

**CANBY CITY COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
June 6, 2018**

**PRESIDING:** Mayor Brian Hodson.

**COUNCIL PRESENT:** Tyler Smith, Greg Parker, Traci Hensley, Tracie Heidt, and Sarah Spoon. Councilor Tim Dale was absent.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Rick Robinson, City Administrator; Joseph Lindsay, City Attorney; Bryan Brown, Planning Director; Jennifer Cline, Public Works Director; Matilda Deas, Senior Planner; and Kim Scheafer, City Recorder.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Mike Robinson, Rick Givens, Daniel Webb, Eric and Josephine Recht, Ethan & Stephanie Manuel, Glen France, Fire Chief Jim Davis, Bob Cambra, Carol Palmer, Bob and Sheila Tice, Susan Myers, Craig Palmer, Lynn McFadden, Joe Meyer, John and Judy Boyle, Eric Pfeiffer-Robinson, Jim Boyle, Bill and Karyn Fenton, Charles burden, Darren Gusdorf, and Marty Moretty.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Hodson called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Willow Creek Conference Room.

**\*\*Councilor Hensley moved to go into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(i) Performance Evaluation of Public Officer. Motion was seconded by Councilor Parker and passed 5-0.**

**OPENING CEREMONIES:** Mayor Hodson reconvened the Regular Meeting at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers followed by the opening ceremonies.

Canby Livability Day Proclamation – Mayor Hodson read a proclamation proclaiming June 24, 2018 as Canby Livability Day and presented it to Bob Tice. Mr. Tice said this was the 15<sup>th</sup> year of the cleanup. They had 14 projects that they would be working on this year. The project list was on their website.

**COMMUNICATIONS:** Rick Robinson, City Administrator, said that Canby was declared the 7<sup>th</sup> safest City on the Safe Wise website. He shared a letter from Amber Mathieson who recognized the Planning Department staff for the excellent work they did. ODOT started work on 99E to stabilize the hillside.

**CITIZEN INPUT & COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None.

**MAYOR'S BUSINESS:** Mayor Hodson said Metro's housing bond had been solidified. It would create affordable housing around the metro area and would be on the November ballot. He had spoken with a paving company who had several positions to fill. ODOT also had several positions to fill. He had met with the Transit Director and with all the funds that they would be receiving they would be able to complete the projects in the Transit Master Plan. He had spoken with the Canby Utility Chair and the water had been tested and no bacteria were present. Wilsonville had also tested their water and it was safe as well.

**COUNCILOR COMMENTS & LIAISON REPORTS:** Councilor Smith had missed the Fire District meeting.

Fire Chief Jim Davis said Ron Swor had been appointed to the Board to replace Dawn Depner. The

Board would be considering a possible fire bond at their next meeting on June 20. Todd Gary would be retiring at the end of the year. He discussed what had been done with the \$0.11 increase in the fire levy. The budget had been approved by the Budget Committee and would be forwarded to the Board. Money was still needed for the fireworks display. They had received a grant to install smoke alarms in homes for people who were unable to. He encouraged people to contact the Fire Department if they needed one.

Councilor Parker said the Bike and Pedestrian Committee would be receiving a grant for a Safe Routes to Schools program.

Councilor Hensley thanked the American Legion for the Memorial Day remembrance ceremony. She congratulated all the students who were graduating.

Councilor Heidt said the Library had a new mobile circulation program. The Summer Reading Program began on June 1. The Transit Advisory Committee held a joint Work Session with Salem Cherriots. The School District had emergency water cisterns at Baker Prairie Middle School. The deadline to sign up for floats for the Canby Independence Day Parade is June 26.

Councilor Spoon said Bridging Cultures would have their lunch in the park this Saturday. Volunteers were still needed for Canby Independence Day. New electrical outlets were being put in on Second and Grant. The Canby High School Concert Choir received third in State and first in sight reading.

**CONSENT AGENDA: \*\*Councilor Hensley moved to adopt the minutes of the May 16, 2018 City Council Regular Meeting and reappointment of Clifford Ash to the Bike and Pedestrian Committee for a term to end on June 30, 2021. Motion was seconded by Councilor Heidt passed 5-0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING: Noise Variance for Wild Hare Saloon & Café (June 23, 2018 7 PM – 12 AM & August 11, 2018 6 PM – 12 AM) – Mayor Hodson read the public hearing script.**

Kim Scheafer, City Recorder, said this was a request for a noise variance on June 23 and August 11. Noise variances had previously been approved for this business and notifications were mailed out to property owners within 200 feet. No comments had been received.

