has quite a bit of experience with drafting Mitigation Agreements, has come into the picture here in recent weeks. But quite honestly, in the months before we hadn't made much progress, but recently we had a meeting with him and also the developers, and so we have been making quite a bit of progress in addressing a mitigation agreement, the concerns of the school district that we've expressed in our comments to the Draft EIR. He noted that they have a meeting coming up in a couple days, and hopefully a series of meetings after that to get our general understanding down in writing. There are still quite a bit of details to iron out, and really from the School District's perspective at this point, unless there's a surprise we're not thinking of, really it's the timeline that's the biggest issue at this point, because based on people's schedules and working out the details, to have it completed and the Mitigation Agreement signed by the 13<sup>th</sup> when this would go to the Council, is a little bit of a tall order. Our joint goal is to get there. And, as we've said before, we're not for or against the development; that's not the School District's role. But the Mitigation Agreement, as we've been discussing in general terms would satisfy our concerns, and then we would not be opposed. If we do not have a Mitigation Agreement signed by the 13<sup>th</sup>, then that becomes a little more problematic. Don't know where we would end up standing at that point, in terms of the next steps; we would have to cross that bridge when we get there. But, he does know that their concerns would still stand as of the 13<sup>th</sup>, if we don't have

the Mitigation Agreement in writing. But, his main point here in providing an update is we are on a good path and we're negotiating in good faith and he does believe that we'll get there. He's just not sure by the 13<sup>th</sup>, to be completely honest.

- Commissioner Kachel asked if the School District is comfortable with the circulation pattern out there, as it affects the schools and the kids, whether it be vehicular and/or pedestrian.

Mr. Pangrazio responded that he thinks the way we have to break it out, and this is how we think of it; with the new development, the question is what mitigation measures do we believe are reasonable, based on the traffic that will increase, traffic that will be created and brought to bear on this area directly adjacent to our schools, right? So, what the conditions are now, are the conditions that are there now. That's what we're dealing with. Beforehand, it wasn't one of our best areas in terms of traffic. We've gotten many areas in the district where we have concerns or complaints from parents that don't think the traffic is good enough. We deal with the concerns all the time; we hear those concerns and do what we can to try to mitigate those concerns. But, specifically, with this development, we're looking at what increased traffic would be brought to bear, based on that. So, there are a lot of different options for what the circulation may be. It's very general in the General Plan, so it's very difficult to know what roads are going to be built out when and what happens when annexation happens. There are a lot of unknowns there, so without getting too far into the details, with our Mitigation Agreement right now, it's about honing in to specific options, of portions of roads, right around the development being built out prior to earlier phases, of potentially than what they would otherwise and parts of roads that might not have been created at all; particularly Stanford Road and then also Esmar. We've got a couple of different kinds of options in play in our conversations, but those options that we've got in front of us; both options, if they end up working, would satisfy our concerns for that reasonable measure of what do we believe the developers' responsibility is to mitigate the specific increase to traffic, that it would create on our school.

Commissioner Kachel remarked that he knows you can never satisfy all the parents that pick up their kids or take to school. That goes without saying. We just want to make sure that this project doesn't create a worse situation or a bad situation. That's what we're here to do the planning for.

Mr. Pangrazio added, and that's why he's here because he has to look ahead one year, five years, ten years. He wants to be able to look that parent in the eye at the stakeholder meeting and say, this came up, we addressed it, we felt strongly about it; this is what we were able to accomplish. If we weren't able to accomplish it, then they need to understand that we're going to be fighting for those needs along the way. That's what would happen, in this kind of case, let's say if we didn't have the Mitigation Agreement go into place. We will not be satisfied with that outcome unless there's a Mitigation Agreement in place.

Commissioner Kachel agreed and noted that he's always a little uncomfortable proceeding with something when something is not in place, but he also realizes that part of the process is to work on these discussions, you've got a new player apparently involved in the process. They're very experienced in that field so you're comfortable that the things are on the table that you need to be able to track. Hopefully you'll get it resolved before it gets to the Council, before the Council can make a decision.

Chairperson Smith added, and it's a condition.

Mr. Westbrook stated that the City has nothing to do with the Mitigation Agreement. It's between the Developer and the School District. We're certainly supportive of the project proponent and the School District getting together. We want both to be happy, and so they're working through that, but it's not necessarily a condition.

Mr. Pangrazio remarked, correct him if he's wrong, but part of that question goes to, so what happens if, what happens if we're not there. And he believes the next step which would be undesirable for all, would be essentially a lawsuit; School District v. City, right? Through CEQA, we've got 30 days?

