Minutes
Aurora Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, November 3, 2015, at 7:00 P.M.
City Council Chambers, Aurora City Hall
21420 Main Street NE, Aurora, OR 97002

STAFF PRESENT	Renata Wakeley, City Planner Kelly Richardson, City Recorder
STAFF ABSENT:	None
VISITORS PRESENT:	Lance Lyon, Aurora Dexter Wilson, Aurora Judi Aus, Canby Jerry Johnson, Aurora Richard Rothweiler, Salem Janet Rothweiler, Salem Karen Townsend, 15058 2nd Street Aurora Gayle Abernathy, 15109 2nd Street Aurora Kathy Kaatz, 14805 Orchard Street Aurora

1. **CALL TO ORDER OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

   Meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Rhoden-Feely at 7:05 pm

2. **CITY RECORDER DOES ROLL CALL**
   Chair Joseph Schaefer - Absent
   Commissioner Craig McNamara- Present
   Commissioner Bud Fawcett - Present
   Commissioner Jonathan Gibson - Present
   Commissioner Mercedes Rhoden-Feely - Present
   Commissioner Tara Weidman - Present
   Commissioner Aaron Ensign - Absent

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   a) Planning Commission Minutes – October, 2015, a comment is made that the Council discussed accessory structures specific to the code.
   b) City Council Meeting Minutes – September, 2015
   c) Historic Review Board Minutes – September, 2015

   Motion to approve the consent agenda as presented was made by Commissioner Gibson and is seconded by Commissioner Fawcett. Motion approved by all.

4. **CORRESPONDENCE – NA**

5. **VISITORS**

Anyone wishing to address the Aurora Planning Commission concerning items not already on the meeting agenda may do so in this section. No decision or action will be made, but the Aurora Planning Commission could look into the matter and provide some response in the future.

No one spoke during this time as the visitors present spoke on items already on the agenda.

6. **PUBLIC HEARING, Opens at 7:10 pm**

a) Discussion and or Action Height Variance Application (VA-15-03) Christ Lutheran Church,

CITY OF AURORA
PLANNING COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT:	Variance 2015-03 [VAR-15-03]
DATE:	October 27, 2015

APPLICANT/OWNER:	Christ Lutheran Church 15029 2nd Street NE Aurora, OR 97002
REQUEST:	Variance application to exceed the maximum height of the Historic Residential Overlay zone for a new proposed forty-eight (48) foot bell/entry tower addition to the existing structure.
SITE LOCATION:	15029 2nd Street NE, Aurora OR. Map 41.W.12CD Tax Lot 2600
SITE SIZE:	Approx. 19,602 square feet, or 0.45 acres
DESIGNATION:	Zoning: Low Density Residential (R1) with Historic District Overlay
CRITERIA:	Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) Chapters 16.20 Historic Residential Overlay zone and 16.64 Variances
ENCLOSURES:	Exhibit A: Assessor Map Exhibit B: Applicant's Variance Application Exhibit C Review Comments from Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) and Aurora Historic Review Board (HRB)

I. REQUEST

Variance application to exceed the maximum height of the Historic Residential Overlay zone for a new proposed forty-eight (48) foot bell/entry tower addition to the existing structure.

II. PROCEDURE

Variance applications are processed as Quasi-Judicial Decisions. Quasi-Judicial Decisions are conducted as stated in Chapter 16.76 of the AMC. Section 16.64 provides the criteria for processing Variance applications.

The application was received on August 12, 2015 and determined incomplete by staff pending additional information. The supplemental information was received by staff on September 17th and the application was determined complete by staff. Notice of the application and hearing was mailed to surrounding property owners on October 9, 2015 and published in the Canby Herald on October 27, 2015. The City has until **January 14, 2015**, or 120 days from acceptance of the application to approve, modify and approve, or deny this proposal.

III. APPEAL

Appeals are governed by AMC 16.76.260. An appeal of the Planning Commission's decision shall be made, in writing, to the City Council within 15 days of the Planning Commission's final written decision.

IV. CRITERIA AND FINDINGS

The applicable review criteria for Variance applications are found in AMC Chapter 16.64 Variances.

