

1 comment. They will discuss what policy should or could be adopted by the City. Their next meeting is
2 January 31st. There will be some presentation to them, which will describe different initiatives. They
3 need to decide what to do with it now. The Planning Commission will be looking at this and
4 recommending what they feel should be in the policy.

5
6 Commissioner Holt said he has expressed interest in joining this committee. He sent a letter to Carl
7 regarding energy conservation and the City making a statement but this hasn't been in discussion yet.

8
9 **A. Discussion of reading materials submitted by Chair Ateljevich regarding "Slope
10 Stability in Land Development"**

11
12 Chair Ateljevich asked that the minutes from these committee meetings be distributed as they need to
13 have some discussion on what the Commission needs to know and when they need to know it. She feels
14 the City needs to develop some standards.

15
16 Commissioner Lovitt said they need more specificity in the text regarding sites that are untenable.

17
18 Chair Ateljevich suggested that the Commission could organize questions and have a speaker available.

19
20 Vice Chair Mitchell wondered how they could handle this.

21
22 Ms. Srivatsa said the Planning Commission will need to do this for future subdivision applications and
23 they could have expert speaker discuss changes in technology, and what should and should not be
24 applied at this time.

25
26 Chair Ateljevich suggested a series of meetings with staff to go over the process for the zoning ordinance
27 upgrades in the work plan. She noted that staff has done a lot of research.

28
29 Vice Chair Mitchell said they hope to meet with staff every two weeks and put this in a format for the
30 Planning Commission. They are also hoping for participation from members of Council.

31
32 **7. C. TR6569 Greg Woehrle (Applicant), Soldier Field Partners, LLC (Owner); LR**
33 **Zoning and H-O-D:** Request for a subdivision of 87.9 acres into eight residential lots
34 and one remainder open space lot pursuant to Part 6, Lafayette Municipal Code and
35 California Government Code Sections 66410 et seq., located at 3148 Lucas Drive. APN
36 238-080-019.

37
38 **HDP86-04 Greg Woehrle (Applicant), Soldier Field Partners, LLC (Owner); LR**
39 **Zoning and H-O-D:** Request for 1) a Hillside Development Permit for a subdivision of
40 87.9 acres into eight residential lots and one remainder open space lot pursuant to
41 Chapter 6-20, Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC), and 2) an exception to development
42 within a Class I and a Class II ridgeline pursuant to Sections 6-2026 and 6-2027,
43 respectively, LMC, located at 3148 Lucas Drive. APN 238-080-019.

44 **Recommendation:** Open public hearing and begin discussion on the merits of the
45 applications; continue public hearing to the meeting of February 2, 2006.

46 **Project Planner:** Christine Sinnette, Tel: 925-299-3241, csinnette@lovelafayette.org
47

48 The Commission was handed out three letters and emails. One letter was from Cal Engineering &
49 Geology, one from Ann Marie Marciarille, and one from the law firm of Foley McIntosh Frey and Claytor.
50 The emails were from Clifford Tong.

51
52 Ms. Sinnette said that in December, the Planning Commission completed its review of the draft
53 environmental impact report. City staff and RBF Consulting are now working on the final EIR and
54 responses to comments, which should be completed in early February. In order to adhere to the statutory
55 deadlines required by CEQA and the Permit Streamlining Act, it is necessary to being consideration of the
56 subdivision and hillside development applications.

1 The project is a subdivision of an 87.9-acre site into 8 residential lots and a remainder parcel, and the
2 construction of 8-single family homes, as well as necessary utility and infrastructure improvements. The
3 project site is located on Burton Ridge and within the hillside overlay district. The General Plan
4 designation of the property is Rural Residential Single Family. At approximately .09 dwelling units per
5 acre, the proposed project is within the density allowed by the General Plan. The project also conforms
6 to the allowed density of one dwelling unit per ten-acre lot or a maximum density of eight dwelling units.
7 The custom home residential lots would encompass approximately 28 acres and range in size from 1.5
8 acres to 5 acres each, with an average size of 3.5 acres. Parcel A would consist of 59 acres of open
9 space and include the existing telecommunications facility.

