

1 **A. Review of Draft Environmental Impact Report for: TR6569 Greg Woehrle**
2 **(Applicant), Soldier Field Partners, LLC (Owner); LR Zoning and H-O-D:** Request for
3 a subdivision of 87.9 acres into eight residential lots and one remainder open space lot
4 pursuant to Part 6, Lafayette Municipal Code and California Government Code Sections
5 66410 et. seq., located at 3148 Lucas Drive. APN 238-080-019.

6
7 **Review of Draft Environmental Impact Report for: HDP86-04 Greg Woehrle**
8 **(Applicant), Soldier Field Partners, LLC (Owner); LR Zoning and H-O-D:** Request for
9 1) Hillside Development Permit for a subdivision of 87.9 acres into eight residential lots
10 and one remainder open space lot pursuant to Chapter 6-20, Lafayette Municipal Code
11 (LMC); and 2) An exception to development within a Class I Ridgeline pursuant to
12 Section 6-2026 LMC, located at 3148 Lucas Drive. APN 238-080-019.

13 **Recommendation:** Complete public hearing, conclude comments from the Planning
14 Commission, and direct staff and the EIR consultant to prepare the responses to
15 comments and final EIR for the Solider Field Subdivision.

16 **Project Planner:** Christine Sinnette, Tel: 925-299-3241, csinnette@lovelafayette.org

17
18 Chair Humann recused himself from this item and left the meeting at 9:35 PM.

19
20 The Commission took a break at 9:35 PM.

21
22 The Commission resumed their meeting at 9:46 PM.

23
24 Ms. Sinnette said this was the second of two scheduled hearings on the draft Environmental Impact
25 Report (EIR) for the Soldier Field project. The statutory period of review is October 11 - November 25,
26 2005. The draft EIR was prepared by RBF Consulting and concludes that the project has less than
27 significant impacts on land use, traffic and transportation, aesthetics, resources, etc. it concluded that
28 there would be no significant impact that could not be mitigated. The Circulation Commission has
29 conducted a public hearing on the draft EIR and had some comments on the cumulative impacts on St.
30 Mary's Road, and relationship to projects that are going on in Moraga. They also commented on
31 landslides and how they impacted the roadway. The Design Review Commission Chair appointed a
32 subcommittee to review the aesthetics and land use aspects of the draft EIR. They will be submitting
33 comments within the review period. Staff has received four letters on the draft EIR and copies have been
34 submitted to the Commission. Scott Smith, City of Lafayette attorney, Laura Worthington-Forbes, Darcy
35 Kremin, and Dustin Joseph of RBF Consulting are all present to answer any questions.

36
37 David Bowie, representing the applicant, said he wanted to respond to comments received from the last
38 hearing. The engineering geologist was present. One of the main concerns expressed by neighbors was
39 in regard to the visibility analysis included in the draft EIR. The draft basically concluded that there were
40 essentially screened views of the site with open views only from the Burton School area, Buckeye Field,
41 and Sweet Drive, which the draft EIR found could be mitigated. Several neighbors expressed that the
42 visibility was much greater. They went to the project site and he handed out pictures taken from the site
43 looking out. They went to some of the viewing areas and looked back to the property site and the
44 vegetation was as effective in screening the project site. This shows how effective vegetation can be as a
45 mitigation measure. Mr. Bowie produced a photo showing the viewing area from the Sweet Drive and
46 Burton School areas (the soccer field). The home locations were on the other side of the ridge. When on
47 the soccer field itself, you cannot see the site. This illustrates that visibility is adequately addressed in the
48 EIR.

49
50 Mr. Bowie continued to address privacy issues that were raised. This was also an issue that the draft EIR
51 concluded could be mitigated. Privacy is always a balancing act. In this instance there are reduced
52 expectations of privacy because the lower neighborhood is a fairly densely crowded neighborhood within
53 close proximity to each other and with minimum setbacks. They are siting the homes to minimize and
54 avoid unduly burdensome impacts. The third issue that was raised was regarding soil stability and
55 geology. The last issue was project alternatives and the inadequacy of the draft EIR to consider other
56 alternatives. A situation where all significant impacts can be adequately mitigated would suggest there is
57 no need to explore another alternative. They feel the draft EIR is adequate.

