

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES
July 1, 2008

A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission was held in the Assembly Chambers, Borough Administration Offices, 809 Pioneer Road, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chris Miller, Chairperson.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Miller Emily Bratcher
 Tom Temple Tom Marsh
 Jennifer Peterson Umit Spencer
 Brian Flemming Nello Cooper
 Ian Michael Hebert

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Pruhs

OTHERS PRESENT: Bernardo Hernandez, Director of Community Planning
 Doug Sims, Planner III
 Cynthia Klepaski, Assistant Borough Attorney
 Julie Conover, Planning Secretary

A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES

Chairperson's Comments

Chris Miller welcomed two new Commissioners, Nello Cooper, Jr. representing the City of Fairbanks and Ian Michael Hebert, Commissioner At Large.

Communications to the Planning Commission

Bernardo Hernandez additionally welcomed new Planning Commissioners. Bernardo advised that the Assembly agreed with Commission's recommendations and approved RZ 2008-021, 023 and 024 at their meeting on June 26th.

Citizen's Comments – limited to three (3) minutes
Agenda items not scheduled for public hearing
None

Items other than those appearing on the agenda
None

C. *MINUTES

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Consent Agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent Agenda items are not considered separately unless any Planning Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.

MOTION: To approve agenda and consent agenda, including minutes of previous meeting by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Mr. Marsh**.

Objections
None

MOTION APPROVED

E. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

F. PUBLIC HEARING

CU2009-001 A request by Greg and Kelly Milles for conditional use approval to establish new utility connections, partially clear existing vegetation and establish new landscaping, provide for underground oil tanks and construct new fencing within a 20 foot Open Space Buffer zone in association with a new office building to be constructed on Lots 1-3, Block 6 South Westgate Subdivision. **(located at the northwest corner of the Airport Way and Market Street intersection)**

Doug Sims presented the staff report. Based on staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended postponement of the request to allow for additional issues to be clarified. No recommendations were made regarding Findings of Fact.

Temple clarified that there wasn't anything that would stop tree clearing on the portion marked as MFO.

Sims said that was correct.

Temple referred to the Open Space Buffer and asked what rights the owner had to remove trees if this request were denied.

Sims The OSB was intended to act as just that, a buffer between the MFO and SF10 with a list of conditional uses. The MFO had a 20 foot rear yard setback and the intent was to match that setback with the 20 foot OSB, to coincide with it. Owner would need special permission to deal with vegetation; couldn't remove trees without special permission.

Miller clarified that the only permitted use is trail maintenance. Everything else was conditional.

Sims said that was right.

Hebert asked if utilities were available along any other lot line besides the OSB.

Sims said he understood sewer and water were available along the frontage way. Electrical was only available to the north. Applicant could clarify.

Miller clarified that a conditional use in the OSB that said you may remove vegetation, install utilities, restore the ground with similar vegetation and so forth would be a normal way to use the conditional use process.

Sims said he would agree with that.

Miller asked staff if there were any particular concerns in the review process of the utility connections to the building.

Sims responded no, but seeing the condition of the 20 foot now and before, he wasn't clear on what it would look like in the after. For that reason, he was recommending postponement. Applicants had not been available to answer questions previously.

Miller clarified that the open space buffer was still in tact.

Sims said it had not been cleared.

Marsh said as he understood it the utility connections and the buried fuel tanks would disturb the vegetation, but the intent would be to restore that. It was not a permanent disturbance.

Sims said that was correct.

Marsh said the permanent disturbances would be the 7 foot fence, which it seemed to him to be a good thing; but then also the 3 foot encroachment for the sidewalk.

Sims said that was his understanding and those questions he had such as why not shift the building to the south to avoid those permanent encroachments...

Marsh clarified, except for the fence.

Sims said correct. The fence would presumably be located along the lot line.

Temple asked if he was able to get a response about the question of moving the footprint further south.