Mr. Westbrook responded that they don't anticipate that it's going to get to that point. There has been a ton of movement he believes through Mr. Pangrazio and Mr. Romano saying that they're going to get there. He believes all indications are, it's going to get done.

Commissioner Kachel stated that's what he was trying to get at. These things do take time and they can be complicated. It's been on the table the whole time. He remembers that Mr. Pangrazio raised some of these issues when this thing was first getting started. Mr. Pangrazio came before the Commission and talked about some of the same things. And now it's coming down to; well this is probably the 11<sup>th</sup> hour. The 12<sup>th</sup> hour is the City Council Meeting and hopefully it's resolved by then. And they can both get up and say, we've satisfied that.

Mr. Pangrazio remarked, that's everyone's desire and we're on that path right now. He thinks it would be ignorant for us to say that it's not possible. That's something that could go in the other direction. If it does, then it's going to be a problem. We're going to have to take whatever action is necessary at that point. But again, he is being very candid; he doesn't anticipate that. He thinks we're on the path. We do have a lot of work to do though; he is going to keep reiterating. He doesn't know where we'll be on the 13<sup>th</sup>. So we could do, at that point, if we don't have the Mitigation Agreement done and signed, then our stance would then have to be that we are in opposition and we have all the same concerns, still stand. That's what our position would have to be even if we're still working on creating the deal.

Commissioner Kachel told Mr. Pangrazio that he appreciates his openness and willingness to discuss.

Chairperson Smith agreed.

Commissioner Condit asked Mr. Westbrook, if they don't have something signed by the 13<sup>th</sup>, can the Council table?

Mr. Westbrook replied that that's an option that is afforded the Council.

Commissioner Condit interjected; to grant more time.

Mr. Westbrook continued, to grant more time, certainly. He doesn't think that staff is desirous to just move this forward. We've just kind of been plotting down a path. We're

trying to keep them on the 13<sup>th</sup> so if the Council elects to move forward, then we can start the process for the LAFCO application. But if need be, the Council is totally within their prevue to say, okay, we're going to take public testimony, but we want to make sure the Agreement is done. That's up to them.

Commissioner Kachel stated that it's just about trusting the process to get things done.

Mr. Westbrook agreed, noting that the City and School District have a great relationship and have for a long time. So, we're not looking to jeopardize that in any way.

Mr. Pangrazio agreed and stated, absolutely.

- Dave Romano

Mr. Romano stated that it was a great pleasure to be in attendance this evening, on behalf of the Alvernaz family.

Mr. Romano explained that the Alvernazes own about 20 acres that would be right in the center of the residential area. So, if you look at this Specific Plan, what you'll see are about 36 acres of School District on the far eastern edge, which includes the Middle School and the Elementary School, and then there are three 20-acre blocks. In the middle is the Alvernaz property; it's actually a singular 20-acre piece. Between them and the school are the Gaede Properties, about 10-acres and then there are three smaller 3-acre pieces. Then if you go to the west, near Moore Road, there are a number of pieces over there. The Alvernaz family has funded this entire effort. Ceres City staff put together a really competent design team, which involves AECOM. They did a great job on your Specific Plan and EIR. It involved K.D. Anderson Transportation and Engineering that does most of the work in the central valley. We're all very comfortable with them. And, O'Dell Engineering, a high quality engineering firm, out of Modesto, did the infrastructure planning. You've really got a good plan. He mentioned that he was not involved from the very beginning, but this project started about 4 years ago. It just shows you again how long and difficult the planning process is, but everybody stuck through with it to this point, and he got involved to try to assist with some closure on some things. And really, we talked about the School District here. The School District made a response letter. It's kind of a challenge, because about 20 years ago, the school districts and the development community got together and went up to Sacramento, and actually did a deal that was supposed to forever resolve disputes between school districts and developers. It was called Senate Bill 50. It set up Level I Fees, Level II Fees, Level III fees, if you ever hear those referred to, and, it worked for about ten years. But what happened was the cost of school construction grew faster than the cost of fee collection. So, school districts generally speaking take the position that even though state law is that we can collect Level I, Level II and Level III fees, we only collect, instead of 50% of what we should get, with the State matching the other 50%, we only collect about 30%-40%. And that's where on annexation projects, not on infill projects; if you buy a lot in the City of Ceres, and you're going to build a house, you would just currently pay the Level II fees - \$4.13 per square foot, and that's what you would pay. But an annexation project, the school districts are concerned that they're bigger; they're going to generate more students; they want to make sure they're fully funded. And so, when we did the West Landing project, on the west side of town, we had a lot of negotiations. He dealt with Mr. Siegel, who is now the Superintendent. The same lawyers; we came up with the mitigation agreement, that created a more robust fee collection program.