10
11 The staff report includes a discussion of the project and its conformance with applicable provisions of the
12 zoning ordinance including Chapter 6-20, Hillside Development. It is expected that the Planning
13 Commission will conduct one or more additional hearings on other aspects of the project including
14 exceptions, alternatives, and findings. Staff's analysis consists of a table listing the applicable
15 development standards and criteria, and indicated whether or not the 8 proposed lots or building sites
16 conform to the standards and criteria. All 8 lots conform to the required development standards of the
17 LR-10 zoning district related to lot width and depth, building height, and on-site parking.

18
19 It gets a bit less straightforward when the 8 lots are compared to the development requirements for
20 subdivisions in the Hillside Overlay District. Reviewing the 8 lots against 21 different development
21 criteria, there are 98 points of compliance, 20 points of partial compliance, and 2 points of non-
22 compliance.

23
24 The staff report also lists the exceptions to the hillside regulations that the applicant is requesting, which
25 lots require which exceptions, and the findings to grant the exceptions. No additional analysis has been
26 done at this time since most of the findings rely on determinations related to loss of economically viable
27 use of the property. The applicant has submitted an economic feasibility study, and this study and a City-
28 initiated peer review of the analysis, are currently undergoing review. The results of this review will be
29 discussed in a subsequent staff report.

30
31 Ms. Sinnette closed her remarks stating that staff recommends the Planning Commission open the public
32 hearing to consider the applications. Instead of continuing the public hearing to the meeting of February
33 2nd, staff requests that it be continued to March 2nd to allow time to compile information for the economic
34 analysis. The applicant has requested 15 minutes for their presentation due to the complexity of the
35 project.

36
37 Chair Ateljevich said that on page 6, part of lot 4 and all of lot 7 are not in the 30% variance but on the
38 next page it says construction would take place on 1/3 of the lot or less and includes lot 8. She wondered
39 about these differences and asked staff for an explanation.

40
41 Ms. Sinnette said it was very difficult to put these tables together and she will accept any changes and
42 look into this further.

43
44 Chair Ateljevich said 12, 13, and 14 where it discusses different viewing sites, she noted the consultant
45 has identified the sites but the Planning Commission has made it clear that viewing sites were not that
46 specific. The vegetation is not correct in the EIR as far as the Commission not allowing non-native
47 vegetation to be planted. The tables assume they will allow non-native vegetation but the City ordinance
48 is specific.

49
50 Ms. Sinnette asked if ornamental gardens were excluded in the Hillside Overlay District.

51
52 Chair Ateljevich said what are allowed is native plants native to the vicinity but it doesn't provide for
53 ornamental gardens. These would not be standard and would be exceptions.

54
55 Commissioner Lovitt asked about the timeline.

56

1 Ms. Sinnette said the CEQA statutory timeline is one year from the date the applications were completed,
2 which was December 29, 2005. CEQA allows for a 90-day extension and the applicant had agreed to
3 that. The final EIR should be certified by March 29, 2006. According to the Permit Streamlining Act, it
4 allows a maximum of 50-days to make a determination on a subdivision map and allows for a 90-day
5 extension to that 50-day limit. This Permit Streamlining Act timeline would begin after certification of the
6 EIR. The final EIR and responses to comments should be released in February and is tentatively
7 scheduled for the February 16th Planning Commission meeting. There will be public notice of this
8 meeting. CEQA does not require a public hearing for the final EIR.

9
10 Vice Chair Mitchell asked if staff could update the Commission on the status of the economic analysis.

11
12 Ms. Sinnette said the subcommittee has met twice with the City attorney and staff is working on providing
13 additional information. The Commission will receive this information prior to the March 2nd meeting.

14
15 Vice Chair Mitchell asked about the progress with the public trail.

16
17 Ms. Sinnette answered that about a month ago, she received two exhibits from the Park, Trails and
18 Recreation Commission indicating their preferred alignment, which follows the ridge. There is a small
19 easement through EBMUD or they could come along the boundary of the property. The East Bay
20 Regional Park District indicated they would defer to the City regarding the exact alignment. The Parks,
21 Trails and Recreation Commission has begun discussions with EBMUD. The applicant has always been
22 agreeable to dedicating an easement along the property line for the trail.

