

Development Review Board – Panel B
Minutes–February 26, 2018 6:30 PM

I. Call to Order

Acting Chair Shawn O’Neil called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Chair’s Remarks

The Conduct of Hearing and Statement of Public Notice were read into the record.

III. Roll Call

Present for roll call were: Shawn O’Neil, Richard Martens, Aaron Woods, Samy Nada, and Tracy Meyer

Staff present: Daniel Pauly, Barbara Jacobson, and Kimberly Rybold

IV. Citizens’ Input This is an opportunity for visitors to address the Development Review Board on items not on the agenda. There were no comments.

V. Election of 2018 Chair and Vice-Chair

A. Chair

Samy Nada nominated Shawn O’Neil as 2018 DRB-Panel B Chair. Richard Martins seconded the nomination.

Aaron Woods nominated Richard Martins as 2018 DRB-Panel B Chair. Samy Nada seconded the nomination.

Shawn O’Neil said he appreciated being able to have served two terms. He commended Mr. Martens in his role as Vice-Chair and supported him being Chair.

Aaron Woods added that having observed and worked with Mr. Martens, he agreed Mr. Martins would be a great Chair.

Richard Martins was elected 2018 DRB-Panel B Chair by a 4 to 1 vote with Richard Martins abstaining.

B. Vice-Chair

Aaron Woods nominated Samy Nada for 2018 DRB-Panel B Vice-Chair. Shawn O’Neil seconded the nomination.

There were no further nominations.

Samy Nada was elected 2018 DRB-Panel B Vice-Chair by a 4 to 1 vote with Samy Nada abstaining.

VI. Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of minutes of October 23, 2017 meeting

Aaron Woods moved to approve the October 23, 2017 DRB Panel B meeting minutes as presented. Samy Nada seconded the motion, which passed 4 to 1 with Tracy Meyer abstaining.

VII. Public Hearing:

A. **Resolution No. 348. Marion's Carpets Digital Freestanding Sign: Allusa Architecture - Applicant for Bergaso Properties LLC - Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Class 3 Sign Permit and Waiver to change the approved pylon sign to a digital changeable copy sign. The subject property is located at 28819 SW Boones Ferry Road on Tax Lot 1300 of Section 14A, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Kimberly Rybold.

Case Files: DB18-0001 Class III Sign Permit with Waiver

Acting Chair O'Neil called the public hearing to order at 6:37 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Shawn O'Neil, Richard Martens, Aaron Woods, and Samy Nada declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Kimberly Rybold, Associate Planner, announced that the criteria applicable to the application were stated on Page 1 of the Staff report, which was entered into the record. Copies of the report were made available to the side of the room.

Ms. Rybold presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's location, as well as the location of the proposed sign, with these key comments:

- In August of 2017, this Board had reviewed and approved the application for the new Marion's Carpet building, which was currently under construction. The pylon sign for Marion's Carpets was also approved at that time. The subject request was for a Class III sign permit was necessitated by a waiver request to allow for an electronic changeable copy sign. The proposed sign would be in the same location with a brick base that would coordinate with the brick on part of the proposed building's façade and upon which the LED display would be mounted.
- Although the Sign Code outlined so-called prohibited signs, it was a misleading statement as certain prohibited signs listed in the Code might be more aptly considered to be conditionally permitted. Which meant they could be permitted pursuant to the approval of a waiver. However, specific criteria or conditions must be met for electronic signs, including having automatic dimming technology to adjust for ambient light conditions and adhering

to guidelines related to luminance, specifically that the sign not exceed 5,000 candelas per sq meter between sunrise and sunset and 500 candelas per sq meter between sunset and sunrise.