16.64 Variances

The commission may grant a variance only when the applicant has shown that all of the following conditions exist:

A. The proposed variance will not be materially detrimental to the purposes of this title, be in conflict with the policies of the comprehensive plan, to any other applicable policies and standards, and to other properties in the same zoning district or vicinity.

FINDINGS: The applicant proposes a forty-eight (48) foot bell/entry tower addition to the existing structure. The maximum height in the Historic Residential Overlay (HRO) zone is thirty-five (35) feet- a thirteen (13) foot differential. According to the applicant, the tower structure will not cast shadows on any neighboring structures or exceed the height of some trees on the property or surrounding area. The applicant also states that the architectural elements are designed to enhance the visual character of the Neo-Gothic features of the historic Aurora Colony and structure.

Notice of the height variance application was mailed to property owners within 200 feet of the subject property on October 9, 2015 and published in the Canby Herald on October 14, 2014. The Aurora Historic Review Board (HRB) reviewed the proposed variance and recommended the Planning Commission approve the variance with a "smaller cross as discussed with the applicant" (see Exhibit C). This is included as a recommended condition of approval. The Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA) reviewed the proposal and expressed no concerns with flight interference.

Staff finds this criteria can be met, with conditions.

B. Special conditions exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and are not applicable to lands and structures in the same zone and over which the applicant has no control.

FINDINGS: The existing structure is unique in that the church's historic architectural elements are unlike residential structures in the zone. Churches are permitted as conditional uses in the zone and the property has a conditional use permit on file. According to the applicant, "while an exact replica of the historic tower is not possible, Christ Lutheran Church wishes to achieve as much accuracy as possible in the restoration of the original bell tower's scale and Gothic Revival style, which includes a slender, steeply pitched roof, pointed arched-windows, and a bell" and that meeting the thirty-five (35) foot height maximum in the zone would have sacrificed historic proportions. The applicant also states that a thirty-five (35) foot height restriction would not allow placement of the bell into the steeple or allow a person sufficient space to access or maintain the proposed bell and, therefore, the requested height is the minimum height to allow for the bell to be installed and maintained inside the steeple.

Staff finds the location of a church in the Historic Residential Overlay (HRO) zone with a 35 foot height maximum is unique for the property and not applicable to other historic properties in the zone and this criteria is met.

C. The use proposed will be the same as permitted under this title and city standards will be maintained to the greatest extent that is reasonably possible while permitting some economic use of the land.

FINDINGS: The variance will not change the use of the property and other applicable city standards and criteria will be maintained and enforced. Staff finds this criteria is met.

D. Existing physical and natural systems, such as but not limited to traffic, drainage, dramatic land forms, or parks will not be adversely affected any more than would occur if the development were located as specified in this title.

FINDINGS: The proposed variance does not encroach upon the City right-of-way and is not determined by staff to negatively impact traffic, drainage, land forms or parks. The property recently received Site Development Review approval (SDR-15-01) for circulation improvements and interior and exterior modifications to the structure. Staff finds this criteria is met.

E. The variance granted shall be the minimum necessary to make possible a reasonable use of the land and structures.

FINDINGS: According to the applicant, the proposed variance allows for the minimum achievement of the scale and stylistic proportions of the characteristic Gothic Revival tower. However, approval of the variance is not determined to be the minimum necessary to make reasonable use of the land or structures as the property is current used as it historically has been. The Aurora Historic Review Board reviewed the proposed variance and, while approving the height, recommended the size of the cross be reduced "so as to minimize any further height issues/dominance". This is included as a recommended condition of approval.

Staff finds this criteria can be met, with conditions.

F. The special conditions which are peculiar to the land or structure involved were not caused or created by the applicant and/or current or previous property owners.

FINDINGS: The current members of the Christ Lutheran Church congregation are not responsible for the demolition of the historic tower. Indeed, the members seek to preserve and restore elements of this historic church- in keeping with the Historic Overlay District and Aurora Comprehensive Plan Historic Resource Policies (Goal 5) Objective: Protect the community's historic character and sense of identity by conserving buildings and sites of historic significance and increasing the zone of control to include more of the original colony property.

Staff finds this criteria is met.

G. For variances to height requirements, six inches shall be added to the required setbacks for the front, side and rear yards, for every foot of height allowed by the commission beyond the established limit.