Mayor Hodson opened the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

Proponents: None.

Opponents: None.

Mayor Hodson closed the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

**\*\*Councilor Parker moved to grant a noise variance to the Wild Hare Saloon & Café on June 23 between the hours 7 p.m. and 12 a.m. and on August 11 from 6:00 p.m. to 12 a.m. to allow them to have live music outside located at 1190 SW First Avenue. Motion was seconded by Councilor Hensley and passed 5-0.**

**APP 18-01 Redwood Landing Subdivision (SUB 17-06/APP 17-03) – Mayor Hodson read the public hearing script.**

**Conflict of Interest**

Councilor Smith – No conflict, plan to participate.  
Councilor Parker – No conflict, plan to participate.  
Councilor Hensley – No conflict, plan to participate.  
Councilor Heidt – No conflict, plan to participate.  
Councilor Spoon – No conflict, plan to participate.  
Mayor Hodson – No conflict, plan to participate.

**Ex Parte Contact**

Councilor Smith – No contact.  
Councilor Parker – No contact.  
Councilor Hensley – No contact.  
Councilor Heidt – driven by the site, but drew no conclusions.  
Councilor Spoon – driven by the site.  
Mayor Hodson – No contact.

STAFF REPORT: Bryan Brown, Planning Director, said this was the second appeal of the approval for the Redwood Landing subdivision. The Council had remanded the application back to the Planning Commission. It went to the Planning Commission on April 23 where the items Council asked to be evaluated and modified were addressed. He discussed the original proposal for the roads and how the roads now followed the parcel lines and benefitted the property owners to the north without going through other parcels. The revised preliminary plat was approved by the Planning Commission. On the plat the turn arounds on the stub streets were addressed. When the parcel in the middle of the subdivision that was not part of this application decided to redevelop, they would have to follow the R-1 zoning with minimum 7,000 square foot lots because they were not dedicating any park land. The properties for future development across Willow Creek were on the plat and showed what the lot layout would be. That would be a phase 2 to this project. Also the area on the west side had changed from 89 lots to 82 lots and the park land dedication was reduced to 5.29 acres. He explained how the storm drainage would be handled and how the City would maintain the future stormwater facility in the park. He discussed the N Redwood Development Concept Plan regarding the roads, and how what was being proposed was similar to what was in the Concept Plan. Also in the Plan were the areas that the steep slopes were identified as well as areas that would be difficult to develop and where the creek and potential wetlands were located. The application had followed the intent of the Plan for these areas. The Planning Commission approved the modified application finding substantial evidence that both the criteria relevant to the subdivision application and the basis for the Council's remand were satisfied in the record. They acknowledged the concerns about the size of the lots, but accepted the density transfer and the revised park dedication as following the intent of the Concept Plan. He reviewed the options for the Council for this application.

There was discussion regarding the developable areas around the park and the density transfer. There was further discussion regarding the option of purchasing the park land instead of the applicant dedicating the land and not allowing density transfer or SDC credits.

Mr. Brown said currently the wetland area was in private ownership, but for the stormwater management, aesthetics, and integrity of the entire park that it was desired to accept the dedication of the land.

Mayor Hodson opened the public hearing at 8:35 p.m.

**Applicant's Argument:** Michael Robinson, attorney for Icon Construction, was representing the applicant. He thought Option 1 in the staff report, which was upholding approval of the application, was the right option to follow. He understood that the smaller lots were disliked and there was concern about how the Concept Plan was adopted. He appreciated the concerns the appellants had, but the decision was tied to the criteria. Part of the criteria was to preserve Willow Creek, and they did that by offering incentives to the developer through density transfer for the park dedication. That was done, and it was what the code required. He discussed the appeal criteria that the Council was subject to. He thought the Planning Commission had considered all of the information and they had approved the revised application. The Council's concerns had also been addressed. The lots with the temporary turn arounds had been made larger, the streets had been aligned where the lots came together at the end of the stub streets, better evidence had been provided that explained the density transfer and buildable areas, the park land dedication had been reduced by one acre, the lot sizes were increased, and the value of the park land dedication was provided. The maximum density on this property was 93 lots and they had reduced it to 82 and the park dedication had been reduced from 6.24 acres to 5.29 acres. The average lot size was now 6,097 square feet. Regarding the appeal, there was no requirement in the code for a proportionate park land dedication and the other criteria mentioned had been met. He asked that the Planning Commission's decision be upheld.