- It was important to note that changing image and changeable copy signs were different. The Development Code did not permit any kind of changing image sign, ~~a sign~~ where the appearance of movement or copy change had a frequency of less than every 15 minutes. In contrast, a changeable copy sign, defined by a frequency of copy change of once every 15 minutes or more, could be conditionally permitted by the DRB.
- Another important consideration was the Sign Waiver Criteria which reflected the Sign Code Purpose Statement stating signs would have an improved functional and aesthetic design, compared to what would otherwise be permitted; would be more compatible and complementary both to the subject site as well as the surrounding development and zoning designation; and either improve or not negatively impact safety.
 - It was important to note that sign content was not considered as part of the Sign Waiver Criteria.
- The proposed sign did meet the height and area requirements of the Development Code for sites in the PDI Zone, having parallel frontage to Interstate 5. Signs in the area had a maximum of 64 sq ft in area, and the proposed sign was 63.56 sq ft. The proposed sign was the same height as the previously approved sign, which was 20 ft; the maximum height for signs in these areas along I-5.
- She entered the following exhibit into the record:
 - Exhibit C2: Email correspondence from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) providing additional information about the State's requirements for signs visible from State highways. ODOT had no issues with the proposal.
- Staff recommended approval of the Class III Sign Permit and Waiver with the conditions as noted in the Staff report.

Aaron Woods asked which direction the sign would be facing.

Ms. Rybold clarified the two sides of the sign would face north/south so it would be visible in both directions to traffic on Interstate 5. It would not face outward to Boones Ferry Rd.

Richard Martens understood the State statute stated that if a sign was outside of the highway right-of-way, the State would not take a position on it.

Ms. Rybold clarified the State still had requirements with regard to visibility, but the proposed sign was not within their right-of-way. The State would regulate a sign differently if it was within their right-of-way.

Samy Nada asked how the proposed sign compared in brightness and illumination to the changeable copy signs recently approved for the high school and middle school in Meridian Park.

Ms. Rybold replied she did not have that information available, but those approvals would have been tied to the same illumination level requirements.

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, added the proposed sign would not be any brighter than those recently approved signs. He also believed the proposed sign had the same manufacturer, Daktronics, a major manufacturer of those types of displays.

Acting Chair O'Neil noted that he had felt compelled to vote no on the prior sign proposals because he thought there were some problems with the way the Code was written. He asked the city attorney if something had been changed to fix that.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, confirmed the Sign Code was the same.

Acting Chair O'Neil stated that because he believed the Code did not properly address that issue, he had felt forced to vote against a digital sign for the high school and middle school. He also felt compelled to vote no on this application because he believed the Code was poorly written and needed to be fixed. He realized he had to remain neutral in terms of sign content. He understood from Mr. Pauly that there would be an effort to make changes, and yet the current application for a Sign Code Waiver was before the DRB.

Mr. Pauly clarified that proposed changes to the Sign Code had been drafted, but had not gone through work programs. He confirmed that it had not been presented to the Planning Commission, and explained that the changes would create two sections, a Prohibited section and a Conditionally Permitted section. Changeable Copy signs would be moved into the Conditionally Permitted section. A conditional permit would be revocable if the conditions were not met.

Acting Chair O'Neil asked if the city attorney had been given an opportunity to review the draft of the proposed Sign Code changes.

Ms. Jacobson confirmed that she had not seen a draft.

Mr. Pauly replied that it had been a while ago, but he believed he had sent it to Ms. Jacobson.

Mr. Woods noticed Page 4 of the Staff report stated that Planning Staff was working with the city attorney to potentially bring minor changes to the Sign Code language in Section 4.156.06. He asked if Staff was actually working on it or not.

Mr. Pauly replied Staff was working on it, but the word 'potentially' referred to the fact that Staff did not have the final word as to whether or not those changes were approved. It was not that Staff was never going to actually bring it forward, but that the Planning Commission and City Council could decide that the Sign Code was fine as is.

Acting Chair O'Neil understood that even though the Staff report stated that the proposed changes had been presented to the city attorney, she had not seen it yet.

Mr. Pauly clarified that he would have to go back through his email, but his recollection was that he had sent it.

Ms. Jacobson responded that she did not recall seeing it, but the bottom line was that it did not matter at this point as it had to go through the process.

Acting Chair O'Neil said he understood that but the fact that the process had not been started mattered to him.

Mr. Pauly explained that different Staff members and the Planning Commission set that work program, but Staff was aware of it.

Mr. Martens asked if the proposed Code changes would have any material impact on the current application.

Mr. Pauly answered no; it would be a conditional use either way. The current Sign Code was awkwardly worded, but that language was where it was because when Staff rewrote that Code section, there were no issues or compelling reasons raised in discussion to move it somewhere else.