Sims said he was unclear as to why that couldn't take place. He believed the applicant could address that now as things have been updated. They had reviewed it, and there still seems to be some finalizing of the building size and footprint, its occupants. There will be multiple occupants in the building.

Miller asked if the buffer fence would be between the MFO and the OSB.

Sims clarified if he was referring to the fence mentioned in Mr. Shuttleworth's letter.

Miller said yes. It wouldn't be between the property line and neighbors, rather the MFO and OSB. And where does the other landscape that this lot requires go, or is the OSB being counted as the landscaping requirement.

Sims said that first, he hadn't considered having the fence as separating OSB and MFO. Regarding the rest, the City will require landscaping to the front of the building as parking lot screening, as well as buffer landscaping in the back. The Commission had the right to add to the City requirements. He didn't believe the City would want to replace their buffering landscape requirements with the OSB.

Miller noted that OSB was much more strict than the City requirements.

Sims said it *could* be, based on Planning Commission's review and approval of the conditions.

Fleming asked Mr. Sims what the OSB currently looked like as he noted in the packet that a number of the adjacent home owners were complaining about the owner already clearing the majority of the lot.

Sims said it was 20 foot wide, was flagged out and identified, and there were trees in it. The remaining front portions of the property had all been cleared. From what he could see, the 20 foot OSB was in tact. There was underbrush, rose hips, small prickly bushes as well as some larger birch and cottonwood.

Public Hearing

Mackenzie Staiger, property owner, Lot 4, noted she'd been before the Commission a couple of times with issues in the area. She said she had no doubt that the applicants would put in a nice building and she was not opposing the building itself, rather the clear cutting of the OSB trees. Their site plan showed a lot of grass and then some clumps of trees and that worried her. If applicants were putting 1,000 gallon fuel tanks into the OSB area, trees would probably not be grown on top of them. She agreed with Mr. Sims and didn't see any reason why applicants couldn't shift their site plan 3 or 5 feet to the south, so as not to encroach a concrete sidewalk into the OSB. She believed there were sewer and water hook-ups on the south side also, and there were chokecherry, birch and cottonwood trees acting as a buffer along the area. If the applicant could come up with some sort of plan and talk to the neighbors, she felt the neighbors would be willing to discuss it all.

Rita Camp, property owner, said she felt like they had already lost much of their vegetation along the back of their property. It used to be they couldn't see Airport Way and now it was visible from all over. She had a nice garden in back and would hate to have to move it.

Temple said he noticed in her email message that she was going to bring some pictures.
Camp said she thought someone else was going to, so didn't.

Marsh noted that she said she may have to move her garden and asked why.
Camp said the property lines had been in place for 50 years but had been resurveyed which showed that some of her property was on his property.

Marsh said than she was encroaching.
Camp said yes.
Marsh noted then she had been getting free use of the property for awhile.

Pauline Alis, property owner of Lot 7 said they had lived there since 1982. When they moved in the fence was there, and like everyone else, they assumed that was the property line. In the 90's it was surveyed and the proper line was inside their fence. They built a concrete dog run when they moved in, right up to the fence, so if fence is now moved they will have to move the dog run and other things. Regarding the trees, she said they really were a buffer for Airport Road. She would hate to have applicant take any of them out; they wouldn't live there long enough to see the trees grown back up. That was the main concern – the buffer from Airport Road.

Sharon Boko, property owner on Riverview Drive, said she's lived there 33 years. She's been to many of the Borough hearings and some were really bad. They'd had some businesses try to come in there that would have been very detrimental to the neighborhood. So far she was impressed with what Mr. Milles was trying to do. She also understood that it was hard when it's in your own back yard. She watched Doyon build across the river from her and it took away the eagles, the moose, all the things they had enjoyed for years. However, she felt this looked like a responsible plan and having known Mr. Milles all of his life, she knew he was a responsible person and would be willing to work with the neighbors. She felt the property owners along there were fortunate to have the trees as a buffer zone. If a family were to come in there and build a big deck in the backyard and take the trees out, would there be a requirement for a buffer zone for that? Probably not. She felt this was a responsible plan.

