



NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

**CITY OF ALBANY
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION
City Council Chambers, 333 Broadalbin Street SW
Monday, October 24, 2011
5:15 p.m.**

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER (Chair Faller)
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG
3. ROLL CALL
4. APPROVAL OF THE February 7, and March 23, 2011 MINUTES
5. OVERVIEW OF LAND USE PROCESS
6. REVIEW OF PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS
7. ACTIVITY UPDATE
8. NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: November 7, 2011
9. ADJOURN

The location of the meeting/hearing is accessible to the disabled. If you need special accommodations to attend or participate, please notify the Human Resources Department in advance by calling 541-917-7500.

City of Albany Web site: www.cityofalbany.net



TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Planning Staff (David Martineau, Anne Catlin, Evan Fransted)

DATE: October 13, 2011 for the October 24, 2011 Work Session

SUBJECT: Albany Development Code Amendments (Planning Files DC-02-11 and DC-03-11)

Action Requested: Review proposed amendments to the Albany Development Code (ADC), and give general direction to staff for the final draft to be presented at the November 7, 2011, Planning Commission public hearing.

Background: Prior to reviewing the proposed amendments, staff will provide an overview of the different levels of land use reviews.

Amendments Summary: The amendments are divided into two planning files.

1. Site Plan Review Process Amendments (DC-02-11): The purpose of these changes are to: 1) make sure that any Site Plan Review process that involves interpretation is a land use decision; 2) streamline and simplify the process; 3) fix conflicting sections.

There are currently three levels of Site Plan Review:

- Option A (new development, Type I-L, limited land use decision);
- Option B (additions or increased intensity to existing site or development, Type I-L limited land use); and
- Option C (change of uses, Type I administrative level review)

The Site Plan Review Option C is a Type I process. The Type I process is a review based on standards specified in the Code that do not require interpretation or the exercise of policy or legal judgment. It does not require notice to surrounding property owners or ability to appeal the decision. Unfortunately, the review criterion for the Option C application often requires staff interpretation and legal judgment. It is possible that a decision on an Option C could be appealed to LUBA if the petitioner made the case that the Option C review criteria are discretionary and a person is adversely affected. We consulted City Attorney Jim Delapoer and he agreed that the Option C criteria do not fit the Type I process. We recommend that the Option C application be eliminated and replaced with a Site Plan Review Type I-L process.

The three different types of Site Plan Review applications (Options A, B and C) can be combined and streamlined to reduce staff time and paper. Projects currently reviewed through the Site Plan Option C process that qualify for the Type I process will simply be processed administratively. There are several ADC sections that conflict and should be fixed at this time.

2. Miscellaneous ADC Amendments (DC-03-11): This package includes several staff identified amendments. Those needing policy direction are summarized below.
 - 1) Surrounding property notice for land use applications: We mail notice to both property owners and residents of rented properties. It is costly (staff time, mailing and copy costs) to include residents of rented properties in the mailings. Much of the mail addressed to the resident is returned. We are not required to mail notice to residents, only to property owners. Staff proposes to mail application notices to property owners only.

October 14, 2011

- 2) Type II land use process: The Type II process allows for a local appeal of a staff decision. We currently mail notices of filing and notices of decision to persons in the notice area. The two different notices can be confusing. We propose to continue to mail the notice of filing to persons in the notice area. We propose to mail the notice of decision to only those persons who provided comments on the application. This limits the appeal to persons who participated.
- 3) Joint use parking facilities: The code allows for parking facilities to be shared in limited situations as an exception, but not the rule. Several requests have been reviewed recently that have raised some questions about the intent of the provisions and were the subject of a recent City Council Work Session. The City Attorney recommends including some specific provisions in the legal instrument currently required by the ADC. Staff suggests reducing the distance of the parking facility from the primary use, and that requests are reviewed by the Director.
- 4) Setbacks for triple and double frontage lots: The Code determines building setbacks by lot frontage. Properties with more than one street frontage have multiple front setbacks. It can be challenging to meet setbacks on triple frontage lots and double frontage lots (excluding corner lots). Staff proposes allowing interior setbacks for one of the frontage lines.