23
24 Dave Bowie, attorney for the applicant, said this is an interesting project. He said there were a soils
25 engineer and the architect who will give a brief presentation. The project fully conforms to the General
26 Plan. 68% of the land is going to be permanent open space and the applicant is willing to give a
27 permanent trail easement. The draft EIR confirmed there were no environmental impacts that cannot be
28 mitigated. The staff report found in their analysis that there were two negatives which were both on one
29 lot with a location greater than a 30% slope. He knows that neighbors are concerned with the soils and
30 geology and they might suggest this evening that further study is warranted on this issue. He said the
31 draft EIR thoroughly discussed this issue. A geotechnical engineer has done a preliminary investigation
32 on the entire site and written two letters to the City, which have been peer reviewed and reviewed by Mr.
33 Coe. The situation has been fully analyzed and there is no need for further study. There were debris
34 flows because of the recent rains. There is nothing in this project that would enhance landslides and in
35 fact whatever they do will improve the situation (see page 337-13 of the draft EIR regarding project
36 implementation). He knows that there has been discussion on the required exceptions for the economic
37 feasibility. They are dedicating to permanent open space 68% of the site without compensation and this
38 is an exaction. Based on the draft EIR there is no impact tied to this project that would require fewer lots
39 than they have proposed. There is no justification for taking any more open space. The economic
40 feasibility suggests 8 lots. If the Commission were to insist on less density and more open space that
41 would be an exaction and not tied in to any actual impact. The project meets and satisfies the economic
42 feasibility.

43
44 Tim Ward, Ward Young Architects, is the architect for the project. He described the site designs and
45 architectural design they hope to use. The homes will be a ranch style development. Each parcel will be
46 5-6 acres. There are three areas focused for development, as they are the only ones out of constraints
47 such as ridgeline, slope, and declination. Visibility has been talked about and in their design it will be
48 crucial to minimize this. Site design has to incorporate grading, drainage, visibility, privacy, and soil
49 stability. In the neighborhood extension, these homes are out of any ridgeline and in the declination. The
50 critical elements for these homes are privacy to neighboring homes and the proximity to existing homes.
51 They will use extensive screening. They need to take on the drainage down the road. All driveways will
52 be pervious and limit peak flows. In each of the home sites there should be an on-site detention and
53 cisterns. There are 3 homes in the Class II ridgeline and they would look to the Planning Commission for
54 guidance how to adjust this.

55
56 Chair Ateljevich said the house on lot 1 is too close to the wetlands and has to move 50-feet away from
57 the willow riparian. The road would have to move to adjust properly.

1
2 Mr. Ward said he was aware of that but didn't want to make those changes yet.
3
4 Chair Ateljevich said they would wait to see where they would be putting the houses.
5
6 Commissioner Lovitt said in CEG's letter dated January 12th, Mr. Wolfe made a distinction between a
7 landslide and a debris flow. He wondered what a debris flow was.
8
9 Mitchell Wolfe, engineering geologist for the project, answered that a debris flow is a specific type of
10 landslide.
11
12 Commissioner Lovitt asked how they would guarantee there wouldn't be landslides or debris flows on this
13 property in the future.
14
15 Mr. Wolfe answered that within the development area looking at where the debris flows occur, they had a
16 debris flow on lot 6.
17
18 Commissioner Chastain asked what distinguished a debris flow and how is it understood.
19
20 Mr. Wolfe said they classify it as a type of material and by the mode of movement. If large pieces of
21 bedrock come off the hill that would be called a translational rotational bedrock landslide. A debris slide is
22 a shallow failure within the soils and does not involve earth flow. It is a slow moving slide primarily
23 composed of clay earth soils. A debris flow only occurs in specific areas because of certain conditions. A
24 debris flow is not generally indicative of the conditions that would cause a larger bedrock slide. There
25 was a small failure identified in one area with soil debris above lot 8 which they would mitigate with
26 mechanical measures.
27
28 Chair Ateljevich said it was her understanding that some of the larger parcels would have stables for
29 horses and would need stabilization. She asked if that was a correct assumption.
30
31 Mr. Ward said 3/4 of the homes would have stables.
32
33 Mr. Wolfe said if they are building a leveled area in a hillside environment they would have to regrade and
34 that would make the ground more stable than it would be naturally if built to contemporary standards.
35
36 Commissioner Holt asked if they could guarantee against future soil movement.
37
38 Mr. Wolfe said they would exercise the standard of professional care in the design and construction of the
39 project. There is not guaranty but there is a warranty.
40
41 Commissioner Chastain said there would be a lot of design development relative to the site plan. There
42 are various issues regarding privacy, primarily as a screening problem. He would like them to help the
43 Commission understand the sites better by establishing general guidelines with diagrams regarding those
44 issues of privacy and in relationship to the visibility of the structures off-site. He would like to know where
45 the public and private parts of the homes would be.
46
47 Mr. Ward said they have done preliminary drawings showing these areas.
48
49 Commissioner Holt said some of their analysis should be regarding visibility off-site and on-site.
50
51 Chair Ateljevich opened the meeting to public comment on this item.
52
53 Natalie Glavinovich, 1800 Camino Verde, Walnut Creek, was speaking for 3164 Lucas Drive. She said
54 she witnessed the New Year's storms and debris flows. She submitted pictures of the area for the
55 Commission. She has reservations about any house being built on lot 8, and feels it would be a danger.
56
57 Commissioner Holt asked if she felt the situation could be corrected through mitigation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