Miller noted that the OSB would still be required if it were a residential development.
Boko said, the 7 foot fence?
Miller asked if it was the fence or the buffer that she felt was the important piece.
Boko said she believed both. The buffer gave people a little bit of privacy, but also the fence would be a deterrent of noise. This was the most responsible plan she'd seen for the property in quite a while.

Cathy Persinger, property owner, said she was not on one of the properties that adjoined subject property. However, she did share property lines with some of those individuals. She believed the Commission had the opportunity to vote on the OSB today and retain it without conditions and that is what she would ask the Commission to do, and not to put it off. The process was initiated by the applicant with intent to cut down the trees and put in grass and a 6 foot fence. There had been subsequent discussions but no one knew what the current plan was; it was always a rumor. She felt that the applicants wanted to go last tonight so they could refute everything the neighbors said. What they have seen so far is applicants want to cut all the trees, replace them with grass. The 40 foot trees currently provided a sound reduction to many of the homes including hers and many others further back that will not be replaced by a 6 or 7 foot fence, and certainly not by grass or concrete. The Airport Road long term plans will have the business traffic going through the residential areas entirely. There will be a buffer zone and if it's not this piece of property it will be the next row of houses and she fears those properties will become less conducive to the neighborhood. She feels like she is shadow-boxing because no one seems to know what the current plan is. She heard something said about a neighborhood meeting but the neighbors don't know about it. She would ask that the

Commission not delay this, but enforce the open space buffer that provides the sound reduction to these homes.

Kerry Hafele, part of Milles project, noted the complaints tonight have been that communications have been poor and that is one thing the applicants were trying to do here tonight – to get everyone here who might wish to testify and let them know the applicants want to talk. He said they agree with the postponement for the fact that most of the folks didn't read that they plan to replace every single tree they have to take, and you can plant big trees. The 7 foot fence would add a good buffer also where the low, underlying brush doesn't. The lot currently has trash and debris in the entire OSB and Mr. Milles has pictures to show it has been used as a dumping ground for lawn clippings and various other things. There's a lot of metal stuck in there. A big problem is the power utility. They have re-routed the water and sewer to hook up in the front. These are all things they hope to answer with the folks from the subdivision. The electrical power is a big issue. There are cottonwoods there, which don't last very long and they are all about to die. Those are the trees Mr. Milles is looking at replacing. He doesn't want to touch any birch or spruce. There are maybe 4 willows that they would like to remove, and they want to landscape, put in nice grass, and make it look as appealing to people from Airport Road looking in. The fence should cover what they would normally see. There are fences encroaching onto Mr. Milles lot, one by 5 feet which is substantial considering the stake is still in his yard. Not all were that way. One was exactly on the property line, then others somewhat jog and turn. They took out plan for oil tanks, removed sidewalk from plans, so they are really asking to put up a 7 foot fence in the back, make it uniform on the property line and replace any trees taken out. GVEA has already said that they plan to clear a lot of the cottonwoods for the fact that some are dangling over top of lines. Once there is a building in there, it becomes unsafe for GVEA to clear those trees. Basically, they are hoping for a postponement so that they can talk to the neighbors and get it planned out.

Peterson clarified that they were proposing to give the Commission a plan that will show that they are not going to cut down any spruce or birch, but will be cutting down cottonwood and a few willows.

Hafele said they will show a plan that is not touching any birch or spruce. The willows and a lot of the cottonwoods they want to remove but will replace the ones that GVEA doesn't actually require them to take out. They would also like to row the trees in a better configuration where they will allow for the maximum buffer.

Fleming clarified that in the new plan they will not have the fuel tanks and not have the sidewalks.

Hafele said that was right.

Fleming noted then they have already accommodated some of the home owners and have already taken care of that.

Hafele said yeah.

Temple said that some of the trees are about 40 years old and asked what they would be replacing them with.