We invite questions prior to the meeting and are happy to provide draft code language at your request. Please contact anne.catlin@cityofalbany.net or 541-917-7550.

ALC/EF/th

cc: Greg Byrne, Community Development Director
Heather Hanson, Planning Manager



APPROVED _____

**CITY OF ALBANY
PLANNING COMMISSION
City Hall Council Chambers, 333 Broadalbin Street SE
Monday, February 7, 2011
5:15 p.m.**

MINUTES

Planning Commissioners present: Paul Davis, David Faller, Glenda Fleming, Cordell Post, Dala Rouse, Michael Styler, Larry Tomlin, and Dave Wood

Planning Commissioners absent: Bob Kish

Staff present: Greg Byrne, Community Development Director; Anne Catlin, Planner II; and, Teresa Nix, Administrative Assistant

Others present: Four in the audience

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Faller called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING FILE DC-06-10: Legislative Amendments to Articles 3, 4, 5, and 9 of the Albany Development Code related to fence regulations. The applicants are Forslund Construction and the City of Albany Community Development Department.

Chair Faller opened the public hearing at 5:17 p.m.

Declarations:

Commissioner Post said that he previously asked staff to consider changing the regulations regarding barbed wire; he recused himself from this hearing.

Staff Report:

Anne Catlin reviewed the public notice information, and then the staff analysis as detailed in the written staff report. She explained the proposal includes a request to allow electric fences up to 10 feet in industrial areas, clarifying existing standards for fences over 6 feet, and allowing barbed wire fencing for animal containment. Staff recommends approval of the proposed Development Code amendments.

In response to inquiries from the Commission, Catlin reviewed existing fencing at Forslund Construction and other properties. Commissioner Rouse opined that, if electric fences between residential and industrial properties are to be allowed, the requirements should be for 8-foot fences with warning signs posted every 25 feet. Commissioner Fleming agreed; she also thinks the warning signage should be

posted on the perimeter fence. Catlin said staff recommends that fences be between 6 feet and 8 feet tall with the height to be determined through the application process. Brief discussion followed regarding alternative security options.

Testimony in Favor:

Michael Pate, Sentry Security Systems, 7608 Fairfield Road, Columbia, SC, said that he considers the perimeter fence and electric security fence to be a unit; the effectiveness of the product is better when the two fences are close together. A separation of 2 feet could cause someone to get trapped; the goal is not to trap the intruder but to push them away. He said that minimum wage security employees have not been found to be an effective deterrent. It is difficult to get through this system; and, if the fence is penetrated, there is an alarm and a call to the property owner. Cameras are incorporated to allow the property owner to investigate from the safety of their home. He suggested that the standards be revised to refer to the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standards, which are approved and accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and the Occupational Safety and Health Association (OSHA). His product uses a 12-volt battery, and it is a pulsed electric device and is not hooked up to the infrastructure. He preferred that warning signs be posted on the security fence to prevent them from being stolen; he is open to direction regarding the number and interval of the warning signs. He reviewed ways to allow for emergency access for the Fire Department including the installation of a red Knox Box with a universal cutoff switch. He said this is a safe, low voltage, pulsing product; a person who touched it would not want to touch it again, but they would not be seriously injured. He thinks that a low voltage permit would be appropriate to this installation. He referred to 9.370(4)(f) *The fence shall be listed by a State of Oregon approved testimony laboratory*; he asked that *listed* be changed to *tested*.

Kami Forslund-Soehl, 3323 Alexander Lane NE, Albany, is one of owners of Forslund Construction. She said the current perimeter fence is 6 feet tall and the barbed wire has been removed. Her company tried monitoring the yard and found it to be ineffective and expensive. Pacific Power had a person monitoring its site who was badly beaten. Cameras cannot cover the entire site, and they are ineffective in the dark. She expressed concern that a solid perimeter fence and then a separation before the security fence would create a place for an intruder to hide and manipulate the security fence. She chose to touch the fence prior to purchasing it; it hurt but it did not make her fall down or convulse. She had a meeting with a representative from the Fire Department who indicated that he was comfortable with the company's plans for emergency access.