FINDINGS: The front setback in the HRO zone shall be a minimum of fifteen (15) feet except the front setback may be reduced to a minimum of ten (10) feet when the garage is located in the rear yard or the garage is located in the side yard of a corner lot (AMC 16.20.C.1). This is not a residential structure and no garage is located to the front of the property. AMC 16.40.160.A.2. further states, "Commercial and mixed-use structures shall be set back… a maximum of ten (10) feet from front lot lines". Additionally, AMC 16.40.160.A.3 states, "For new structures or additions to structures, including porches, the front setback shall not exceed four (4) feet more or less than the average front setback of the adjacent structures". The existing structure to the west is setback twelve (12) feet from the front property line. With a maximum setback of 10 feet for the zone and a variance allowance under AMC 16.40.160.A.3. of up to four (4) feet, a setback between six (6) and twelve (12) feet from the front property line would typically be permitted.

The applicant proposes a setback in their site plan for the base of the steeple at fourteen (14) feet, ten (10) inches and proposes to exceed the maximum height in the zone by thirteen (13) feet.

This amounts to an approx. three (3) foot variance from the permissible front setback under Title 17 and a height variance of thirteen (13) feet or an additional setback of six (6) feet. Staff finds the steeple setback of fourteen feet can be considered met from the front setback permissions varying between 6-12 feet for the front property line and this criteria is met.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in the staff report, staff recommends that the Planning Commission **approve** the application for Variance (file no. VAR-2015-03) based upon the following:

1) Develop the subject property in accordance with plans approved by the city.

2) Comply with all City of Aurora and State of Oregon development, building and fire codes.

3) Reduce the size of the installation (cross) atop the bell tower, as discussed and approved by the Aurora Historic Review Board (HRB). Evidence of review and final approval on the installation (cross) atop the bell tower by the HRB shall be required in advance of City approval of the structural permit application.

VI. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. Approve the variance request to exceed the maximum height of the Historic Residential Overlay (HRO) zone for a new proposed forty-eight (48) foot bell/entry tower addition to the existing structure.

1. As recommended by staff, or
2. As determined by the Planning Commission stating how the application satisfies all the required criteria, and any revisions to the recommended conditions of approval, or

OR

B. Deny the variance request to exceed the maximum height of the HRO zone for installation of a new proposed forty-eight (48) foot bell/entry tower.

OR

C. Continue the hearing to a time certain or indefinitely (considering the 120 day limit on applications).

Staff notes a correction to pg 1 notice was published October 2015 not 2016. Number 7 Criteria A conditional approval and #3 to be removed because of reduction of the cross and it shouldn't have been included as a condition. Pg 4 reduced to condition 1&2. Commissioner McNamara wants to confirm the height of the steeple at 48 feet. Which the applicant states is well within the FFA and informs everyone that the congregation has decided based on feedback to not place a cross on top of the steeple. Vice Chair Rhoden-Feely asks the applicant was it this congregation that took the original steeple down and the applicant states yes in the early years.

Richard Rothweiler 363 State Street Salem, OR. Architect presents a brief description of the project and the fact that they want to return the church steeple to resemble the old church as much as possible and to allow the hanging and maintenance of the old church bell.

Citizen Karen Townsend 15058 2nd Street Aurora, also a member of the Historic Review Board although I am coming before you as a citizen with concerns regarding the height of the steeple that is proposed. I like the design that is being proposed except for the height I feel as though it is to over powering for the neighbor hood/block. I really think the steeple could be modified and the height brought down and still provide ample room for bell maintenance. This is 5 stories high and it will overwhelm the block and the other historic properties surrounding it. Vice Chair Rhoden-Feely ask the applicant the height of the old

historic church the applicant was unsure of the actual height and provided a guess. Townsend goes on to say had the old church been there its possible neighbors wouldn't have purchased property there maybe.

Gayle Abernathy 15109 2nd Street I am also a member of the Historic Review Board however this evening I am here as a citizen with many of the same concerns as my neighbor Miss Townsend.

Commissioner Weidman asks the applicant if they could accomplish this project with lowering the height of the steeple. The applicant states this is what we need to complete the project and to preserve the architecture from the old building. We did hear many of the concerns and that Is why we removed the cross to bring some of the height down. If we can pull it down 12 inches then we will but not sure if it is possible. Weidman states that with the additional height it does make a very large statement.

