

REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
BANDON CITY HALL
August 25, 2016

COMMISSION: David Kimes, Chair
 Sheryl Bremmer, Vice-Chair
 Daniel Graham
 David Reed
 Harv Schubothe
 Blythe Tiffany
 Ben Fisher

STAFF: Matt Winkel, Interim City Manager
 Michelle Hampton, City Planner
 Fred Carleton, City Attorney
 Sandra Messerle, Minutes Clerk

1.0 ROLL CALL

Roll call was taken with those present and absent reflected above.

2.0 CONSENT AGENDA

The meeting was opened at 7 p.m. by Chair David Kimes. Chair Kimes made a few corrections to the July 28th meeting minutes. Commissioner Harv Schubothe made a motion to pass the minutes as amended, and Vice Chair Sheryl Bremmer seconded the motion. The motion to approve the July minutes as amended was passed 5-0.

3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Kimes opened the meeting for Public Comment – an opportunity for citizens to speak on issues not on the Meeting Agenda. The time limit for each speaker is three (3) minutes.

Seeing no Public Comment speakers, Chair Kimes moved the meeting forward.

4.0 HEARINGS

4.1 CONDITIONAL USE: BEVERLY AND DAVE KOEPKE - REQUEST TO SITE A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 28-15-36 CB, TAX LOT 801. PROPERTIES ARE ZONED CONTROLLED DEVELOPMENT 1 (CD-1)

Chair Kimes officially opened the Public Hearing on the above titled Conditional Use Permit. He read all proceeding and process rules and regulations, all of which can be found detailed in full in the project file at City Hall.

Chair Kimes asked if any Commissioners wished to declare a conflict of interest in this permit request. Vice Chair Bremmer indicated that she had driven past the lot, and also observed it from the ocean view side. She indicated that the visual experience she has had with the lot would not impact her ability to be impartial in the Hearing.

Chair Kimes indicated that he had also made a site visit; and that it would not impact his impartiality in the matter.

With that, Chair Kimes asked if there was any member of the public that wished to challenge the qualifications of any Commissioners to participate in the Hearing. Seeing none, he moved the Hearing forward, asking for the Staff Report.

City Planner Michelle Hampton affirmed for the Commission that the owners of this property are Beverly and Dave Koepke, represented by Mr. Michael Deets, who is in the audience for the Hearing. She described the location in the CD-1 Zone and the Shoreline Overlay Zone; located on the West side of Beach Loop. She further explained detailed aspects of the property including the fact that it is in the Moderate to High Hazard Zone on the Hazard map, thereby requiring the owners to submit hazard reports. The owners did submit that report, Ms. Hampton continued, noting that the work was completed by three separate firms. One was the Galli Group, a geotechnical consulting firm; another was Terra Firma; and the other was Chris Oliveira, a professional, certified engineer.

Ms. Hampton noted that the Galli Group pulled the consolidated report together for submission, and she indicated that she felt they did a very thorough job. She reported that they made very specific recommendations on how the property could be developed safely. Based upon her review of the thorough hazard report and completed application, Ms. Hampton is recommending approval to the Commission.

However, she noted, there were additional issues to be done to meet the criteria of the CD-1 Zone, including the invitation of testimony on the project. Ms. Hampton called the Commission's attention to two letters of opposition to the project in their meeting packet. These are from property owners on the East side of Beach Loop, directly across from the property; and are the only letters of opposition to the project the Planning Staff has received. Ms. Hampton summarized for the Commission that the major concern expressed in the letters was the planned size of the structure, and whether it was characteristic of the neighborhood. However, she said, in reviewing the criteria, the Code has a purpose statement that says new developments should provide a coastal village atmosphere, and to exclude those uses which would be inconsistent with the area's character. The key word in the statement, Ms. Hampton explained, is "use." Inasmuch as the use of the development is a residence, she found it is consistent with the character as a residence.

Additionally, she said, it does meet the height limitations and lot coverage perimeters of the Zone. In the past, Ms. Hampton continued, when reviewing developments on the West side of Beach Loop, they have always considered the entire property in terms of lot coverage. In this case, she said, she specifically narrowed it down to the buildable lot area. Even with that, she explained, she found that the Applicants and the project still meet the conditions. Details can be found, she said, on Page 11 of the Staff report.

Ms. Hampton concluded that in all respects, this development meets the criteria for a Conditional Use in the CD-1 Zone. She again recommended the Commission approve the Conditional Use permit.