Testimony in Opposition: None.

Neutral Testimony: None.

Staff Response:

Catlin said it is important to note that Development Code provisions were written more generally and are not specific to this fence system. The City's Building Official has expressed concern that if the Code referenced IEC standards and if Oregon were to then develop standards for this product, there could be conflicts. The IEC standards were used in drafting the proposed distances between the perimeter fence and security fence. The subject property was in industrial use prior to the neighboring residential uses; applications with new construction would be required to comply with current set back, buffering, and screening requirements. The Building Official was specific in requesting that 9.370(4)(f) state that the fence shall be *listed*; and in discussions with the City's Electrician, the state indicated that it was comfortable with that language. If there was direction to change the language as requested by Mr. Pate, staff would need to find out if that would be supported by the Building Official and the state.

Chair Faller closed the public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

Commission Discussion and Action:

In response to inquiries from the Commission, Catlin said that she will follow up with the Fire Department to ensure that its concerns are satisfied.

Following discussion, Catlin summarized the Commission-directed changes to the proposed language as follows: Use the alternative language for 9.370(4)(d) but delete the first bullet point; change 9.370(4)(e) to state that warning signs will be posted at intervals of not less than 25 feet; and add a provision requires that all electric fences to be a pulsed system rather than a continuous charge system.

In response to further inquiries from the Commission, Community Development Director Greg Byrne agreed with earlier comments by Catlin that direction to change the language in 9.370(4)(f) would need to go back through the City's Building Official. The Commission could direct that staff bring information back for final action or could direct that the language be changed if it is appropriate to do so.

MOTION: Fleming moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve as modified (the modifications as summarized by Catlin above and with staff to make a final determination on the use of the wording in 9.370(4)(f) – *listed, tested, or approved*) the proposed Development Code amendments as summarized in the staff report for planning file DC-06-10. This motion is based on findings and conclusions of the staff report and testimony presented at the public hearing. Davis seconded the motion, and it **passed** unanimously with Post abstaining.

The City Council will hold a public hearing on this case on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, at 7:15 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING FILE DC-01-11: Amendment to the Albany Development Code to permit alternate plans for non-residential site landscaping. The applicant is the City of Albany Community Development Department.

Faller opened the public hearing at 6:58 p.m.

Staff Report:

Byrne reviewed the findings and conclusions as detailed in the written staff report. He explained the proposal is to allow alternate perimeter landscaping on commercial properties developed under previous codes in limited circumstances. Staff recommends approval of the proposed Development Code amendment. Brief discussion followed.

Testimony in Support: None.

Testimony in Opposition: None.

Neutral Testimony: None.

Staff Response: None.

Chair Faller closed the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Commission Discussion and Action:

MOTION: Commissioner Post moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Development Code amendments related to site landscaping in planning file DC-01-11. This motion is based on the findings and conclusions of the staff report and testimony presented at the public hearing. Commissioner Wood seconded the motion, and it **passed** unanimously.

The City Council will hold a public hearing on this case on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, at 7:15 p.m.

ACTIVITY UPDATE

There was no report.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for March 7, 2011, at 5:15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Chair Faller adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Submitted by

Reviewed by

Teresa Nix
Administrative Assistant

Anne Catlin
Planner II



CITY OF ALBANY
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION
Santiam Room, 333 Broadalbin Street SE
Wednesday, March 23, 2011
4:15 p.m.

MINUTES

Planning Commissioners present: Paul Davis, David Faller, Glenda Fleming, Dala Rouse, Michael Styler, Larry Tomlin, and Dave Wood

Planning Commissioners absent: Bob Kish (excused), Cordell Post (excused)

Staff present: Greg Byrne, Community Development Director; Heather Hansen, Planning Manager; and Sheena Dickerman, Administrative Assistant I

Others present: None

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Faller called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m.

REVIEW OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES (OAR) REQUIREMENT:

Community Development Director Greg Byrne communicated the Oregon Administrative Rules for complying with the Goal 5 requirements (Exhibit A).