**Appellants' Argument:** Daniel Webb, Canby resident, said upon review of the staff report they were in agreement with Option 2, the City purchasing 2.79 acres of park land, not allowing density transfers, and the applicant revising the subdivision plan. The park land would be purchased through Park SDCs. There would be a net difference of approximately four lots for collectable SDCs, but collection from future developments would recoup this small difference in cost.

**Proponents:** Ethan Manuel, property owner for the Redwood Development, said a vocal group could sway opinion and create uncertainty and doubt beyond the reality of a given situation. He thought this was the case with this subdivision application. There were three long-standing Canby families participating in this project. He had lived on the property for twelve years with his family. They were the Council's constituents too. He discussed the N Redwood Development Concept Plan. There was a requirement in the Concept Plan that a master plan had to be put in place for this area. The point was to avoid disjointed developments with no continuity and connectivity. This application was approved by the Planning Commission twice. The most contentious issue was density transfer resulting in lots less than 7,000 square feet. The Concept Plan recommended density transfer to be used and allowed for lots to be less than 5,000 square feet. None of the lots were less than 5,000 square feet. He thought the application of the density transfer was in the spirit and intent of the Concept Plan. The density transfer did not give him an advantage over other property owners, but tried to make him whole as a person contributing more than his fair share of park land. He generally agreed with the findings and recommendations in the staff report. He thought the Council should choose Option 1 instead of Option 2. The price of the park land would be around \$600,000, and the City would have to use tax payer money for something the City could receive for free. He did not think it was a wise use of City resources. The items the Council remanded back to the Planning Commission had been addressed and a revised plan had been submitted that included an average lot size in excess of 6,000 square feet. He did not think everyone on the appeal application was still against the development. Density and infill was important in order to preserve rural farmland. This application would provide an outstanding neighborhood that would add to the community in a responsible way. He encouraged the Council to deny the appeal and uphold the Planning Commission's decision.

**Opponents:** Eric and Jo Recht, Canby residents, said they were opposed to any application that turned low density into medium density. The plan presented had only 5% of the lots meeting the definition of

low density. They supported Option 2 and the application of low density, 7,000 square foot lots, and the use of park dedicated funds to purchase the park land. This would provide fair compensation to land owners and was fair to neighbors whose park fees would assist in this compensation. No one wanted to take anyone's land, and it was not tax payer money but money that all developers contributed into a fund. They would like the mix of low, medium, and high density areas be applied as presented in the Concept Plan and the purchase of the park land through SDCs alone without use of density transfer.

Glen France, representing the Postlewait Estates HOA, said the HOA believed the appeal criteria had not been met as good planning concepts were not met. The extreme density transfer changed the majority of the lots to medium density. By not creating an HOA for this area, the developers were shifting the burden of maintaining the common area, landscaping, and bioswales of the neighborhood to the City and provided no long term maintenance for a wall along Redwood Street. Good planning would require an HOA as a condition of approval. The Planning Commission did not consider all of the pertinent information to this case and the options for Council tonight had not been presented to the Commission. Allowing the extreme density shift from low to medium density and not requiring an HOA would have significant negative impact on Postlewait Estates and other subdivisions surrounding this development. Postlewait Estates did not want their tax dollars to go towards maintaining other neighborhoods' common areas when they and many other neighborhoods paid to maintain theirs. He questioned whether the City had the funds to maintain this area. The cost to create an HOA was minimal and the long term positive impact for the community was substantial. They believed that Option 2 was a good compromise and recommended adding a condition of approval for an HOA to maintain the common areas along Redwood Street.

Mayor Hodson asked if the common areas would fall back on the City to take care of.

Mr. Rick Robinson said if there was a common area that was collecting stormwater for a subdivision, the City expected the subdivision to maintain it. There was a collection area for later release into Willow Creek as the water moved east, and for the water moving west, it would enter the stormwater drainage system. Unless it was in a public area, the City did not maintain bioswales. He acknowledged it could be a problem.