Hafele said that would be up to the client, but what he had talked about was birch, spruce; anything that will grow good and does provide... the cottonwoods that are there now are tall and don't block anything. The only thing that blocks anything is the low lying shrubbery which a 7 foot fence would take care of. He, personally, was not a big fan of cottonwoods because they rot out from the inside and you can't tell if they are going to die or fall.

{Pictures were passed out to Commission Members from Mr. Milles, to become part of the record}

Hebert clarified that the utilities would be rerouted, the tanks won't be in the open space buffer, and the walking path would not be in the buffer.

Hafele said that was correct.

Kelly Milles, applicant, said their goal was to beautify an area that was in need of it. They did not plan on ripping out trees and leaving a bare area. They want to remove garbage that is sitting there, vegetation that is overgrown in the garbage and replace any trees they remove. The replacement trees they intend to use would be birch and evergreen and they would like to transplant trees that are already 10-15 feet in height; any trees that are transplantable, because you can't bring in a 50 foot tree and expect it to grow. They are building a nice, professional medical business, not a late hour retail chain, and they really hope they can work with the neighbors on this. They don't want to upset or offend anyone. She had no idea this would end up being such a big issue and honestly thought that the people would embrace the idea of them trying to make it a more desirable looking piece of property. Their goal was a positive one.

Peterson clarified again that the new plan would not cut down any birch or spruce.

K. Milles said not unless utilities... her husband would address all that, but they want to keep every tree that they can that is nice and not encroaching on the power lines

Hebert noted that he would like to see Steve Shuttleworth's suggestions from the City incorporated into any revised plan.

Greg Milles, applicant, said he did appreciate the neighbors that came out for this. Applicants have not had the opportunity to talk with them previously. He was new to this process and they were learning things as they go. This was one reason they would like to postpone. They want to invite those present and anyone not present within a 500 foot radius of subject property, to Hometown Physical Therapy next Wednesday night at 9pm so they can show new plan, in detail, and answer any questions. The sidewalk and fuel tanks were gone, water and sewer would be accessed off of the access road at their own expense so as not to disturb anything. They still want to put in the fence. They were never planning to put just grass in the back and it had never been stated that way. Mr. Milles submitted a letter from Golden Valley, Pat McArdle, in which GVEA was recommending that all the poplar trees be taken down from the 20 foot buffer because in the future, and when the building was there, they wouldn't have access to it. Those trees have a shortened life span, heart rot, and GVEA was recommending removal.

Temple asked that the letter from GVEA be read into record rather than passed around. Secretary read letter.

Fleming asked the uses for the building.

Milles said currently the only tenant would be a physical therapist office.

Public Hearing Closed

MOTION: Move to approve by **Mr. Marsh**, seconded by **Ms. Bratcher**.

MOTION To postpone, by **Mr. Temple**, seconded by **Ms. Peterson**.

Discussion

Temple said he believed staff had a good point. There was still information out there and the Commission needed to make an informed decision. Communication between the applicant and surrounding neighborhood was intended and information from that meeting would be beneficial to the Commissioners.

Peterson noted that the plan talked about this evening sounded more palatable to her and she felt it was in the best interest of the applicant to postpone rather than be denied.

Hebert said he also believed it would be beneficial to have a better detailed drawing and updated staff report that would clarify the issues.

Hernandez asked date of postponement.

Miller noted this was a Conditional use and they needed lots of details to work with on these. What he heard tonight was completely different than the plan presented in packet. GVEA, he believed, should have come in for a conditional use to cut down trees there. There are lots of things at issue. OSB was put in for a very specific need, and lots of details still needed to be cleared up.

Sims clarified for the record, that with regard to GVEA the overhead utility was there prior to the OSB. **Miller** said then they were grandfathered. He wanted to see lots more details on this. Postpone for 30 days.

Roll Call: **Ms. Bratcher**, yes; **Ms. Peterson**, yes; **Mr. Flemming**, no; **Ms. Spencer**, yes; **Mr. Hebert**, yes; **Mr. Cooper**, yes; **Mr. Temple**, yes; **Mr. Marsh**, yes; **Mr. Miller**, yes.