Commissioner Wood asked for clarification regarding the meaning of Safe Harbor as used in the proposal. Byrne explained that there are two methods that can be used for Goal 5; the ESEE (Economic, Social, Environmental, and Energy) and the Safe Harbor. The Safe Harbor method is 50 feet. If the City varies away from the Safe Harbor method, then the City must do the ESEE analysis. Wood asked if it would be at the expense of the City. Byrne affirmed. There is the potential for land owners to do an analysis if they feel that the Safe Harbor is excessive. Wood clarified that the City was safe doing the Safe Harbor because it was defined, not discriminatory and it affects everyone the same. Byrne agreed.

Hansen stated that if a riparian corridor was found to be a manmade ditched or piped, then it could be removed as significant.

Commissioner Rouse noted that in earlier discussions with the City Council (CC) they wanted to use the Safe Harbor method. Hansen replied that until recently, for the Calapooia and Oak Creeks, there was support for using the tree height method. After looking at it closely, staff found that there was not much of a difference between the two methods.

Byrne said that the City had an ESEE analysis done for City-installed utilities and infrastructure in the Oak Creek area. The reason for the ESEE analysis was because there are significant wetlands and the rules say that *nothing* can be put in unless an ESEE analysis is done. Development in the area depends on the infrastructure.

Byrne emphasized that staff has not done anything without guidance from the OAR or state law that says it must be done or by local committees or state model ordinances. Hansen added that certain areas the state says it must be protected but is inexplicit on how it should be accomplished.

Hansen explained that for riparian corridors the state law requires 50 feet of protection around the wetland. Byrne explained that the City does a local adoption of significance and must follow the state's methodology. Wood asked if it was a third party validation. Hansen affirmed.

Rouse asked how to get a property removed from the significant wetland list if it is not significant. Byrne stated that there are 5 or 6 factors that make it significant; if *any* factor is a yes, then the wetland is automatically significant. Hansen added that when a delineation is done, the boundary changes. The state considers all wetlands the same until the City adopts their local wetland inventory and then there is a difference between significant and nonsignificant. The City must regulate development in the significant wetlands. Significant wetlands are well protected.

REVIEW RIPARIAN OVERLAY:

Byrne reviewed the riparian inventory sheets (Exhibit B) and explained the process. Hansen added that Exhibit B is an example of using the standard method. This particular example would have had a setback of 75 feet. Styler clarified that the 50 feet was from the top of bank. Byrne affirmed. The handout was an example of how the study is done. Wood said that this would address the science that has been done to assess. Hansen agreed.

Rouse commented that the blackberries and the reed canary grass are dangerous to the turtle habitat.

Tomlin asked about the “yes” and “no” answers on the sheet. Hansen explained that it was how the scoring was done.

Davis asked if it was *ex parte* contact when the property owner, Mitchell, provided him a copy of a letter from an attorney. Byrne explained that the process was legislative and not quasi-judicial. With the legislative process, the commissioners can expect to be lobbied by the public. If a commissioner does have communication with someone from the public, they will have to disclose it. He added that any contact with staff outside of the hearings is not considered *ex parte* contact.

- Riparian Inventory example – Byrne handed out Exhibit C an aerial photo of Mitchell’s property showing the 50-foot corridor. Wood asked if under the current proposal if the property could not be developed. Byrne replied that streets and roads are allowed in the riparian corridor. The property owner would be allowed to build a bridge, have drainage facilities, water dependent uses, and replace existing structures. Staff cannot allow the property owner to develop the entire property.

Davis asked about the letter from the Grand Prairie Water Control District’s (GPWCD) attorney that Mitchell submitted previously. Hansen replied that GPWCD was given notice regarding the Goal 5 public hearings. Rouse suggested that the City ask for their regulations. Hansen shared that generally GPWCD will go and remove vegetation. She commented that it is an example of federal and state agencies not working together.

Wood asked if once the proposal was adopted if the layers would show up on title reports. Byrne replied that all of the overlay districts would appear if someone viewed the zoning on a property. The City will also flag the permit system to show that a property is affected by a natural resource overlay.

Fleming reminded that the property owner had suggested using the wetland as part of the landscaping requirements.