Chair Kimes asked if any Commission members had questions for the Staff. Seeing none, he offered a question relative to Staff's recommendations in the Staff Report. The first recommendation the Staff made, Chair Kimes noted, is that "someone from the Galli Group be onsite." The second recommendation, however, refers to "someone from the Galli Group or with equivalent qualifications" – and he noted the inconsistency, that one cannot have both.

Ms. Hampton apologized for the confusion, and explained how that recommendation came about, largely due to the recommendations being made initially by the Galli Group. However, while the

City cannot require a developer to utilize a specific contractor, on Page 2 of the Staff Report, she did address the rationale for this exception.

Chair Kimes said he would prefer it read, “All recommendations made by the Galli Group shall be met and adhered to with the exception of...”

Ms. Hampton agreed, adding that “Number 2 should read the Galli Group or someone with equivalent qualifications.”

Vice Chair Bremmer, however, expressed concerns that those changes would in effect negate the recommendations of the Galli Group, which several times throughout their report called for one of their people to be on site. This is a different circumstance than what has been done in the past, she explained.

Chair Kimes said he agrees that this is a different circumstance than in the past, but he is not in favor of getting the home owner locked into using a specific contractor, and unfair billable rates might arise from locking them into one source for the work.

Vice Chair Bremmer asked, however, how can the Commission accept the geological report as detailed fact, yet not follow it to the letter? And how does the Department Staff or the Commission determine who an equivalently qualified source is?

Chair Kimes admitted that he did not know the answer to that question.

City Attorney Fred Carleton advised the Commission that it would be advisable to make the decision now.

Further, he said that Mr. Deets has come forward to say that he intends to follow the report, and have the Galli Group on site to see that it is adhered to; this is what has been presented. Now, if Mr. Deets changes his mind later on this contractor, then it would be up to him to come before the Commission and formally request that change. If the Commission does not like the switch, that is the Commission’s option to deny.

Mr. Deets affirmed Mr. Carleton’s perception.

Ms. Tiffany noted that the wording pertaining to ‘someone of equivalent qualifications’ needs to be taken out of Recommendation number 2.

Vice Chair Bremmer affirmed that if the developer of the project wants to make a change later, then the Commission can evaluate it and make amendments to the recommendations if necessary.

Mr. Carleton gave an example of how the interchange might work. If the Galli Group were to bring someone forward out of retirement that the Commission would readily approve of, then it is a simple modification to make.

Chair Kimes said that he is also uncomfortable with the words, “Dark Sky” in recommendation number 3, because it refers to a specific thing; and the voters of Bandon have already said they do not want the ‘dark sky’ concept in the community.

Vice Chair Bremmer noted that many times the Commission has utilized the words “full cut off” to achieve the same result.

Chair Kimes agreed that he has a distaste for the negative connotation of ‘dark sky,’ but does like verbiage that disallows encroaching on neighboring properties along the beach.

Moving on, Vice Chair Bremmer noted that the geological report mentions several times specifications regarding fill that the property has on it and particularly a low area that requires more. Inasmuch, she said, as the Commission has had numerous discussions regarding fill, native grade and such – and especially in light of this property being on Beach Loop, where height limitations are adhered to strictly – how will the City make certain that the additional fill will not raise the height of the grade and therefore the structure to be built there? Has a provision been made for that aspect of this development? she asked.

Chair Kimes responded that they have had lengthy discussions with the developer regarding the multiple changes in fill that will be made, and have reached an agreement that the native grade will be held at exactly what it is to date. He said he did not know if it had to be specifically written into the recommendations.

Vice Chair Bremmer stated that it would be helpful to have that agreement documented.

Ms. Hampton explained that in any development that occurs along Beach Loop, the Public Works staff will go out in advance of the release of any fill permit and establish the measurement of native grade before anything else is done.

Ms. Bremmer asked Ms. Hampton about the result of a meeting she had with Joseph Bain, of Bain Insurance, regarding insurance. Is the project appropriately insured, or do they need more in his estimation? Is the City accepting any liability on this project?

Ms. Hampton responded that she met with Mr. Bain earlier in the week, and he is not concerned. He was going to contact the property owners, and would get back with her if any further liability coverage would be required.

In other concerns, Vice Chair Bremmer referenced pages 14 and 19 of the Staff Report, noting that the entries stating “info to be provided.” Did the Applicant provide maps, descriptions or items that would detail signage, etc., indicating compliance with the Comprehensive plan?

Ms. Hampton said most of that “to come” criteria has to do with the estuary; and she stated that she is comfortable that the Applicant and the development is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Through the geotech report and the application process, the Applicant has submitted a massive number of maps, detailed documentation and material in support of the project and in compliance with all criteria.