Ms. Gavinovich said there was a ravine and she did not know how to mitigate that without impacting the side of the hill.

Tina Tankka, 3165 Lucas Drive and is a neighbor of Marie Blits and below house 8. She submitted pictures of the slides. She said that two hills come together on the site and water flows into a V. She is concerned with the architecture of the homes as their homes are a standard ranch style, and if these homes are different it will impact the contour of the hillside. She wondered how far down in the bedrock the contractor will go for the foundations.

Marie Blits, 3166 Lucas Drive, said they had to put sandbags behind their house to divert the water. They have had drainage problems with the hillside before. They have dug the ditch deeper and have stabilized it more but it has to be maintained. Lot 8 is steep and she doesn't feel they can protect privacy.

Ann Marie Marciarille, 1 Lucas Court, also submitted photos of the slide. She has retained a real estate attorney who has been in touch with Planning Commission staff. The letter from her attorney requested the Commission to defer deliberations until a full and complete study of soil and water can be performed since there have been changes from the rain.

William Gavan, 2 Leeward Glen, said he has been coming to meetings for the past 5-6 years regarding this proposed development. His objection is visibility and soil stability and he feels they cannot mitigate these problems on lots 4, 5, 6, and 7. He feels the EIR is flawed when it says these issues can be mitigated. An acre or more on all sides have been impacted by recent slides. The creeks/roads get inundated with stuff coming off the hill. Visibility of the development impacts the privacy of all neighbors.

Commissioner Lovitt said that any property owner has the right to make an application and a public hearing. He wondered if there have been any years when there has not been significant runoff from the hill.

Mr. Gavan replied that there have been significant slides every 3-5 years, and he has lived in the area for 25 years.

Clifford Tong, 9 Dianne Court, representing burtonvalley.com, said they have put pictures on their website of the slides. The exception on page 12 of the staff report should include lots 5 and 6, which should be included as they fall within the ridgeline exception or slope exception. Lots 4, 5, and 6 are within the Class I ridgeline setback as well. He was disappointed that the Commission did not have the economic study because he feels that has important points that deal with economic viability. Viability deals with the economic viability of a project not the profitability of a project.

Bryan Goldwyn, 2750 Rohrer Drive, said the significant issues are soil stability, privacy, and whether these issues can be mitigated. He also submitted photos, which showed the two major slides below lot 5 and into lot 6.

Ginny Glavinovich, 3164 Lucas Drive, lives near lot 8, and feels that maintenance of drainage is critical for the houses below. Drainage in the lot 8 area is a real concern.

Doug Robison, 3154 Lucas Drive, lives at the top of the hill. He said they had to put sandbags out to divert water from their property. He said there were breeches in 5 locations on the hill. He feels this is a potential safety hazard and a real concern for the long term.

Mr. Bowie said that the comments regarding the slides and debris flows have nothing to do with this property. A speaker said he has lived there 25 years and these slides have occurred every 3-5 years. This would indicate this has nothing to do with this development. Their development has nothing to do with these slides. If the project goes forward, the situation will improve. If the project does not go forward, what has been going on will continue to occur. Developers who built the homes at the foot of the hillside should have addressed this issue at the time of their development.