- Aerial of variety of conditions on Burkhart creek (Exhibit D) – Byrne described the condition of the area. Davis pointed out that the Planning Commission (PC) approved the application. Byrne replied that it would not be approved today. Wood asked if the property was sold, if it would be required to retro back to the natural state. Byrne replied that the City would encourage them to do some restoration. Wood asked if there was some city, county, state funding that could be used to plant trees or shading. Byrne replied that it was possible. He explained that the City is going into a phase 2 permitting, which will make grants and information available. He added that 86 percent of the thermal load on water in the Willamette Rivers is a result of the elimination in the riparian corridor. Rouse added that the City has paid almost 10 million to fix the issue. Byrne replied that to the degree of allowing this to continue, the City will end up paying even more. Discussion followed about local business and groups looking for local improvement projects.

Tomlin asked why the county was not being required to monitor the riparian corridor.

REVIEW HABITAT ASSESSMENT OPTIONS:

Byrne stated that there is a lot of support for 50 feet instead of the 100 feet being proposed. The 100 feet is proposed based on the recommendation from the consultant. Staff is recommending that the boundary be amended administratively based on the property owner having an assessment done. This is similar to the current wetland delineation process. He explained that if the PC went with the 50 feet, no development would be allowed in the 50 feet. If a person went outside of the 50 feet they would likely impact turtle habitat. Discussion followed regarding where development would be allowed, habitat assessments, and what is required from the state, and the 100 feet versus 50 feet.

The following questions, comments, or suggestions were made during discussion:

- *Habitat assessment is a Goal 5 requirement.
- *Suggestion to go with the 50 feet.
- *There is a scientific recommendation of 100 feet.
- *There are low cost assessments for owner properties.
- *There are current nesting sites.
- *There are some areas that do not and never will be a turtle nesting site.
- *Have an ordinance that states that *if* habitat is found then it could be extended.
- *The 100 feet would be an interim until a study or individual studies are done.
- *Could the 50 feet be changed once a study is completed by way of PC, CC, etc? Byrne answered yes.
- *Concern to have 50 feet in the interim and lose habitat.
- *Private landowners will protect and have to protect.
- *Those that develop the land maybe less inclined to protect the turtles.
- *Has there been a degradation of the turtles?
- *Local conservation easements.
- *Voluntary versus mandatory enhancements.
- *Turtle habitat areas and nesting habits.
- *Difficulty for property owner to go through the process twice if the proposal was 50 feet.
- *Wording about access to property owner's access to the lake.
- *Have wording that a habitat assessment is done in the riparian corridors and the most restrictive being the implemented.
- *State requirement of clear and objective standards for everyone for a habitat assessment.
- *Public Hearing testimony has been only from those in opposition of the 100 feet and there are other property owners that are not opposed.
- *Staff will come to the next PC public hearing with two options.
- *The neighborhood meeting mail out was to the 40 residents on the Thornton Lakes. There is a majority of the property Thornton Lake property owners interested in the assessment.

REVIEW WETLAND/RIPARIAN ON NORTH ALBANY PARCEL:

Referring to Exhibit E an aerial photo of the property located on Robinhood Lane NW, Hansen said that it was an example of how the adjustment process would work. There are provisions where the City cannot render a property unbuildable. Currently, there is a variance process that is encumber some and expensive. Staff is proposing an adjustment process which is \$60 and administrative. It allows for 3,000 square feet of buildable area. Discussion followed regarding the property. Rouse asked if the PC could do a site visit to the property. Staff affirmed.

REVIEW COMBINATION OF OVERLAYS ON THORNTON LAKE PARCEL:

Showing the aerial photo of the Amos property (Exhibit F), Byrne noted that this property has all of the overlays located on it. The question to be asked is if there is a buildable area on this lot. Discussion followed regarding the overlays on the property.

The following questions, comments, or suggestions were made during discussion:

- *Property owner is allowed to have a driveway.
- *Property owner is allowed to do water uses.
- *Location of house on the property.
- *Should variances or adjustments be permitted into the riparian area?
- *Property would not qualify for an adjustment as there is enough buildable land.

REVIEW DEFINITIONS:

Byrne went through the definitions and explanation list (Exhibit G). Discussion followed regarding the lack of certified habitat specialists and qualified habitat professionals.