Relative to the Comprehensive Plan, Ms. Hampton continued, she did go through the Plan thoroughly looking for that coastal village component, but found that in the Plan it only addresses the Jetty. However, as she explained earlier, in the Code, it is listed in the purpose of the CD-1 Zone.

Chair Kimes asked if there were any other questions from the Commission to the Staff.

Mr. Schubothe replied that all of his concerns had been addressed.

Seeing no further questions from the Commissioners, Chair Kimes read the procedural rules for providing Public Testimony as part of the Public Hearing. These procedural rules are part of the permanent file of the project and available to the public in the City Offices.

With that, Chair Kimes invited Mr. Deets, the Applicants' representative, to the podium to present the project.

Mr. Mike Deets, 86629 N. Bank Lane, Coquille, presented a brief verbal timeline of the initial stages of the development, pending approval from the Commission during the evening's meeting. The clearing, ground work and preparatory work will be done prior to the rains of winter, so that construction can begin in early spring.

There were no questions from the Commissioners.

Chair Kimes offered the podium to anyone who wanted to provide testimony in the matter of the Conditional Use application. There were none presented in favor, and none offered in opposition.

Chair Kimes asked if the Staff had any further comments to offer. There were none.

Ms. Tiffany made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Vice Chair Bremmer seconded the motion. The motion to close the Public Hearing passed 5-0.

In final Commissioner comments, Chair Kime said he appreciated the Applicants' thoroughness of application. He noted that he not only understood what they wanted to do, he was able to understand everything they said.

Ms. Tiffany noted that the Commission had already discussed much of the pertinent issues regarding the application.

Chair Kimes noted for all that the Findings of Fact on this project was going to appear later in the Agenda. He explained that normally that would not take place until the next month. However, because the developer needs to get the old fill out and move soils before the winter rains, the Commission was agreeable to fast tracking the formal process. This was aided, in large part, by the thoroughness and attention to detail of the application.

Commissioner Ben Fisher said he does have some concerns about building a large mansion in the area out there.

Mr. Schubothe thanked the Applicant for providing a detailed, complete application. For months, he noted, there has been an unfortunate pattern of applicants not doing so, resulting in delays, denials and frustrations.

Ms. Tiffany made the motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit with Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Staff Report. Mr. Schubothe seconded. The motion to approve was passed, 5-0-2 absent (Graham and Reed).

5.0 FINDINGS OF FACT

5.1 CONDITIONAL USE: JOHN DANIELSON/ELIZABETH MAY/BARBARA DANIELSON – 725 BEACH LOOP DRIVE (28-15-25 CB, TL 1000) – TO OPERATE A VACATION RENTAL DWELLING IN AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING IN THE CONTROLLED DEVELOPMENT (CD-1) ZONE

Chair Kimes stated that he appreciated all of the additional information that the Applicants provided, including their written agreement to put visible signage out near the neighboring property directing tenants to the ample off street parking on their property. Additionally, there will be signage visible from both sides at the entryway of the parking area.

Ms. Hampton reported that several of the Commissioners had brought to her attention that at the last meeting, a 15th Condition of Approval was added. However, it failed to make it into the final Staff Report, and that has been included in the packets for the meeting. She reminded the Commissioners that the 15th Condition of Approval deals with access and egress into the property.

Mr. Schubothe made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact. Ms. Tiffany seconded the motion. The motion to approve the Findings of Fact was passed 5-0-2 absent (Graham and Reed).

5.2 CONDITIONAL USE: BEVERLY AND DAVE KOEPKE - REQUEST TO SITE A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 28-15-36 CB, TAX LOT 801. PROPERTY IS ZONED CONTROLLED DEVELOPMENT 1 (CD-1

Ms. Hampton explained that, as previously indicated by Chair Kimes, normally the Commission does not review and approve the Findings of Fact until the month following the Public Hearing on a permit. However, because the geotech report on the project was very specific regarding the need to move the soils prior to the winter storms, the Planning Staff and the Commission felt it necessary to fast track the process for this particular permit. She called the Commission's attention to the Findings of Fact, noting that Page 18 of 18 will have amendments to the Conditions for Approval based upon the discussions/concerns expressed earlier in the meeting. Also, the verbiage will be changed from the "Staff recommends" to "the Commission recommends." She further outlined the detailed changes to be made throughout the Conditions for Approval.