Susan Myers lived in Postlewait Estates and was the HOA Secretary. Mr. Givens had stated they did not need to have an HOA as the bioswales, landscaping, and street trees would be taken care of by the City and the individual homeowners that backed up along the wall and it would be in the CC&R's that it would be maintained that way. She had served on the City's TSP advisory committee, facilitated Canby's visioning project, worked on the design standard advisory committee, Tofte Farms HOA Board, and helped establish both southern neighborhood associations. She supported Option 2. If these lots went back to being low density, they would have to pay SDCs and that money could be used to pay for the park land. She thought it was a good compromise. The Concept Plan showed these lots as R-1 and the majority were R-1.5. The higher density was not a public benefit, as there were higher density areas in the Concept Plan. She thought the density transfer was not required in the code, but that the City had the discretion to determine if it was in the public good to allow it. The Planning Commission approved this application in a 4-3 vote and many Commissioners were unhappy that there was not an alternative. They did not have an Option 2 as the Council did. She thought Option 2 made the property owners whole without the extreme density transfer and the park land was purchased through the SDCs. At the last meeting, the applicant stated he would consider an HOA, but had decided not to pursue it. Instead the CC&R's had been modified to show that the City and a few homeowners would maintain the wall, street trees, and bioswales on Redwood. She thought the homeowners would not understand that they

were responsible for maintaining the property behind the wall and to the back of the City curb. She showed pictures of areas that were currently not being maintained.

Carol Palmer, Postlewait Estates resident, said the Concept Plan showed this area as low density. It mirrored what was happening on the west side where the higher density was towards Territorial and 99E, then medium density and a core of low density. She thought it resonated with retail market analysis that talked about mixed neighborhoods. She opposed the plan submitted by Icon as it made the low density lots medium density lots to a great extent. She asked that the Council think about the residents who took an active role in the development of the Concept Plan and how they felt this was a bait and switch. This area was meant to be low density, and she was concerned about creating disgruntled citizens who were distrustful of the City. She supported Option 2 because it would give them back low density in this area.

Bob Cambra, Canby resident, was not in favor of density transfer as it increased the population in particular areas and taxed resources and infrastructures. Any reduction of lot size would be helpful to reduce future problems. He was in support of Option 2. The use of Park SDCs was the solution to the park land issues. The park land was an important area and was made of wetlands that would not require a lot of upkeep. He thought it would be a good use of SDC funds. It would also help to reduce the development and the impact on infrastructure.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:** Mr. Mike Robinson clarified the vote of the Planning Commission was 5-2. He thought the pictures submitted by Ms. Myers should be areas that were maintained by property owners and Code Enforcement could help take care of the issue. They had spoken with Mr. France about an HOA, but they did not think an HOA was necessary as there was no common area. The owner of Icon was willing to do an HOA, but questioned what they would be assessing people for on a monthly basis. Regarding Option 2, it could cost the City over \$600,000 and the applicant would do an appraisal for the property if the Council chose that option. Regarding density transfer, he read from the Concept Plan regarding lot size averaging and how density transfer worked. He did not think these lot sizes would create problems with stormwater, public facilities and services, or transportation. The lot size averaging was being done to protect Willow Creek and he thought it would be contrary to the Concept Plan to go with Option 2. These would still be single family homes that could be built for less cost which would help make them more affordable. He asked that the Planning Commission's decision be upheld.

Councilor Smith asked if Mr. Mike Robinson thought the density transfer in the code was permissive or required. Mr. Robinson thought it was a mandatory requirement.

Mayor Hodson closed the public hearing at 9:37 p.m.

Councilor Parker discussed the proper use of Park SDCs. He thought the funds were to be used to expand capacity.

Joe Lindsay, City Attorney, said using SDC funds to purchase park land was within the definition of expanding capacity.

Councilor Spoon asked how much park land was required from this application.

Mr. Rick Robinson explained it was 2.51 acres, and if they followed Option 2, the City would purchase the remaining 2.79 acres in order to get the 5.3 acres that the Concept Plan wanted to preserve.