1 Commissioner Holt asked what the responsibility of the current owner is for these slides.
2

3 Mr. Bowie said the general legal opinion is that if there has been no development work to change the
4 normal flow then what happens, happens. With no development to change the normal flow of water and
5 a home has been built below that, then the homeowner has created a situation for which they are now on
6 the receiving end of.
7

8 Commissioner Holt asked what the homeowners association could do about that.
9

10 Ms. Sinnette answered that this could be a condition of approval but it would be better to put that into the
11 CC&Rs and then if there were any default it would be handled through the CC&R process.
12

13 Mr. Bowie said that he disagreed with Mr. Tong's analysis. Economic viability isn't done in the abstract
14 but has to look at the reasonable expectations of the developer, and if there is some use of the property
15 that is one factor to be considered. This is a balancing act between the developer and the existing
16 homeowners. Fairness requires that there not be an exaction without compensation. This project will not
17 cause any particular impact, which would justify reducing the density that they propose. Regarding
18 privacy issues, these are impacts they are always trying to mitigate in the standard fashion using
19 landscaping and orienting the homes in a certain way. These are large lots and distanced from the
20 adjacent neighbors is great. He feels it has been exhibited that they can mitigate any issues with this
21 project.
22

23 Commissioner Holt asked in a broad sense what could be done to mitigate the existing conditions of
24 movement on the site.
25

26 Mr. Wolfe said their efforts would be focused on mitigation measures for these 8 lots and what
27 appropriate measures are required. They recognize the slide hazards that exist on lot 6 and if the repair
28 system were implemented there is a high probability the slide would not have occurred. Similarly on lot 8,
29 they recognize there is a slide hazard potential and runoff issue out of the ravine. They recommend
30 installation of a drainage culverts to intercept the water and it would be reasonable to assume if these
31 were developed they would not have this hazard.
32

33 Commissioner Mitchell said regarding areas 4, 5, 6, and 7, these are very steep. If they build a house
34 they could drill down far enough till they hit something that will hold it but would create an impervious
35 surface. One drawing called for dissipaters and during peak flows could they hold that water in a cistern
36 because just dissipating the water would still have an effect on other people.
37

38 Mr. Wolfe said the architect had taken that into consideration and recommended cisterns on the lots. The
39 other question is where they put that water. They don't put it in area that is susceptible to slides. The
40 overall geology in Lafayette, in general, is steep. Steeper hillsides have more concrete material than
41 gentler and shallower hillsides. If they are building on a steeper hillside, you are more likely, in general,
42 to find competent, hard strata than shallower elevations.
43

44 Commissioner Chastain asked Mr. Wolfe in his experience, how typical was this situation dramatized in
45 the photos.
46

47 Mr. Wolfe answered that there is a similar project where they are building houses at the bottom of a
48 hillside with similar ravines. They recognized there are debris flow hazards and rebuilt the slopes the
49 same as they have proposed here. Every project has to tailor the remedies with the requisite remedial
50 measures. There have been frequent storms in 81, 83, between 86 and 93 there was a drought, and a
51 storm in 97/98. These types of storms have to be intense periods over a short duration to cause such
52 slides.
53

54 Chair Ateljevich closed the public comment period on this item.
55

1 Ms. Sinnette suggested if the Commission had any comments or issues on the way staff prepared the
2 table or analysis, staff would like to be made aware of that. Staff has listed which lots need which
3 exceptions and in order of importance, and would like the Commission's comments on that.

4
5 Commissioner Lovitt asked if the ordinance makes a distinction in terms of hierarchy of importance of
6 exceptions.

7
8 Chair Ateljevich said that other than exceptions being Class I, II or III that the ordinance does not make
9 such a distinction. She feels the public visibility is a high priority as well as soils and geology.

10
11 Ms. Sinnette said regarding such things as aesthetics, visibility, geology, and soils, she would suggest the
12 Commission wait to receive the response to comments. The consultant has prepared the response to
13 comments by creating a series of master responses as well as detailed and individual comments. She
14 anticipates this would be ready for the Commission at their February 16th meeting.

15
16 Vice Chair Mitchell said he was glad for the staff report, which was helpful for specific issues that could
17 still be a conflict for the Commission.