Vice Chair closes the public hearing at 7:40 pm

Planning Commission begins there discussion first Commissioner Fawcett ask the applicant if the bell is currently in the tower and does it currently ring and the applicant states yes. Fawcett asks the height of the water tower for comparison and City Recorder Richardson states the water tower is 91.90 feet tall and the bottom of the Verizon equipment is at 53 feet. The museum is less than 35 feet tall.

Commissioners wanted to know the height of the original steeple the applicant was referring to however the applicant didn't have that information. After a brief discussion regarding whether it would be visible from Highway 99E.

A Motion is made by Commissioner McNamara to accept the application with the conditions as stated and is seconded by Commissioner Gibson. 2 ayes 3 nayes motion fails.

The Commissioners then look at the staff report to better clarify and Vice Chair Rhoden-Feely then asks questions of the applicant regarding each criteria to determine if all of them have been met to the group's satisfaction.

following this discussion another motion is made.

Commissioner Weidman makes a motion to deny based on the fact that criteria E and F there is no second therefore motion fails.

A motion is made to accept the application as presented with the conditions of approval by Commissioner McNamara and is seconded by Commissioner Gibson. 2 ayes and 3 nayes motion fails again.

At this point staff asks the Commissioners what additional information do they need so that we can move forward somehow this evening. Commissioner Fawcett states that they want the height of the original steeple and heights of trees around the building for comparison.

A motion is made to continue the hearing until the December 1st Planning Commission meeting and requesting the height of the original steeple is made by Commissioner Fawcett and is seconded by Commissioner Gibson and is passed by all.

b) Discussion and or Action on Legislative Amendment on AMC 16 Code Sections (LA-2015-02)

Public Hearing begins at 9:10 pm

Staff report;

TO:	Aurora Planning Commission
FROM:	Renata Wakeley, City Planner
RE:	Legislative Amendment 2015-02 (LA-15-02)
DATE:	November 3, 2015

REQUESTED ACTION

The Planning Commission's options for taking action on Legislative Amendment 15-02 include the following:

A. Adopt the findings in the staff report and recommend that the City Council adopt Legislative Amendment 15-02:
   1. As presented by staff; or
   2. As amended by the Planning Commission (stating revisions).

B. Recommend that the City Council take no action on Legislative Amendment 15-02.

C. Continue the public hearing:
   1. To a time certain, or
   2. Indefinitely.

BACKGROUND

In 2013, House Bill 3460 created a medical marijuana registration system and allowed medical marijuana facilities (MMFs) to be located in certain zones, including commercial, industrial, and mixed use. In 2015, House Bill 3400 further clarified marijuana regulations, expanded permissions for recreational marijuana, and also allowed jurisdictions to adopt reasonable time place, and manner restrictions on both. The Planning Commission has given staff general direction related to the marijuana issue and has had general discussions regarding proposed amendments to the Aurora Municipal Code (AMC).

At the same time, the Planning Commission received feedback from interested parties regarding recreational vehicles and accessory buildings and LA-15-02 includes proposed amendments to clarify the text on these items.

The following sections of the Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) are proposed for amendment:

- 16.04 Definitions
- 16.14 Commercial
- 16.16 Industrial
- 16.36 Manufactured Home Regulations
- 16.42 Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements

Legislative Amendment 15-02 includes the draft code amendments to the Aurora Municipal Code. The revisions are attached in a **bold** and ~~strikethrough~~ format for review purposes (see Exhibit A).

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to create "reasonable regulations" as allowed by House Bill 3460 and 3400 for time, place and manner restrictions for marijuana associated retailers, processers, and growers. By addressing marijuana sales, production, and processing, the City seeks to further clarify where these uses are permitted and mitigate potential conflicts with surrounding uses. The proposed amendments seeks to add clarity and certainty to the Aurora Municipal Code – Title 16.

FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS

The Aurora Planning Commission, after careful consideration of the testimony and evidence in the record, adopts the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions:

1. In accordance with the post-acknowledgement plan amendment process set forth in Oregon Revised Statute 197.610(1), the City Planner submitted the draft proposed amendments to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on October 13, 2015, which was 21-days prior to the first evidentiary hearing and 28-days prior to the tentative City Council hearing on November 10, 2015.
2. Amendments to the Code, Comprehensive Plan, and/or Maps are considered Legislative Amendments subject to 16.80.20. Legislative Amendments shall be made in accordance with the procedures and standards set forth in AMC 16.74-Procedures for Decision Making-Legislative. A legislative application may be approved or denied.
3. AMC 16.74.030 outlines notice requirements. At least ten days prior to the first public hearing, the City shall publish notice in a newspaper of general circulation. The notice of the planning commission and city council hearings was published in the Canby Herald on October 28, 2015, at least 10 days prior to the scheduled November 1, 2015 City Council hearing.
4. Proposed amendments for consideration of legislative changes to the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, implementing ordinances and maps are a legislative action. Section 16.74 calls for amendments to the Development Code to be processed as a recommendation by the Planning Commission and the decision by the City Council.
5. AMC 16.74.060 includes the standards for decision of Legislative Amendments as outlined under FINDINGS below.
6. The Planning Commission will review the proposed legislative amendments at a November 3, 2015 public hearing and a tentative City Council hearing is scheduled for November 10, 2015.

FINDINGS

A. The recommendation by the planning commission and the decision by the council shall be based on consideration of the following factors:

1. Any applicable statewide planning goals and guidelines adopted under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 197;

FINDINGS: Goal 1, Citizen Involvement: A public hearing on the proposed amendments is schedule before the Planning Commission on November 3, 2015 and a second hearing is scheduled before the City Council on November 10, 2015. Notice was posted at City Hall and published in the Canby Herald. The staff report was available for review one week prior to the Planning Commission and City Council hearings. This is consistent with City procedures. Staff finds Goal 1 is met.

Goal 2, Land Use Planning: The proposal does not involve exceptions to the Statewide Goals. Adoption actions are consistent with the acknowledged AMC for process. Goal 2 generally supports clear and thorough local procedures. Staff finds Goal 2 is met.

Goal 3, Agricultural Lands and Goal 4, Forest lands are found not to be applicable.

Goal 5, Open Spaces, Natural Resources, and Historic Areas: The proposed amendments do not affect regulations within the Aurora Historic District nor does it affect open spaces or natural resources. Staff finds Goal 5 does not apply.

Goal 6, Air, Water and Land Resource Quality: Goal 6 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 6 resources.

Goal 7, Natural Hazards: Goal 7 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 7 resources.

Goal 8, Recreational Needs: Goal 8 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 8 resources.

Goal 9, Economic Development: The draft code amendments respond to a need/revision identified by Senate Bills 3460/3400 to address permitted uses on commercial and industrial lands. The proposed code amendments are not found to deter employment or business opportunities but rather to allow for greater economic uses on commercial and industrial properties while also protecting the intent of these zones and permissible locations as well as the intent of the Aurora Historic District.

The Planning Commission has determined which uses under the Senate Bills are best suited in which zoning locations to match the purpose and intent of the zone. The code update also addressed design standards for storage units in the commercial zone to protect design standards of the primary structures in the zone. Staff finds Goal 9 is met.

Goal 10, Housing: The draft code amendments address storage of recreational vehicles on residentially zoned lands and within public rights-of-way not intended to accommodate housing. Staff finds Goal 10 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 10 issues.

Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services: Goal 11 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 11 issues.

Goal 12, Transportation: Goal 12 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 12 issues.

Goal 13, Energy Conservation: Goal 13 is not applicable as the code amendments address permitted uses under State law on properties already zoned for commercial and industrial development. The proposal does not address Goal 13 resources.

Goal 14, Urbanization: Goal 14 is not applicable. The proposal does not address Goal 14 issues as the proposed code amendments apply to existing commercial and industrial sites within the City limits and permissible uses within these zones.

ORS 197 does not include specific notice requirements for legislative processes but the City met all notice requirements under AMC for Legislative Amendments. ORS 227.186, more commonly known as Measure 56 notice, does not apply as the proposed amendments do not reduce permissible uses of properties in the affected zones.

2. Any federal or state statutes or rules found applicable;

FINDINGS: Staff finds the adoption actions are consistent with Oregon Revised Statute 197.610(1) for notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Measure 56 notice was not required as the proposed amendments do not reduce permissible uses on commercial lands.