Acting Chair O'Neil asked Mr. Pauly if he was speaking for the City, the city attorney, or as Senior Planner when he stated it was Staff's position that the proposed changes to the Sign Code would have no impact on the current Sign Code Waiver application.

Mr. Pauly replied he was speaking in terms of Planning Staff making a recommendation for approval to the DRB. Whether the proposed Sign Code changes were adopted or not, Staff's recommendation would remain constant if an application met the basic criteria for a waiver.

Acting Chair O'Neil called for the Applicant's testimony.

Bob Schatz, Allusa Architecture, 2118 SE Division St, Portland, OR 97202, introduced himself, noting that Carl Skoro of Marion's Carpet was also present. He said he had nothing to add but agreed with Staff's decision.

Carl Skoro, Owner, Marion's Carpet, 1635 SE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97214, provided a history of his company, which was 53 years old and founded in 1965 by his father, Marion Skoro. He grew up with the company, and they struggled a lot because the company did mostly new construction in the 1970s and 1980s. He had heard a lot about a carpeting company in Seattle that had opened giant 30,000 sq ft to 40,000 sq ft stores. Every time he would go to an event that they also attended, he would hear rumblings about the giant stores having what the customers really liked. He began driving to Seattle once a month to look at the stores and figure

out what they were doing. When he bought the business from his father, he changed his store more into a model of the Seattle-based stores. Most retail carpet stores were about 3,000 sq ft to 4,000 sq ft, and the Seattle-based stores were about 40,000. Marion's Carpet was a tad smaller than that, but carried many things that most floor covering stores did not. He bought a digital sign for his Grand Avenue store 28 years ago, and it gave people driving by a better idea of the breadth of the rugs, hardwoods, and carpeting, including car carpets and shag, that his store carried. He requested the Sign Code Waiver so he could install a sign to indicate that Marion's Carpet carried more than just standard carpet and standard hardwoods. The current sign at the Grand Ave location had been there almost 30 years. There had never been any accidents related to the sign or any complaints. He did not think the new sign would be a problem and would do a good job of advertising the items inside the store that could not be seen when driving by, which was why he had submitted the application.

Mr. Woods asked what hours the sign would be operational. just as stated...

Mr. Skoro replied the sign would be turned off between midnight and 5:00 am. As required, there would be a 15-minute hold on sign images; no message on the sign could change without a 15-minute break. He confirmed the planned frequency of change was every 15 minutes.

Acting Chair O'Neil called for public testimony in favor of, opposed and neutral to the application. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing at 6:57 pm.

Samy Nada moved to approve Resolution No. 348 with the addition of Exhibit C2. Richard Martens seconded the motion.

Acting Chair O'Neil stated he was very disappointed in the City for not changing the Sign Code, so now he would be voting against the proposal, which he believed he would have supported had some changes been made. He was embarrassed because he was to be neutral about the applicants, but had to vote down the high school, middle school, and this business's sign proposals, even though he was pro-business. That was not on him; however, but on the City. He had a feeling there was a little bit of positioning within the City about what changes should or should not have to be made, and he believed that perhaps, the Planning Department did not believe there needed to be any changes, but he did.

Motion passed 4 to 1 with Shawn O'Neil opposed.

Acting Chair O'Neil read the rules of appeal into the record.

- B. Resolution No. 349. Calais East Five Year Temporary Use Permit: Pacific Community Design - Representative for Polygon WLH LLC - Owner.** The applicant is requesting approval of a Five (5) Year Temporary Use Permit for a Sales Office, Temporary Parking and three model homes in the Calais East at Villebois subdivision in Villebois. The subject property is located on Tax Lots

2500, 2600, 2700 and 3900 of Section 15AB, T3S, R1W, Clackamas County, Oregon. Staff: Daniel Pauly.

Case Files: DB18-0002 Class III Five (5) Year Temporary Use Permit

Acting Chair O'Neil called the public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. and read the conduct of hearing format into the record. Shawn O'Neil, Richard Martens, Aaron Woods, and Samy Nada declared for the record that they had visited the site. No board member, however, declared a conflict of interest, bias, or conclusion from a site visit. No board member participation was challenged by any member of the audience.