And so on the far west side of town, they'll pay more. We're having those discussions right now. What's unique here, is part of those discussions, is also the pace with which we provide some circulation because the school site is on a dead end. A lot of people show up there in the morning. They're kind of there at the same time. They've staggered the schools' starting times to try to avoid some of that traffic issue, but they realize that there's going to be some more homes. It's not an environmental issue under CEQA. CEQA analyzes, does it exceed level of service need; when do we need the traffic signals? The type of conversation we're having is really, when do we build Esmar, how do we connect it through the neighborhood and get people up to Whitmore? And we've actually had some time to meet with the Gaede family, who are between the Alvernaz property and the School District, to get them to agree to work with us to get right-of-way sooner so we can create more looping, more circulation paths on the west side of the School District, and then maybe the School District will be able to work on getting some access points into the school sites from the west side as well, to take some of the load off of Eastgate. That's the kind of the conversation we're having; it's not a CEQA project, not a CEQA issue, it's not a Specific Plan issue, but we're working that out. He is confident; it's always the imminence of hearings that make the discussions become a little bit more robust and bring them to closure. But, we've done this before; it's not out of the ordinary. He appreciates Mr. Pangrazio's time; Dr. Siegel's time. We'll be talking to their counsel after this hearing to kind of start buttoning things up. We have a standard form agreement that we used on West Landing. It's got a lot of pages in it, but most of that's boiler plate. We're just going to have to work on a few little parts of that. He's optimistic that we're going to get there. The project is consistent with Ceres' General Plan. He's appreciative of all of staff's work, your neighbor's work, and working with us. He is here to answer any questions there may be. On behalf of the Alvernazes, this project has come before you after a long path, and is ready to move forward and be approved. He thanked the Commission for their time and reiterated that he's available for any questions.

Commissioner Condit asked what fee level this project would fall under.

Mr. Romano replied that the Ceres School District currently collects Level II fees, and Level II fees are at \$4.13 per square foot based upon the current report. They redo that report every year; it adjusts a bit every year, and there are rules and parameters that allow them to collect Level II. If they don't meet those, they collect Level I, which he thinks is currently \$3.79. And, if the state runs out of money in the Bond program, and you're a Level II district, it just goes to Level III, which is basically double Level II. But, take that number, and multiply it by two; \$8.26 per square foot. There are no Level II districts that he knows of. The state has passed the bond and so there is the availability of bond funding, but it is up to the Governor to keep that bond funding replenished and these districts get in line for that money. But currently it's Level II; a long answer to a short question.

**The Public Hearing was closed at 6:39 p.m.**

Commissioner Condit thanked the Developers' willingness to work with the City and the School District. They've put a lot of time and effort into this. He went onto explain that his feeling on this project is we can't move forward right now. You've heard him echo this; public safety concerns and traffic concerns since he's been on the Commission. His views haven't changed, especially on expanding our City limits.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Commissioner Kachel; seconded by Commissioner Del Nero to recommend to the City Council the following:

- 1) Certification of the Whitmore Ranch EIR of the proposed project, making findings, as set forth in Resolution No. 18-21, including Appendix A;
- 2) Approval of the project, including adoption of the Whitmore Ranch Specific Plan and related Financing Plan, as set forth in Resolution No. 18-22;
- 3) Rezoning of the Whitmore Ranch Specific Plan area, subject to the findings contained in Resolution No. 18-23; that would include adoption of the Statement of Overriding Conditions, finding the project benefits outweigh the environmental impacts identified.
- 4) Recommend Council initiate proceedings for annexation to file with LAFCO.

Motion passed by the following vote:

**AYES:** Commissioners Del Nero, Johnson, Kachel, Chairperson Smith  
**NOES:** Commissioner Condit  
**ABSENT:** None

Chairperson Smith thanked Mr. Romano, the School District, Mr. Gerken, Mr. Alvernaz; stating the Commission appreciates their time.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

None

**PUBLIC MEETING(S):**

None

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

None

**MATTERS INITIATED BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**

None

**REPORTS:**

Commissioner Condit reminded everyone that Election Day is next Tuesday; remember to vote.

Director of Community Development, Tom Westbrook reminded the Commission that the Halloween festival that used to be held in this building; this year they're doing something different. It's a "Trunk or Treat" that is going to be held on downtown 4<sup>th</sup> Street, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Halloween night.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The Commission adjourned at 6:43 p.m. to the next regular scheduled Planning Commission meeting of Monday, November 5, 2018.

APPROVED:



Laurie Smith, Chairperson

ATTEST:

  
Tom Westbrook, Secretary

1: PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OCTOBER 29, 2018 PC, 10/29/18, 10/29/18