Ms. Tiffany moved to accept the Findings of Fact. Mr. Schubothe seconded the motion. The motion to accept the Findings of Fact was approved, 5-0-2 absent (Graham and Reed).

Ms. Tiffany made a motion to reflect the same change in the record for the previous Findings of Fact. Ms. Bremmer seconded the motion. The motion was passed 5-0-2 absent (Graham and Reed).

6.0 DISCUSSION OF PLANNING FEES

Ms. Hampton shared with the Commission that the Fee Comparative Analysis before them is the same that she provided to them prior to their joint work session with the City Council. She said she admittedly left a little confused as to where they were at with regard to Planning Fees.

She reported that she spoke with Mr. Winkel, and they recommend that the City of Bandon Planning Department go with an hourly rate for services. She noted that at the back of the Comparative Analysis, Mr. Winkel was able to compile an average rate of \$51.43, based upon the wages of the Planning Director, the City Planner and the City Manager. However, she noted, many of the varied applications and permits involve other department heads, and these are factors that will need to be addressed in establishing a "cost based" hourly service rate. This type of hourly

rate could help the department offset its costs, particularly with regards to reviews of already considered applications.

Ms. Hampton offered that she is putting this analysis and possibility forward for the Commissioners' consideration, and to solicit their guidance in how to proceed.

Chair Kimes noted that the County charges \$125 per hour for its planning fees, which theoretically, at minimum, covers department costs – department heads, insurance, salaries, etc. He asked Ms. Hampton if she, in fact, had a set per hour fee in mind.

Ms. Hampton responded that she did not have a cost based fee in mind, but rather, brought this initial concept forward to see if it is the direction the Commission would like her to explore further.

Chair Kimes asked Ms. Tiffany for her thoughts. She admitted concern over the cost based approach to fees, because as a resident brings an application forward, they would have no idea of how much time would be needed to process it, or what the cost to file would be in advance.

Mr. Fisher and Chair Kimes both noted that the County does charge in advance. The County charges a \$500 fee per application, then charges \$125.00 per hour out of that deposit. For that deposit, the applicant receives four (4) hours of work. However, he does not know how it is handled if the services fall below the covered four hours of work.

Ms. Tiffany asked about establishing averages for each type of permit application, so that when a customer comes in, the staff can estimate the full charge for that particular type of application? And, she asked, if the application service fees exceed the initial \$500, does work stop until another payment is made?

Mr. Schubothe noted he had the same question. What if the resident is charged the initial four hours based upon the averages, but the work exceeds eight (8)?

Chair Kimes responded that if the service fees exceed four hours, then another \$500 is required for the work to continue.

But, Ms. Tiffany asked, is that how we want to handle this?

Ms. Hampton told the Commissioners that she is actually looking to them for direction on how to proceed. The Department currently does charge some flat rate fees on a number of specific applications. For example, she said, on a Conditional Use Permit application, the Department charges \$750. However, she added, that is not a matter of just covering staff time, but rather the expense of public notification including sending out the notices and publishing in the local paper.

Ms. Hampton gave another example of Zoning Compliance applications. Currently, she said, they charge \$300. She added, however, that it does take approximately 3 to 5 hours of Staff time to just process those applications, if they are, in fact, complete when submitted. Time pursuant to processing them includes reviewing them, notifying the tribes and others. But if they have to redo it and send it back to the Commission, maybe more should be charged.

Ms. Tiffany asked for clarification; whatever the Commission decides to do with fees, doesn't it need to go before the City Council for enactment? It is their purview to establish these fees.

Chair Kimes responded that the Commission would need to make a recommendation to the City Council. However, he reminded the Commission that at the joint meeting, the Council instructed the Commission to recommend a Planning Department fee structure.

Mr. Winkel affirmed that the City Council will be looking for a formal recommendation from the Commission and the Planning Department on establishment of fees; after all, they are the individuals with experience and knowledge about what kinds of time and costs are involved in permit applications.

Ms. Tiffany asked, then, if the resulting recommendation will be a combination of what the Planning Department is doing now in terms of charging flat rates to cover extemporaneous costs, in addition to the setting of per hour application fees to cover time costs. As an example, Ms. Tiffany cited, theoretically, an applicant being told that the actual application fee would be \$750, plus a Staff cost of \$125 an hour to process the application.

Ms. Hampton said she believes that it is the scenario she has put before the Commission. She wanted to bring these initial thoughts before the Commissioners, she said, in order to secure feedback and direction prior to bringing back a more concrete recommendation for their consideration. Is there a direction, other than cost based fee analysis, that the Commission would like them to take?