Mr. Pauly presented the Staff report via PowerPoint, briefly reviewing the site's history, location, and surrounding features with these key comments:

- Recently, the Applicant decided to remove the parking area, but minimum parking requirements were still met with on-street parking. This might be the last model home complex in Villebois, and to his knowledge, there had never been a parking complaint from neighbors or anyone else about the model home complexes.
 - Many previous model home complexes involved a modular trailer, the model homes themselves, and parking as a temporary parking lot. The proposed model home complex, including the changes recently sent out, was only three larger homes on medium and standard lots. One of the model homes would contain the sales office.
 - Landscaping and fencing would be similar to previous model home complexes built over the years.
- Polygon had a good track record of closing them down without issues. Only one model home complex had been operational for five years and that was because there were approximately 500 homes for sale. The proposed complex would only offer 60 lots for sale, so he anticipated it would be in use for substantially less than five years if market conditions remained constant. However, the standard temporary permit was for five years, just in case.
- All of the signs had to match the Villebois Master Sign and Wayfinding Program, just as in other areas of Villebois.
- The play structure and skateboard park, which had just been completed, would be just south of the site across Palermo Street, which had just been completed.
- Lot 26, which had previously been the parking area, would be built as a home for sale.
- The criteria to be considered for a temporary use permit included the availability of appropriately zoned land. (Slide 4) Obviously, commercial land existed, but it was typical to build model home complexes accessory to a single family subdivision.
 - The land was to be available for the allowed use. Once all of the other homes were sold, the homes in the model homes complex would be converted to single family homes and also sold.
- He reiterated the five-year time period was a worst case scenario. If it took five years to sell all of the homes due to market conditions, the Applicant would like that flexibility.
- He noted the memorandum in the revised Staff report (page 14 of the 31, Exhibit A3) discussed the amendments made last week to remove references to the canopy sign and parking area, which were no longer being proposed as part of the Temporary Use Permit, as

well as any references to Lot 26. The following exhibit had been distributed to the Planning Commission and entered into the record:

- Exhibit A3: Revised Staff report dated February 22, 2018 that removed references to the canopy sign and parking area no longer being proposed as part of the Temporary Use Permit, as well as any references to the lot the parking was going to be on. An updated drawing was also included.

Aaron Woods asked if there was still a parking requirement, noting a previous document had shown the number of required parking spaces was based upon square footage of living space.

Mr. Pauly replied the requirement remained the same. Following the same calculations that the Board had used to approve the last couple of model home complexes, the total requirement would be six spaces. But, rather than putting those six spaces in an off street parking lot, those six spaces were readily available on adjacent streets and were allowed to be used to meet minimum parking requirements in the Code. He reiterated that he had not heard of any complaints or issues related to parking for model home complexes throughout Villebois or other neighborhoods. There would not be any neighbors present until the use of the model home complex was almost over.

Mr. Woods confirmed that the only parking spaces for the model home complex would be on the street, whereas in previous developments parking had been in a lot, as well as on the street.

Mr. Pauly added that in the amended Staff report, a new condition of approval required that the space directly in front of the sales office model home be ADA accessible. The Applicant was fine with that condition. He indicated a curb cut, rather than a ramp, would provide ADA accessibility.

Tracy Meyer asked when the five years would start.

Mr. Pauly replied the five-year time period would start when the DRB's decision was final, so from March 2018 through March 2023.

Acting Chair O'Neil stated that even though Mr. Pauly had mentioned there was no issue with parking, the skate park was around the corner and the DRB had fielded complaints regarding lack of parking when that had been presented.

Mr. Pauly clarified that the model home complex would be about a block away.

Acting Chair O'Neil stated that both current and future owners were worried about the potential lack of parking due to the skate park, and even though the model home complex was a block away, he had heard a lot of complaints about the lack of parking in Villebois, so he was curious why Mr. Pauly had not.

Mr. Pauly replied that most of those complaints came from the denser parts of the neighborhood with smaller lots. The subject neighborhood had larger lots and, therefore, more parking. He believed the area for the proposed model home complex was far enough away from the skate park that the street would not be in competition with the skate park for parking. He confirmed that he believed there would be plenty of parking for both the skate park and the model home complex. The Code allowed for immediately adjacent right-of-way to be used to meet minimum parking standards. The question was whether other uses, like the skate park, would take away parking from the proposed complex and he did not believe the six spaces around the proposed model home complex would be impacted by other area uses.