1
2 Mitch Wolfe, Cal Engineering, is a local geotechnical engineer. He is working with the City of Lafayette
3 on the library and is familiar with the geology of the area. He understands the concerns raised regarding
4 impacts of the project on landslides and the design concept is designed to mitigate all landslides identified
5 by the project. If a landslide is within the project, it will be mitigated with standard measures. There were
6 also issues raised with regards to hydrology and that the development could increase slides in other
7 areas. This project has been designed to reduce the amount of drainage and implementation of the
8 project would actually reduce the amount of water and potential for landslides.
9
10 Vice Chair Ateljevich asked about the drainage and that it would also impact Grizzly and Las Trampas
11 Creeks and wondered if either creek would be impacted with higher peak flows.
12
13 Mr. Wolfe answered it was his understanding by the hydrology study that there would be less than 1%
14 increase in peak flows.
15
16 Vice Chair Ateljevich asked why that information wasn't in the EIR and perhaps mitigated.
17
18 Mr. Wolfe said he would have to look into that.
19
20 Vice Chair Ateljevich said in regards to repair of landslides, for instance with Lot 8 in a drainage swale,
21 and both above and below the house are groups of oak trees, how can that slide be repaired without
22 impacting the trees.
23
24 Mr. Wolfe replied that he would have to look into the individual tree plan. Their proposal to mitigate the
25 landslide issue on Lot 8 is to construct buttress fill in the ravine designed to build a house upon and to be
26 a landslide debris collection area.
27
28 Commissioner Harris said that on the landslide features map (3.7.3) it looks like 2 or 3 are identified slide
29 zones (Lots 3 and 5) and wondered if there has been a subsurface investigation.
30
31 Mr. Wolfe said there has been no subsurface investigation at this time, as that would take place when the
32 homes sites have been established.
33
34 Commissioner Harris said that assuming mitigation for landslides what kind of foundations would be built
35 for the homes.
36
37 Mr. Wolfe answered [inaudible].
38
39 Commissioner Harris said he was concerned that they don't know what's under those lots now due to
40 experiences with other subdivisions.
41
42 Mr. Wolfe said that was a good point but that a detailed geotechnical exploration would be undertaken for
43 all the lots once the homes are established. Right now it would be conceptual.
44
45 Commissioner Holt asked if they could repair the soil so that it wouldn't slide.
46
47 Mr. Wolfe replied in the affirmative.
48
49 Commissioner Holt asked if he based this on borings.
50
51 Mr. Wolfe said he has worked on repairing landslides in similar areas where they are now proposing to
52 develop.
53
54 Vice Chair Ateljevich opened the public hearing on this item.
55
56 Alison Hill, 932 Hawthorn Drive, representing the Parks, Trails and Recreation Commission, said that Jeff
57 Peacock was also present. They are interested in a trail that connects from the northern to the southern

1 end. The old trail plan and the new one they are working on along with East Bay Regional Park District
2 show a trail linking Briones to Las Trampas. They agree with what's been shown but need a connection
3 to the south. They have been speaking with the people who own the stable and will work with them to
4 provide an easement through their property. There is a fire road in the area and an ideal connection
5 would be through the East Bay MUD land. It is essential for their plan for this connection.

6
7 Jeff Peacock, Vice Chair of the Parks, Trails and Recreation Commission, said they are revising the
8 Master Trail plan for Lafayette. He produced a working copy of the map to be included in the revised
9 Master Trail Plan they have been working on.

10
11 David George, 2730 Oak Canyon Road, lives on the south side of the ridge accessed by Rohrer Drive.
12 He said he has read the draft EIR in detail. Despite what the draft EIR says, he feels building homes
13 adjoining Class 2 ridgelines are unmitigable for the hillside ordinance and there are two homes that are
14 directly impacted by both the Class I and Class II ridge setbacks. By the existing vegetation ordinance in
15 the General Plan, all four of the homes on the Class 2 ridgeline cannot be concealed by existing
16 vegetation.

17 Mr. George said from the south side looking north towards the ridge, the draft EIR did not incorporate
18 these viewpoints. The homes are highly visible from Rohrer Drive and from the lower area on the public
19 trail. He will submit photos of the ridge from those points showing how visible the homes would be. This
20 will make a mockery of the Hillside Ordinance.

21
22 Mr. George continued saying the privacy issue for surrounding existing residents was not addressed in
23 the draft EIR. The homes are directly above his neighbor the Goldwyn's bedroom. East Bay MUD will
24 not be able to provide water to the homes. The homes will exacerbate mudslides on the south side of the
25 Class II ridge. He is concerned that the draft EIR says if a bunch of critical ordinances are set aside then
26 the impact of this project will be "less than significant". He is not opposed to developing the site and in
27 favor of the Lucas Drive extension concept, which was briefly touched upon in the EIR. Drainage and
28 stability issues of the property he feels could be mitigated successfully.