Ms. Tiffany asked then, is Ms. Hampton's goal to come back to the Commission with a list of all of varied permit applications, that would have a set fee for each application on one side of a page, and on the same line item on the other side of the page, have an estimate of the cost based per hour rate for processing that is anticipated to be charged in addition to the initial application fee?

Mr. Winkel explained how he sees the process working. The Staff will analyze and evaluate, based upon previous experience, the amount of time needed to process each type of application. Then, he said, in the instance of a Conditional Use permit, the applicant would be charged a set fee that includes the actual costs of the processing (\$750) plus three to five hours of staff time to process a complete application. So when filing their application, the applicant would be told up front that if their application is fully detailed and complete, their expense for the filing would be \$1,100 which includes all costs and staff time to process. If their application is not complete or needs numerous reviews, then additional charges will apply at a cost of "so much per hour", and the clock starts ticking.

Mr. Winkel reminded the Commission that while the main goal here is to recoup the Planning Department costs, it can also serve to encourage people to turn in complete, precise applications; otherwise, they will end up paying a premium for partially completed applications. It is the partial or incomplete applications that the Commission and the Department has been dealing with in the past year that really burns up the Staff time, and causes completed applications to get shoved aside.

Ms. Tiffany asked if the Commission could move to make a recommendation in accordance with what they have discussed during the evening's meeting.

Mr. Winkel indicated that inasmuch as they appear to have Commission consensus, they would prefer to come back to the Commission again with a proposed fee schedule, as Ms. Tiffany conceptualized earlier, for their full consideration.

Mr. Carleton noted that in the City of Bandon, they are not exactly in the middle of a corn field, where things are exactly the same from one end of the town to the other. The Commission just experienced that with the development considered earlier, with the fill, the slope, and the hazards considerations; and with a recent application involving wetland considerations.

What that results in, he said, is the Planning Department Staff spending lots of time with other organizations, including the tribes, DSL and a host of others. And the Staff does not walk into those meetings with a stop watch ready to bill for every lost 30 seconds that are spent talking about how the drive down was. He believes the Staff could work out an assessment of typical time expenditures on various types of applications, but also have some additional categories that includes special meetings or meetings with agencies on an applicant's behalf. Everything, he said, needs to be done on the one-hour charge, because to do otherwise, applicants are going to start asking to see the time sheets.

Mr. Carleton noted that some of the meetings that involve the Staff have a lot of stakeholders gathered around a table for often a long period of time. In other words, not one size fits all applications in terms of time required, based upon the environmental aspects of the locations. So, Mr. Carleton said, we need a fee structure that accounts for those projects that are more complicated, not because of completeness of the application, but because of the environmental nuances and implications of the projects. In some instances, the Staff may opt to charge less to a client for their time in that venue, because they may actually be gathering information that will benefit other applications as well.

In conclusion, Mr. Carleton noted that there are a lot of ways they can get to where they need to be, but he would advise against putting a strict stopwatch on every interaction over the initial first hour.

Mr. Schubothe said that he feels an average is a potential way to secure a structure to the fees, but noted that some applications will take more time and some will take less. But he is wrestling with the concept of charging an initial flat fee, but then adding more on top. From a purely mathematical standpoint, he said, an average might work, but what about those instances where it doesn't?

Ms. Tiffany added that an average, again, would be based upon a complete application. That emphasis would serve notice on those who turn in incomplete applications, or come back with continual changes, that they will be charged a premium over those who have done a thorough, detailed application with all required materials as requested.

Vice Chair Bremmer noted that some of that disparity could be handled by charging for extensions. Currently, she sees no charges indicated for extensions, but as the Commission has learned in past months, that is at a tremendous cost in time (redone Staff Reports) and materials (publications) to the City. If the Department were to charge for extensions, it may produce the outcome of applicants not relying on them as a way to complete their incomplete plans and applications. Of course, Ms. Bremmer said, there could be exceptions for extenuating circumstances, and no one is going to charge another hour because an applicant went over their allotted time by 30 seconds.

Further, Vice Chair Bremmer noted a reference to a 'Citizen's legislative matter' on the last page of the fee comparison. She indicated that it look like a fee charged for citizen legislative initiatives of \$1,750 by Coos County. Since it is the only submitted comparative fee structure that has it, it may not be applicable to communities anyway, but she said she thought it was interesting.

Vice Chair Bremmer then recommended again that fees for requested extensions could help balance the fee costs for complete and incomplete applications.