18 The Commission had no comments on pages 4 and 5 of the staff prepared analysis table.

19
20 Chair Ateljevich said on page 6 it was hard for her to determine that lot 8 was part of a cluster because it
21 is different in character from the rest of the development. The Commission agreed to change lot 8 to a "-
22 ".
23

24 Chair Ateljevich said on page 7 under Structures, there is tree removal apparently for the road
25 development/driveway. It says that no swales or rock outcroppings will be impacted by structures,
26 parking or emergency access, yet lot 8 is a swale as is lot 6. On page 8, visibility is not confined to 14
27 sites. She doesn't think open space is relevant to off-site visibility.

28
29 Commissioner Holt said if the trail doesn't exist now or the easement over the property is that considered
30 a public viewing.

31
32 Ms. Sinnette said it was not on the public viewing map but the Commission asked that the EIR specifically
33 address this. Everything north of Rohrer up to a connection with the proposed Burton Ridge trail is on the
34 new master trails map. She does not know if there is an easement. In talking about the differences in the
35 number of viewing sites, one has to read what staff is trying to say.

36
37 Chair Ateljevich said she is objecting to the idea that they can only look at specific points.

38
39 Ms. Sinnette asked if Chair Ateljevich was expecting some further analysis as the six have been
40 addressed in the EIR.

41
42 Chair Ateljevich said will have to some re-staking [inaudible]. It looks like the applicant has changed the
43 width of road.

44
45 Ms. Sinnette said she checked with the City engineer and the numbers that she states in the staff report
46 he is fine with. She would double check with the fire district.

47
48 Vice Chair Mitchell said on page 12 referring to the exception for the class ridge, it shows lots 7 and 8
49 would be the only slots eligible for the exception. He would like staff to verify that lot 4 is the only one in
50 Class II.

51
52 Ms. Sinnette said she looked at only the building site and that the lot lines are of no relevance for this
53 analysis.

54
55 Vice Chair Mitchell said he would encourage the economic analysis to speed forward.

56
57 Chair Ateljevich said she appreciated the carefulness of the study.

1
2 Ms. Sinnette said the next public hearing would be on the final EIR. Discussion on consideration of the
3 application will take place at the March 2nd meeting. She anticipates the economic feasibility study will
4 take the whole meeting to discuss. This project differs from the typical application, and requested the
5 Commission's input on what staff's future reports should focus on.

6
7 Commissioner Chastain said staff should proceed as focusing on each site within the range of the criteria.
8 Privacy is an on-going issue. The Commission needs to understand the sites better relative to the
9 building design and site design of each house. It is important to have diagrams of the kinds of activities
10 planned inside the houses and in relationship to the situation off-site. They need to see how each house
11 will be used and how that fits into the larger community.

12
13 Chair Ateljevich said in the case of lot 1, she would like to see the proposed addressing of the DEIR
14 moving 50-feet.

15 Commissioner Holt said they need to look at the driveways and roads and how they connect.

16
17 Ms. Sinnette asked if the Commission would like more exhibits at this level.

18
19 Vice Chair Mitchell said they need the economic analysis. The DEIR said the environmentally superior
20 alternative is the neighborhood extension and he feels they should not rule that out.

21
22 Ms. Sinnette said the DEIR identified it as environmentally superior but it is actually only minimally above
23 the current project.

24
25 Vice Chair Mitchell said even if it were equal to the current project, he feels they should look at this.

26
27 Commissioner Chastain said he hoped Mr. Ward understands what the Commission has described so
28 that it helps them understand what are the site impacts/visibility. He does not want to wait on that
29 information.

30
31 Ms. Sinnette said the Zimmerman report goes to that level of 28 lots.

32
33 Chair Ateljevich asked if staff could identify what the Commission should refer to from that report.

34
35 **Vice Chair Mitchell moved and Commissioner Chastain seconded to continue this item to the**
36 **March 2, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.**

37
38 **AYES: Ateljevich, Chastain, Holt, Lovitt, and Mitchell**

39 **NOES: None**

40 **ABSENT: Harris and Humann**

41 **ABSTAIN: None**

42
43 **8. OTHER BUSINESS (NONE)**

44
45 **10. PLANNING MANAGER'S REPORT (NONE)**

46
47 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

48
49 **Commissioner Holt moved and Commissioner Chastain seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:30**
50 **PM to the regular Planning Commission meeting of February 2, 2006.**

51
52 **AYES: Ateljevich, Chastain, Holt, Lovitt, and Mitchell**

53 **NOES: None**

54 **ABSENT: Harris and Humann**

55 **ABSTAIN: None**

56
57