Chair Faller left the meeting at 5:22 p.m.

Davis liked the “reasonable/feasible” definition. Byrne said that it is used in state and federal laws it takes into account economics and takes into account the impact of development on the property.

Byrne explained what would need to take place to have a bridge in a riparian corridor.

Byrne gave an explanation of side casting, temporary versus permanent. The City does not have a way to enforce it effectively at this time. If this was the standard they would use the standard for the public and private utilities in the field. Any material not placed in would be hauled off. Fleming asked if a property owner can abandon with the side casting on top. Byrne said that is what happens but they would be in violation of the code. Hansen stated that the City has an Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control program.

Tomlin asked if anything lateral was built to the lake, would it impede the turtle movement. Others affirmed.

Styler asked if there was any control of the type of fill that is being used. Byrne replied that was one reason to do side casting and use the fill that is on site. Rouse suggested that the City needs to specify the amount of fill.

Tomlin asked if the 1,000 foot exemption could be modified if there were no homes on the property. Byrne replied that it would depend upon whether there was a 50 foot or 100 foot setback. If it was 50 feet, the property owner would not be allowed to do anything.

Fleming suggested instead of the wording “use of chemicals/pesticides is discouraged” to change to “the use of pest management is encouraged.” Rouse said the less wording that uses the word can’t and more that uses can is better.

Wood asked about the 5 year bond. Hansen said that it may be removed from the proposal. The City has bonds for landscaping for when landscaping is required and the timing does not make sense. This happens with planting in the wetlands. She said that the Department of State Lands requires a permit for land that is moved but does not regulate the removal of plants. If vegetation was cleared and/or the City asked that another wetland area on the property was enhanced, the property owner would not know what to plant. Wood suggested doing something else rather than holding on to someone’s money for 7.5 years. Others agreed. Hansen said that the City is supposed to minimize the impacts as much as possible. This is easy if a person takes a tree down then to have them put one up. As it becomes more complex the process becomes more complex. Byrne said that this is when a qualified professional comes in. Staff would rely on the professional to evaluate.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO ALBANY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ADC):

Rouse recommended that once staff has the bold and strike information instead of going straight to a public hearing to have an extensive work sessions before for the PC. Byrne agreed. Hansen went through the changes made to the bold and strike version to Article 6 (Exhibit H). There was discussion on some of the changes.

The following questions, comments, or suggestions were made during discussion:

- *Approval for the removal of regulations on fences.

- *Someone is working on turtle-friendly standards that will be made available to the public but will not be in the Code.
- *There is difficulty finding a list of native plant lists site appropriate but it is the desire of staff to have this available.
- *For number 7, the overlay districts should be protecting the property.
- *A conservation easement on the property would still be possible.
- *Suggestion on number 8 to defer to Department of State Lands and Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife mitigation requirements.
- *Does PW have a sign off on their approvals, for planning to sign off?
- *Other code changes regarding conditional uses and site plan applications.
- *Archaeological regulations and sites.

Byrne explained that the next step in this process is staff will be writing code that reflects the changes and will be in the next agenda packet.

Rouse suggested that when staff talks about goals and policies to be less rigid and less specific, it is less likely to have to change the Comprehensive Plan (CP) when ADC needs the changes. Byrne said that staff will make some changes but is not taking on rewriting the CP.

Referring to page 45 of the March 21, 2011, PC agenda packet, Fleming asked what the benefit of allowing the open space zone to count. A person is unable to build in OS. She suggested saying that OS may be used to fulfill this requirement *only if*.

Rouse suggested making clear what is allowed in the riparian corridor. Hansen replied that usually people come in and go through the section and it makes sense to staff to have them in one section together. Rouse recommended defining and being specific in the heading.

Byrne handed out two articles for the PC to read (Exhibits I and J).

ACTIVITY UPDATE

Hansen shared that the next project is the South Albany Area Plan.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Planning Commission is April 4, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Byrne adjourned the meeting at 6:17 p.m.

Submitted by

Reviewed by

Sheena Dickerman
Administrative Assistant I

Heather Hansen
Planning Manager