Chair Kimes asked Ms. Hampton if the extension connotation actually had to do with year extensions on actual work, rather than application process extensions.

Ms. Hampton reminded the Commissioners that what they have in the fees schedule analysis is the actual fee schedule for neighboring coastal communities and the County. She then cited the fees of each community regarding appeals. While there is a set fee, there are a host of different appeals within each community (administrative, council, etc.), and the numbers provided take in that broad spectrum. She noted that in the case of Bandon, it may be advisable to come up with a list of those varied appeals, and the fee to be charged for each type, rather than putting a flat fee on all. For example, she said, an appeal of an administrative decision can be just as expensive as an appeal for a conditional use; yet the City of Bandon has no fee for an appeal of an administrative decision.

Perhaps, Ms. Hampton said, it would be beneficial to have both, a complete listing of the fees as they currently exist, along with notations where fees are not currently charged but should be; along with a proposed schedule of flat fees with cost based average charges for Staff time, as well as per hour charges for anything over and above that average rate.

Ms. Hampton reminded the Commission that as she reported at the Joint Work Session, they have done eight (8) applications that the Staff has reviewed three times now under one application fee. Unfortunately, the Staff is finding that this has become common practice – not the uncommon practice – but the common practice among applicants now.

Mr. Carleton offered to the Commission that this might be the kind of thing that the Department and the Commission transitions into – swat one fly today, another one tomorrow – in order to address the concerns that Mr. Schubothe brought up. If one bases the rate upon the actual costs, it then becomes hard to make it a matter of averages. Yes, he said, there are certain functions that the Planning Staff does for every application. But what if we are dealing with an application that is thorough and complete, but suddenly over 50 residents take an interest in it? Or, what if you get one of those email threads from Dave Perry, our DLCD Representative, or a host of phone calls? Do you then charge the applicant for that?

In summary, Mr. Carleton reminded the Commission that what they have essentially said is that one of the biggest time wasters for the Staff is that of incomplete applications. So, he recommended, addressing that issue, in addition to the fees. Tell applicants with incomplete applications, “after the 30-days’ notice you are given to complete your application, you will be charged this amount for future reviews.” Focus on the fees and the incomplete application issue, and tackle other time issues as the Commission identifies them, he said.

Mr. Fisher said he would be very interested in seeing a fee schedule.

Vice Chair Bremmer suggested that the Staff carefully and strategically look at the things they currently do charge for and those things that they don’t. If, in fact, in that review they find that some of the things they currently don’t charge for are things that take an extraordinary amount of time, they might want to initiate charges for those actions; like extensions.

The point is, Chair Bremmer said, review of these charges are not designed to gouge the person that wants to build something, but rather to influence the people who want to take up a lot of time to minimize their impact on the Staff and the Department. It is a reminder that we are not here to plan their projects for them; but rather to review their fully completed plans in compliance with city code criteria.

Ms. Hampton asked for clarification on the request from the Commissioners at this point. She asked if their request is for her to produce a complete list of fees being charged currently, along with notations of services not currently being charged for that the Staff believes should have fees attached, and finally, what the Staff's recommendations are on future fees.

Chair Kimes added that he believes the Commission would also be interested in seeing the Staff's assessment of what time averages would be in any one of a number of services upon which initial fees for Staff services could be charged. He would also like to see those time averages/costs for 1) an incomplete application, and 2) a completed but complex application that would have an impact on the normal time frame of the average application.

Vice Chair Bremmer noted that she likes the idea of a per hour Staff time charge, but wondered if they are creating an administrative nightmare by doing so, based upon the increased record keeping and the amount of time billing for overages.

Chair Kimes recommended to Ms. Hampton that she sit down with the County Planning Staff and see how they handle the aforementioned administrative issues.

In other Planning Department efforts, Ms. Hampton noted that she has sent out some information on Planning Training opportunities to members of the Commission and Planning Department Staff. If anyone is interested in attending, she said, please let her know.

Mr. Winkel reported that he is working on getting a Planning Director or another Planning Staff member into the department to help with Ms. Hampton's work load. She is the sole Planning Staff right now.

7.0 COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Fisher reported that they have been filming a movie on the beach called "Damsels." It stars the actor from the Twilight series. He said the film crew has been out on the beach the past few days, and the Commissioners may or may not have noticed the activity.

Mr. Schuboth noted that the last Music in the Park of the season will take place on Saturday, from 1 to 4 p.m., featuring Bob Schaffer.

8.0 ADJOURN THE REGULAR MEETING

Chair Kimes adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Sandra J. Messerle