29
30 Commissioner Mitchell asked staff about the visibility the speaker brought up on Rohrer Drive and where
31 the public viewing area terminates.

32
33 Ms. Sinnette answered that the public portion ends at the swim club and anything east of that is private so
34 that portion would not be considered under the evaluation.

35
36 Ann Marie Marciarille, 1 Lucas Court, Lafayette, said she wrote comments to staff. Every map she
37 viewed this evening perpetuates the omission she outlined in her letter. The maps exclude the residents
38 at 1 Lucas Court (Swale A).

39
40 Bryan Goldwyn, 2750 Rohrer Drive, owns the horse stables. Regarding the sliding scale of privacy
41 mentioned by staff earlier, which is weighted for master bedrooms specifically and where the homes are
42 and feels the elevations are impossible to mitigate. Lots 5 and 6 look directly into their master bedroom.
43 He had a photograph taken from the front of his house. He will be preparing written comments and
44 enclose the photographs. Although it is a private road, there are a number of people from the swim club
45 and tennis club and neighborhood that walk up to see the horses. The public significantly uses this road.

46
47 William Gavan, 2 Leeward Glen, Lafayette, said he supports Clifford Tong's burtonvalley.com letter to the
48 City. The Rohrer extension is privately maintained but has been dedicated to the City. The City has never
49 accepted it because the City does not want to maintain it but it is a very public road. The eastern end of
50 Rohrer Drive is 2nd or 3rd most public area in all of Burton Valley. He would like the EIR to address that
51 as a prominent viewing area. He feels that for residents south of the project there is no way to mitigate
52 visibility.

53
54 Virginia Glavinovich, 3164 Lucas Drive, wanted her letter entered into the public record and wanted to
55 address the comments from the geotechnical expert. The #8 area has a lot of landslides and her home is
56 moving. Another home in the area is also experiencing the same problem. She feels the ridgeline is not
57 stable.

1
2 Bill Nagle, 3172 A Lucas Drive, is concerned with the EIR not adequately addressing subsurface water.
3 Water has been going underneath his house because the slope is very significant (near Lot 8). He
4 doesn't see how subsurface water was not addressed in the EIR.
5
6 Mr. Nagle said regarding the alternative section he felt it was a good idea to consider extending the
7 development out Lucas Drive, as that area is more level. He is concerned the development will create
8 more landslide problems.
9
10 Brad Kisner, 3159 Lucas Drive, lives directly behind Lot 2. He is concerned with privacy issues as Lot 2
11 looks into the south side of his home and there is no vegetation to prevent that impact.
12
13 Mr. Kisner also stated that the EIR does not analyze or come up with any true mitigations. The EIR
14 focuses their viewpoint on where people can't see the home sites rather than where they can be seen.
15
16 Vice Chair Ateljevich recommended Mr. Kisner submit those sites in writing.
17
18 Mr. Kisner said he would do that. The public trail from the top of Rohrer Drive and Buckeye Fields it is
19 extremely visible. There are 750 members of Rancho Colorados who use the tennis club and the club is
20 open to the public.
21
22 Mr. Kisner explained that there is seepage underneath his house and it is wet and he has done
23 everything he could to mitigate that himself but the pressure of the upper hills pushes water underneath.
24 Slides continue behind homes on the lower portion of Lucas Circle and the initial repairs did fail.
25
26 Commissioner Mitchell asked if Mr. Kisner had any comment on the neighborhood extension alternative.
27
28 Mr. Kisner said at the February 17th hearing he recommended where the extension went up with similar
29 size lots and houses as those that exist on Lucas Drive. He would like to see a true extension of Lucas
30 Drive.
31
32 Cliff Tong, 9 Dianne Court, representing burtonvalley.com., recognized the cooperation of Greg Woehrlé.
33 At the last hearing there was discussion about the economic feasibility study and a peer review ordered.
34 The Class I ridgeline the exception hinges upon the ability that to not grant it would essentially result in
35 deprivation of all economic value of the property. This is an extremely high bar. The feasibility study that
36 was submitted does not address that. For Class II ridgelines the bar is slightly lower which says they
37 need to show there is no other economically viable way to develop the property without the granting of the
38 exception. The City should not be in the business of assuring that a property owner gains the proper
39 level of economic value on his investment. The feasibility study violates a number of viability principles
40 with the inclusion of some costs. There is \$590,000 for landslide repairs built in and this has nothing to
41 do with the validity of the project or the rationale of the City to grant the exception for the project.
42
43 Commissioner Mitchell asked staff about the relationship between the economic study and the Class I
44 ridgeline criteria used, which state that all economic viability would need to have been lost.
45
46 Ms. Sinnette said that is what the findings state and that is subject to interpretation.
47
48 Commissioner Mitchell asked if the applicant was currently looking to increase the number of units
49 beyond 8.
50
51 Ms. Sinnette responded that 13 were necessary but 8 would be an economically viable use of the
52 property.
53
54 Scott Smith, City attorney, said the study submitted by the applicant concludes there is a \$2.4 million gap.
55 Assuming all those variables are true he would suggest the project isn't viable. The expected rate of
56 return is not the same as the total lack of economic use. Whether the gap is true, remains to be seen and
57 whether that gap is deprivation of economic use is another question.