The addition of specific definitions for marijuana grow sites, processing sites and retail sites under AMC 16.04 ensures compliance with recently adopted legislation at the State level. Above the State-imposed and regulated standards for said facilities, jurisdictions are permitted to adopt reasonable time, place and manner restrictions to meet the intent of their development code and comprehensive plans. Proposed amendments to address these new regulations and to further clarify the locations of specific facilities are found by staff to be reasonable and address the intent and purpose of the specific zoning codes, as outlined under each zoning code chapter.

Staff finds this criterion is met.

3. The applicable comprehensive plan policies and map; and

The applicable Aurora Comprehensive Plan Goals align with the Statewide Planning Goals and associated policies as outlined under FINDINGS, subsection A.1 above. Staff finds this criteria is met.

2. The applicable provisions of the implementing ordinances.

FINDINGS: The draft code amendments respond to a need/revision identified by Senate Bill 3460/3400 to potential permitted uses on commercial and industrial lands. The proposed code amendments are not found to deter employment or business opportunities but rather to clarify locations of permitted specific uses, allow for greater economic uses of commercial and industrial properties, and maintain design standards while also protecting the intent of the zones and the Aurora Historic District.

Staff finds the proposed code amendments can be established in compliance with the development requirements of the Aurora Municipal Code while maintaining the stated intent of the underlying zones.

B. Consideration may also be given to proof of a substantial change in circumstances, a mistake, or inconsistency in the comprehensive plan or implementing ordinance which is the subject of the application.

FINDINGS: Staff does not find a change in circumstance, mistake or inconsistency in the comprehensive plan or implementing ordinances. Rather, the proposed code amendments are a result of Senate Bill 13460/3400531 and the City's need to refine and clarify permitted locations and uses within the City of Aurora, adopt "reasonable regulations" for their review, as well as further clarify storage of recreational vehicles and design standards for accessory structure. Staff finds this criterion is met.

EXHIBIT A Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) section 16.04- Definitions
Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) section 16.14- Commercial zone
Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) section 16.16- Industrial zone
Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) section 16.36- Manufactured Home Regulation
Aurora Municipal Code (AMC) section 16.42- Off-Street Parking and Loading

Staff states there is one correction on the staff report in definitions shopping should be shipping containers and striking "and is not designed for human/animal occupancy not connected to utilities".

There is a brief discussion between Commissioners regarding logistics.

A motion is made to approve as amended by Commissioner McNamara and is seconded by Commissioner Fawcett. Motion Passes.

Public Hearing closed at 9:40 pm

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

   a)

8. **OLD BUSINESS**

   a) Discussion and or Action on Orchard View Subdivision. The background of the issue was presented currently the tracts are owned apparently by the developer the CCR's were recorded and the HOA was later voted on by property owners and voted out. The way it

recorded and the HOA was later voted on by property owners and voted out. The way it stands now the property owners are supposed to be maintaining the two tracts. There was an offer last month by one property owner to purchase the one tract and add as part of her front yard as she has been maintaining it since she purchased her property. We wanted to open it up to the property owners and get feedback from each of you to see if something can be agreed upon.

Various questions were asked by citizens who attended

Jerry Johnson, Aurora asks what the options are; Chair Schaefer informs Mr. Johnson that is why we are here tonight to discuss different options.

Kathy Kaatz, states I have been maintaining the land as part of my yard since we purchased the property however if I can't make it a part of my yard legally then I don't really want to keep maintaining it.

Rachel Nelson, Aurora would like more information on the costs that would be involved.

Pros and Cons of forming an HOA was also discussed and it was about 50/50 some in support and some in opposition.

During the discussion and so many different options discussed it is the consensus of the board to continue this discussion into January in hopes to get even more people involved.

If the City takes it over and maintains it then the City will bill the property owners.
Chair Schaefer enters the meeting at 8:38 pm.

Action Items; Have Public Works get an estimate on what it would cost to clean and maintain the area.

9. COMMISSION/DISCUSSION

a) City Planning Activity (in your packets) Status of Development Projects within the City.

10. ADJOURN

Chair Schaefer adjourned the November 3, 2015 Aurora Planning Commission Meeting at 9:43 P.M.

Chair Schaefer

ATTEST:

Kelly Richardson, CMC
City Recorder