Matilda Deas, Senior Planner, explained they had used the standard formula for park land and applied it to the entire Concept Plan area. That was modified when the wetlands and steep slopes were taken into account. Some of the lots would have no park land to dedicate and some would be giving twice as much as they normally would be required to give due to the topography and the way the creek ran. She explained how much this land was assessed, about \$100,000 per acre, and how that amount could be different from an appraisal. The \$100,000 per acre was what was charged for the SDCs, and if it was more than that, the SDCs would not be able to recoup the total cost. The density transfer was to make the property owners who were giving twice as much whole, but the confusion was the density transfer was not an increase in density but it did decrease lot sizes.

Mr. Lindsay said the spirit of the Concept Plan was to accept dedication of land, but it did not specify how much. If it was less than the proposed application, they would have to go back and figure out what that meant for the rest of the development.

Mayor Hodson asked if the Planning Commission did not have Option 2 as an option, did it quantify as new evidence.

Mr. Lindsay said no, it was the Council's ability to condition their approval. If they did choose Option 2, the Council would be able to continue the hearing to allow the applicant to revise the plan to show what dedication of less park land would look like.

Mr. Rick Robinson explained two of the issues were the dedication of park land and the appropriateness of density transfer. Option 2 addressed those issues and provided the Council another tool in the tool box to address them in accordance to the code.

Mr. Lindsay said the Planning Commission had the same code and tools, but the Council had the tools highlighted for their consideration.

Mayor Hodson did not like the density transfer, but he understood it was in the code. He thought the size of the park had been corrected. He thought Option 2 should have been brought to the Planning Commission.

Councilor Parker agreed this should have been brought to the Planning Commission and he thought it made the Council do the Commission's job.

Councilor Smith read from the code regarding appeals. The Council had the power to hear new evidence. When it was a remedy or alternative solution, it was not new evidence. He did not like Option 2, but he did not think the Council was prohibited from doing it.

Councilor Heidt said this application hinged on density transfer. There was not a net gain or increase with the density transfer, although that seemed to be the perception of the neighbors. It looked like higher density, but there were still the same number of homes.

Ms. Deas clarified it did not increase density, but what was not communicated well was that it resulted in clustering and smaller lots.

Councilor Heidt asked if Option 2 would adversely affect the three property owners who were doing the density transfer.

Mr. Lindsay said the record would have to be re-opened and new evidence presented to answer that question.

There was consensus that the answer to that question was not relevant to the criteria of the appeal.

Mr. Rick Robinson said Option 2 had been developed after staff had discussed the challenges associated with this application. Staff had reevaluated the tools available that were relevant because of the process and the public testimony that had been received. The issue of density transfer, which was pivotal in this case, could be addressed through purchasing the park land instead.

Councilor Parker said one of the factors for choosing Option 2 would be the cost of the park land, and they did not have that answer currently. He could not make the decision without all of the information.

Mayor Hodson said if they decided to go that route, the hearing would be continued so the applicant could get that information.

Councilor Hensley asked since the wetlands were still there, would Options 2 or 3 increase any lot sizes. If so, would the application have to go back to the Planning Commission because there would be different lot sizes?

Ms. Deas said if they only dedicated 2.51 acres, the lots would have to be a minimum of 7,000 square feet.

Mr. Rick Robinson said as long as the street alignment and infrastructure did not change, it would not have to go back to the Planning Commission.

Mayor Hodson said the appeal was on the five items the Council remanded to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission had approved the revised application. It had been appealed that the revised application had not addressed those five remand items. The Council needed to determine if the five items had been addressed.

All but Councilor Spoon thought that was the case. Councilor Spoon thought the park land dedication was still excessive.

Councilor Smith thought the revised application met the code.

Councilor Heidt did not think the density transfer violated the spirit of the Concept Plan and the smaller lots would help make the homes more affordable.

Councilor Heidt asked how Option 1 would benefit the City more than Option 2. Mayor Hodson said that was a determination for the Council to make.

Councilor Spoon was in favor of Option 2, but she would need to know how much the park land would cost. She thought the way the density transfer was being used with the excessive park land dedication was a loophole for the property owners to make the most amount of money. She thought the park land dedication should be reduced so the density transfer would not be an issue.

Councilor Parker thought they should either vote on this appeal as to whether or not it addressed the remand items or remand it back to the Planning Commission to look at Option 2 or 3.