1
2 Commissioner Harris asked about the issue of economic return. On page 3.2-23 of the EIR, he would like
3 some added discussion of the assumption in the EIR that this level of development is the only economical
4 viable use of the property or not.
5
6 Mr. Bowie said regarding the issue of privacy, the EIR draws a distinction between the public portion of
7 the road and private portion of the road so the EIR is correct in its analysis. Privacy issues were raised
8 and he feels this is usually a balancing act usually addressed when actually siting the homes. Regarding
9 drainage and soils, the testimony has indicated there are currently existing drainage and soil problems
10 without any development on the site. The net result of development will result in improved conditions.
11 The draft EIR has adequately addressed that it can be mitigated. The discussion on economic feasibility
12 is not an environmental issue and not usually addressed in an EIR. This will need to be addressed as
13 part of the development process. This is not a proper topic for the EIR and feels the EIR has addressed
14 all the compliance issues. Regarding the neighborhood extension alternative, the draft EIR addressed
15 that issue specifically in the analysis and it mentions that the neighborhood extension alternative would
16 still require exceptions to the Hillside Ordinance. There is no substantive difference between the
17 neighborhood extension alternative and the proposed project alternative as it can be fully mitigated.
18
19 Vice Chair Ateljevich closed the public hearing on this item.
20
21 Vice Chair Ateljevich addressed the economic study and it was her hope that they could appoint a
22 subcommittee this evening comprised of Planning Commissioners and staff to identify some of the
23 information needed to determine [inaudible]. The peer report should correctly identify if there is
24 information they don't have about the value of the lots as their current information is based on 2-year old
25 information.
26
27 Commissioners Holt and Lovitt agreed to serve on this subcommittee.
28
29 Vice Chair Ateljevich said Page 3.2.-1 begins the environmental analysis. Regarding mitigation 3.2.3-2A,
30 she feels the project sponsor could submit and incorporate better suggestions but doesn't see adopting
31 the Zimmerman Master Plan guidelines. The study suggests that some of the lots are not suitable for
32 two-story homes.
33
34 Commissioner Mitchell said he agreed, as he didn't think it spoke to their interpretation of the City's
35 ridgeline ordinance.
36
37 Vice Chair Ateljevich said regarding 3.2-2B the mitigation says plans will be reviewed and approved by
38 the City. She wondered if this was enough because it should be reviewed by the Design Review
39 Commission but approved by the Planning Commission.
40
41 Ms. Sinnette said the process would include the entire City process.
42
43 Vice Chair Ateljevich said in the General Plan analysis, LU-1.1 policy on scale refers to the same design
44 guidelines and she feels it doesn't address the scale at all.
45
46 Commissioner Holt said he doesn't see the relevance but felt the last sentence in the 3rd paragraph was
47 important and should stay.
48
49 Commissioner Lovitt said the City ordinance covers that in another sentence but is a mitigation for scale.
50
51 Vice Chair Ateljevich said it should conform to the scale of the neighborhood and should use the same
52 mitigation measures for privacy.
53
54 Commissioner Lovitt suggested striking all references to the old plan.
55
56 Vice Chair Ateljevich said they could make the comment that they don't feel the old plan should be the
57 guidelines.

1
2 Commissioner Lovitt said on 3.2-15, using LUG.3 mitigation, the visibility analysis contained in 3.3 of the
3 draft found that many of the homes could be concealed.