Ms. Meyer confirmed the six parking spaces were open spaces on the street, not dedicated for use solely by the proposed model home complex. The spaces would also be available parking for the sales and construction employees.

Mr. Pauly clarified that in such situations, the construction parking was more dominant, but Polygon had a good track record of keeping construction parking away from occupied homes and sales offices by using a system that posted no construction parking signage. The same would be done with the sales office to ensure parking was available for customers.

- He confirmed Polygon had proposed the change last week, stating that they realized they did not need the parking lot. Because the model home complex was smaller than most seen previously in Villebois, Staff had agreed.

Mr. Woods stated he could not find where Sign #1, referenced on Exhibit B3, was placed.

Mr. Pauly clarified the Board did not need to approve signs. Per the Staff report, whatever temporary signs the Applicant wanted to install simply had to follow the existing rules for Villebois. Even though the sign was included in the exhibit, no permit was needed for signage. Signs were either exempt or pre-approved as a part of the Master Sign and Way-Finding Program for Villebois.

Mr. Woods stated that when he reviewed something, he wanted to review it in its entirety, whether it was a requirement or not. It appeared to be omitted which was why he had asked the question. He confirmed that Sign #4 would be right in front of the sales/model home on the sidewalk, indicating the parking spaces.

Samy Nada asked if the street was wide enough to accommodate large vehicles, like garbage trucks, if cars were parked on both sides of the street.

Mr. Pauly replied the street was a typical condition that met all of the Public Works standards, a typical residential street. During the temporary use, he would not foresee parking on the street to be any different than when the homes were eventually occupied and residents had their cars out front.

Mr. Nada stated he was not sure how wide the street was, but usually streets only had parking on one side to accommodate moving vehicles.

Mr. Pauly added that he did not expect that all of the parking spots would be filled on a weekday morning during trash collection time. He confirmed the width of the street was sufficient for cars to be parked on both sides.

Acting Chair O'Neil understood the skate park was around the corner, but the residents who had testified regarding their concerns about the lack of parking were still there, even though they did not show up to testify tonight because the proposed model home complex was in a different location. At that time, the representation was that there was parking elsewhere, but now the Board was being asked to give up six more spots.

50:30

Mr. Pauly replied if the Board felt strongly that more parking was needed, the Board could require the parking area. However, in terms of the skate park, it was important to consider that the parking during the temporary use would not be significantly greater than when those homes were occupied.

Acting Chair O'Neil stated that he respected Mr. Pauly's representations, and meant no disrespect at all towards the Applicant, but neighbors had complained about the lack of parking and he felt compelled to be consistent, with every decision he made, based on those issues.

Mr. Pauly responded that the parking the Board had required as a condition of approval during the approval of Trocadero Park was added per the DRB's requirements and was being constructed along Palermo St and around the skate park.

Acting Chair O'Neil understood that in that same decision, it was determined that the traffic engineer would monitor the traffic and parking situation in that area.

Mr. Pauly said construction had not yet commenced, but he expected that it would be monitored going forward.

Mr. Nada asked if the temporary spaces would still be used for parking once the model homes were occupied.

Mr. Pauly explained it would be used for resident parking once the homes were occupied.

Mr. Nada asked why then was there a need for a specific approval.

Mr. Pauly replied it was a commercial use and the Code required that commercial uses have approval. The DRB's approval for single-family homes considered a minimum parking area, which was typically met in garages and driveways. Model homes were different in that the driveways and garages were blocked off and not used for parking, which pushed parking onto

the street. Therefore, only on-street parking could be considered to meet minimum parking requirements.

Acting Chair O'Neil called for the Applicant's testimony.

Eric Hawkinson, Pacific Community Design, 4814 SW Marigold St, Portland, Oregon, representing the Applicant, believed Mr. Pauly did a sufficient job explaining the application. He did not have anything further to add and offered to answer questions.

Mr. Woods asked why the Applicant had decided not to proceed with the parking lot.