**\*\*Councilor Smith moved to uphold the Planning Commission's decision to approve APP 18-01 and to adopt the findings and conclusions of law as recommended by staff. Motion was seconded by Councilor Heidt.**

Councilor Spoon said one of the items the Council asked for on the remand was an appraisal value for the park land dedication. They had not received an adequate appraisal, and if they had, they would probably be considering Option 2. This item was not adequately addressed in her opinion.

**Motion passed 4-1 with Council Spoon opposed.**

**RESOLUTIONS & ORDINANCES: Resolution 1285 – \*\*Councilor Heidt moved to adopt Resolution 1285, A RESOLUTION EXTENDING WORKERS' COMPENSATION COVERAGE TO VOLUNTEERS OF THE CITY OF CANBY AND REPEALING RESOLUTION 1263. Motion was seconded by Councilor Spoon and passed 5-0.**

**Ordinance 1483 – \*\*Councilor Heidt moved to adopt Ordinance 1483, AN ORDINANCE, PROCLAIMING ANNEXATION INTO THE CITY OF CANBY, OREGON 2.64 ACRES INCLUDING 2.0 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY DESCRIBED AS TAX LOTS 200 AND 201 OF PORTION OF SE ¼, SEC. 27, T.3S., R.1E., W.M. (TAX MAP 31E27DB); AND APPROX. 0.20 ACRES OF ADJACENT NE TERRITORIAL ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY AND APPROX. 0.44 ACRES) OF PART OF TAX LOT 1500 (TAX MAP 31E27AD) KNOWN AS SPITZ ROAD WHICH IS VACATED COUNTY ROADWAY NOW OWNED BY THE CITY OF CANBY; AND AMENDING THE EXISTING COUNTY ZONING FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL FARM FOREST FIVE ACRE (RRFF-5) TO CITY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-1) FOR THE ENTIRE AREA; AND SETTING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPERTY TO BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE CANBY CITY LIMITS. Motion was seconded by Councilor Parker and passed 5-0 by roll call vote.**

**Ordinance 1484 – \*\*Councilor Parker moved to approve Ordinance 1484, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH MASTER CLEEN, INC. FOR JANITORIAL SERVICES FOR VARIOUS CITY FACILITIES, NOT TO EXCEED \$57,787.00; AND REPEALING ORDINANCE 1452 to come up for second reading on June 20, 2018. Motion was seconded by Councilor Hensley and passed 5-0 on first reading.**

**Ordinance 1486 – \*\*Councilor Hensley moved to adopt Ordinance 1486, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH CANBY EXCAVATING, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$481,373.30 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE NE 11<sup>TH</sup> PLACE SANITARY SEWER REPLACEMENT & OFFSITE STORM DRAINAGE; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. Motion was seconded by Councilor Parker and passed 5-0 by roll call vote.**

**Ordinance 1487 – \*\*Councilor Smith moved to adopt Ordinance 1487, AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF CANBY TO ENTER INTO AN AMENDED CONTRACT WITH KINTECHNOLOGY, INC. TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE COMPUTER TECHNICAL SERVICES FOR THE CITY. Motion was seconded by Councilor Heidt and passed 5-0 by roll call vote.**

**NEW BUSINESS:** Findings, Conclusion & Final Order ANN 18-01/ZC 18-01 - **\*\*Councilor Hensley moved to adopt the Findings, Conclusion & Final Order for ANN 18-01/ZC 18-01. Motion was seconded by Councilor Heidt and passed 5-0.**

**ADMINISTRATOR'S BUSINESS & STAFF REPORTS:** Mr. Rick Robinson shared how he had come up with the options for the appeal hearing, not Mr. Brown. He had intended to be helpful, but it proved to be the opposite and he apologized.

**CITIZEN INPUT:** None.

**ACTION REVIEW:**

1. Approved the Consent Agenda.
2. Approved a Noise Variance for Wild Hare Saloon & Café.
3. Upheld the Planning Commission's decision for APP 18-01 Redwood Landing Subdivision.
4. Adopted Resolution 1285.
5. Adopted Ordinances 1483, 1486, and 1487.
6. Approved Ordinance 1484 to come up for second reading on June 20, 2018.

There was no Executive Session.

Mayor Hodson adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:45 p.m.



Kimberly Scheafer, MMC  
City Recorder



Brian Hodson  
Mayor

Assisted with Preparation of Minutes - Susan Wood