4
5 Vice Chair Ateljevich asked if in the process of project review, there was found to be greater visibility in
6 other places than one of the 4 in the EIR, are they still free to use that analysis in their review?
7 Mr. Smith answered yes, what the Commission is bound to, is substantial evidence presented during the
8 proceedings and the Commission could respond positively to that evidence and incorporate it.

9
10 Commissioner Lovitt said if many of the homes could be concealed when viewed from below, does that
11 mean in the future they could not consider other viewpoints.

12
13 Mr. Smith said no, if there was testimony given to other points.

14
15 Vice Chair Ateljevich said on 3.2-18, the EIR says Lot 3 is in a Class I setback but her overlay shows Lot
16 3 is not in any setback. There is a mitigation for wetlands so then it would be in a Class II setback but
17 she thinks this should be checked into. Lots 7 and 8 are in a Class I setback. Lot 7 is completely in a
18 setback, Lot 8 is a little in a setback. Lots 4, parts of Lot 5 and 6 are in a Class II ridgeline, and the
19 consultant said Lot 2 is also but Lot 2 is not in a setback.

20
21 Commissioner Lovitt said towards the end of the discussion on Policy OS-1 there is a statement that says
22 "given the constraints of the site, maintenance of the ridgeline setback create more significant impacts in
23 other areas" and he was not sure of that standard.

24
25 Vice Chair Ateljevich said this was based on 8 houses but the City goal is not to develop ridgelines.

26
27 Commissioner Lovitt said in the discussion on Policy OS-1.2 there is an inconsistency because much of
28 the site remains in its natural state.

29
30 Vice Chair Ateljevich said this was okay.

31
32 Vice Chair Ateljevich said in OS4.3 policy, regarding preserving existing woodlands, she doesn't think this
33 will be preserved if the landslide repair is done on Lot 8.

34
35 Vice Chair Ateljevich said in OS-5.1, this is where she questioned the impact on Las Trampas Creek.
36 She doesn't feel offsite drainage impacts have been considered.

37
38 Vice Chair Ateljevich said on 3.2-.20, Policy P-3.1, they must show the regional trail system as well as
39 access trails.

40
41 Vice Chair Ateljevich said in Policy OS-1, she feels they really don't know what they are getting into,
42 especially regarding Lot 6 and parts of Lot 8.

43
44 Commissioner Lovitt said on 3.2-22, regarding Lots 6 and 7, the project will not meet the regulations
45 between Class I and II ridgeline setbacks.

46
47 Vice Chair Ateljevich said no mitigation was required if they grant the exceptions.

48
49 Mr. Smith said this was the hardest part of the EIR because they are up against a finding or constraint,
50 and the Commission may have to struggle with this. They are coming to the no exceptions alternative but
51 this may not be feasible because it is illegal according to U.S. law. They are constrained to approve
52 mitigations that are constitutional.

53
54 Vice Chair Ateljevich said that they don't have to grant all the exceptions.

55
56 Mr. Smith said they have to consider all layers of the hillside constraints and whether they add up to no
57 development because the applicant says only 1% of the site is developable. If the Commission accepts

1 that conclusion then that's probably good enough for purposes of the EIR. You can take that 1%
2 developable area and test it against the economic analysis and the physical constraints. He suggests the
3 Commission think about the layers of constraints for purposes of the EIR, and then, back into the density
4 required by the constitution. Mitigations or alternatives that you might impose aren't feasible if they are
5 unconstitutional.

6
7 Commissioner Harris said on 3.2-20, regarding soil erosion (Policy OS-7.1), he feels the potential of
8 interaction of underwater moisture is not satisfied and that issue has to be investigated.

9
10 Vice Chair Ateljevich said that in d. on page 3.2-24 that structures in the Hillside Overlay District are not
11 standard for ridgelines and mitigation measures are in the aesthetics and design. That does not really
12 mitigate impact and that design can't mitigate the impact on ridgelines. She asked about the
13 perpendicular orientation of the houses.

14
15 Commissioner Chastain said this was part of the master plan.

16
17 Commissioner Holt said this should be omitted.

18
19 Commissioner Chastain said in e. on 3.2-25 that this was not a bad idea but they did not need to refer to
20 building orientation.

21
22 Vice Chair Ateljevich said in h. on 3.2-25 they should skip the list of plants, as they know what they want.
23 The idea that they should include non-native plants was not in conformance with the City's ordinance.