Mr. Hawkinson replied that because those residential parking spaces would be there once the subdivision was constructed, it seemed appropriate to have those spaces utilized for the model homes that would be there anyway.

Mr. Nada asked if Mr. Hawkinson believed the temporary permit would be needed for the full five years.

Mr. Hawkinson replied it was hard to say, adding he could not speak to that as Pacific Community Design provided the engineers and consultants, not the sales people, for the project.

Acting Chair O'Neil noted for the record that no one was in the audience and closed the public hearing at 7:26 pm.

Richard Martens moved to approve Resolution No 349, including Exhibit A3, the revised Staff report dated February 22, 2018. Aaron Woods seconded the motion.

Acting Chair O'Neil noted he had concerns about parking; however, proper notice was given for the hearing and no one was in attendance. He was trying to make consistent decisions based on prior applications that came before the Board and did not believe the parking issues had been addressed since the previous hearing when residents did show up to voice concerns.

Mr. Martens stated he was at the skate park this afternoon after school hours, and only one person was present. There was more than adequate parking. The subject application would create new parking not currently there. It was hard to imagine that so many people would drive in from out of the area to use the park and park their cars in the neighborhood, which was the concern at the previous hearing. He did not believe that was a credible argument. There had been people who lived in Villebois and parked on the street raising objections about new people moving into Villebois and then parking on the street, so he did not share sympathy for the parking issue, which appeared non-existent from his perspective.

Acting Chair O'Neil appreciated and respected Mr. Martens' opinion but also noted that the time of day at which he had gone to the skate park might not have reflected when the highlight

of the parking might be, adding he had concerns about other days and times. He also wanted to hear from residents, and when residents of Villebois came to hearings with concerns, he was going to take that as gospel because it was at least evidence that they had concerns and he would make a decision based on that. The fact that no one showed up tonight meant that apparently, they had no concerns regarding parking at the model home complex.

Mr. Nada asked if the City had done any traffic studies in the neighborhood where parking complaints had been received to assess parking availability at different times and on different days to determine if the complaints were valid.

Mr. Pauly responded that engineers had been tracking that to some extent or another, but he did not know the details. Mark Ward in the City's Engineering Division took those complaints. He had not heard any really hot complaints recently that had come to Staff's attention.

Motion passed unanimously.

Acting Chair O'Neil read the rules of appeal into the record.

VIII. Board Member Communications:

Tracy Meyer introduced herself to the Board, noting she was near retirement and looking for meaningful work in the community. She worked in Salem at SAIF Corporation, the workers' compensation insurer for about half of the businesses in Oregon, and believed serving on the DRB was a good way to get involved in Wilsonville as she lived in Charbonneau. She tended to be pro-business, but was also concerned about the injured worker, so she believed she could offer a good balance and argue both sides of any issue. She had lived in Charbonneau for about 25 years and had also worked at SAIF for 28 years.

- A. Results of the December 11, 2017 DRB Panel A meeting
- B. Results of the January 8, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting
- C. Results of the February 12, 2018 DRB Panel A meeting
- D. Recent City Council Action Minutes

IX. Staff Communications

Daniel Pauly, Senior Planner, highlighted the DRB Panel A meetings, noting the January 8th meeting included the approval of the new parking area at the Community Garden and future dog run in Memorial Park. He reviewed the details, key issues, and the concerns heard from residents at the hearing, noting City Council confirmed the approach approved by the DRB was best. He noted both DRB Panels would be busy in the coming months with applications for two subdivisions in Frog Pond, a small subdivision on Canyon Creek South, and an eye health clinic in Town Center. The eye clinic would be new construction on one of the vacant pads near the movie theater.

Acting Chair O'Neil requested an update on the Universal Health Services project that was approved by the Board last January, noting that the DRB, and Staff especially, had put in a lot of work on that application.

Mr. Pauly reported that as the approval was set to expire, the applicant had requested a one-year extension in late December/early January to address the pending legal items. Approval was granted and he expected the City would know within the next year whether or not the project would proceed.

Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, noted that the court hearing was done and the matter was now in mediation.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Pinyerd, ABC Transcription Services, Inc. for
Shelley White, Planning Administrative Assistant