24
25 Vice Chair Ateljevich said regarding the density permitted with economic viable use, she feels they were
26 not in a position to make this finding yet. She also felt they were not in a position to make the findings
27 regarding the Class II ridgeline. On 3.2-27 regarding visibility, there is some visibility from Lot 3 from
28 Sweet Drive, Lot 4 from Burton Drive, and Lot 1 from Burton Valley School.

29
30 Commissioner Lovitt said there were continued references to things that were not the City's standards.

31
32 Commissioner Lovitt said on page 28, Paragraph g, each proposed house site location would minimize
33 visibility.

34
35 Commissioner Holt said he did not have a problem with this because they were sited to minimize visibility.

36
37 Vice Chair Ateljevich said this would be compliant with mitigation.

38
39 Commissioner Chastain said the paragraph describes optimizing privacy between home sites and this
40 should be made clear as it sets a standard.

41
42 Commissioner Holt said in all cases the homes would be subject to design approval and this outweighs
43 everything else, and felt they were getting too specific.

44
45 Commissioner Lovitt said he was not sure if this was between the new homes or existing homes.

46
47 Vice Chair Ateljevich took a straw vote on the comments in paragraph g.

48
49 Commissioner Harris thought that this was important.

50
51 Commissioner Mitchell was okay with this sentence.

52
53 Commissioner Holt was okay with the sentence.

54
55 Vice Chair Ateljevich said she was okay with the sentence.

56
57 Commissioners Lovitt and Chastain also were okay with the sentence.

1
2 Vice Chair Ateljevich said regarding the fire department regulation requiring roads to be 36-feet wide to
3 allow parking on both sides of the, the Commission might not want parking on both sides of the road.
4 They should give themselves leeway to remove parking and allow a narrower road if they want to.
5

6 Ms. Sinnette said if the Planning Commission should make a decision to continue this item to a specific
7 meeting they should also make a motion to extend the public review period. CEQA allows them to have
8 up to a 60-day public review period up to 60 days. If the Commission feels they could complete this at
9 the December 1, 2005 meeting, they should extend the public review period to December 2, 2005 at 5PM
10 for public comment.

11
12 Commissioner Harris said he would not be available between now and December 14, 2005.

13
14 Commissioner Harris said in 3.3 regarding aesthetics, he was concerned about a full picture of the off-site
15 visibility issues. He would like to see more information about visibility from public view sites on the south
16 end from the two locations.

17
18 Commissioner Harris said in 3.5-14, one of the mitigation measures focuses on grazing, and he wonders
19 who would manage animals on the site and to him, this does not seem practical. The grazing issue
20 comes up again in 3.5-16.

21
22 Commissioner Harris said in 3.7-12, there is the same issue and the potential for landslides with
23 underwater flow interacting with landslide conditions. He feels this needs more investigation.

24
25 Commissioner Harris said in 3.10-7, Vice Chair Ateljevich had brought this up regarding irrigation up to
26 100-feet horizontal distance.

27
28 Vice Chair Ateljevich said this was not as bad as she read it. It's "if" landscaping is within this 100-feet of
29 defensible space then it has to be irrigated, and this was an easier standard to meet.

30
31 Vice Chair Ateljevich directed staff to set up the agenda with the draft EIR being first on the agenda.

32
33 Ms. Sinnette said the continued items would be heard first and the draft EIR would be the last of the
34 continued items.

35
36 Vice Chair Ateljevich said other new items would continue after the Solider Field draft EIR.

37
38 **The Commission voted to continue the public hearing to the meeting of December 1, 2005, and to**
39 **extend the public comment period on the draft EIR to December 2, 2005.**

40
41 **AYES: Ateljevich, Chastain, Harris, Holt, Lovitt, and Mitchell**

42 **NOES: None**

43 **ABSENT: Humann**

44 **ABSTAIN: None**

45
46 **8. OTHER BUSINESS (NONE)**

47
48 **9. PLANNING MANAGER'S REPORT (NONE)**

49
50 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

51
52 **Commissioner Holt moved and Commissioner Harris seconded to adjourn the meeting at 11:45**
53 **PM to the regular Planning Commission meeting of December 1, 2005.**

54 **AYES: Ateljevich, Chastain, Harris, Holt, Lovitt, and Mitchell**

55 **NOES: None**

56 **ABSENT: Humann**

57 **ABSTAIN: None**