MOTION TO POSTPONE TO AUGUST 5, 2008 MEETING PASSED

I. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

FMATS: Ms. Bratcher advised there was a Technical Committee the next day and they would be scoring all of the projects that have either been sitting in the transportation improvement program for awhile or just need some new evaluation. It should be an interesting meeting and they were trying to accommodate the public more with their scheduling and this meeting would be at noon at downtown City Hall.

TITLE 17: Mr. Hernandez said the legal department had been looking at the outline so they were still working on reviewing.

Vision Fairbanks: Mr. Hernandez advised that Vision Fairbanks would be advanced to the public hearing of August 21st before the Borough Assembly. On July 17th and August 7th, the Assembly will hold work sessions on it. The Mayor was introducing an Ordinance recommending adoption of Vision Fairbanks as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The Mayor also identified a map area to define where Vision Fairbanks. Additionally, he was amending the plan by adding a page (handed out to Commissioners). Mr. Hernandez read a portion of amendment that he felt Commissioners needed to take particular note of: ***“The Vision Fairbanks Downtown Plan may be modified in the course of implementation decision, and it should not be interpreted as restricting the Assembly’s ability to accommodate the actual development of the downtown core area, and the changing needs of the community.”*** He asked Jill for an explanation, and she said we use the Comprehensive Plan and will be required to use the Vision Fairbanks Plan when reviewing any ordinances, rezones and so forth. The Borough Assembly will also be required to consider the Plan. But at the Assembly’s public hearing for rezone changes, they can deviate from the Plan. In effect, they can change the Plan while they make a decision on the rezone. It gives authority to the Borough Assembly to deviate from Plan if they think it’s necessary to do so, particularly on zone changes.

Bratcher clarified that Jill wrote this at the request of the Mayor.

Hernandez replied that was correct.

Temple asked what the wisdom was in saying this was the Comprehensive Plan unless the Assembly doesn't want it to be the Comprehensive Plan, in which case it was no longer the Comprehensive Plan.

Hernandez replied that he did counsel the Mayor on the fact that we did not want a Comprehensive Plan du jour; it was not a plan for a particular Assembly and had to transcend assemblies and administrations. It had to be a plan that goes twenty years into the future that decisions can be made by. The Plan was based on sustainability in the end. It brings land use and transportation together and more so now than ever, and we need to look at the planning effort. The Mayor had some strong concerns and members might have to ask him what those concerns were. Perhaps he feels it was somewhat restrictive. The Mayor has been very helpful with FMATS and trying to get two-way traffic working well. But the other part of this is the land use. Both had to be right for them to work together.

Miller noted they had made rezones that went against the Comprehensive Plan. It's was just a plan. If you decide to go against the Plan knowingly, then it happens. Sometimes it needs tweaking. It may not fit the circumstances coming before them five years from now, and changes would need to be made. He didn't see it as anything different other than explicitly saying the same thing as with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan doesn't necessarily point out everything they do, but is used as a guide to make decisions. He didn't see the addendum as a huge problem.

Hernandez said the Mayor sought legal apparently because he did not like the way it is now, and made these modifications. There is a concern that when you make a decision, and make it based on the Comprehensive Plan on compatibility and other issues in the area....

Miller said they will continue to do that and if the Assembly chooses to go against the Comprehensive Plan, it's the same thing they do now.

Hernandez noted that one of the things that he believed was important to take into consideration, was that people make decisions based on what the Plan says. It's fair to make decisions based on what is actually happening on the ground, but if you are a developer and you want to make long term decisions on how to develop a piece of property and you know that the Plan can be changed ...

Miller commented that the zoning ordinance can be changed.

Hernandez ... the Plan can be changed at a meeting, then it doesn't provide that kind of stability.

Miller responded that it provides the same kind of stability that our zoning ordinance does. He could rezone property to GC on Airport Way tomorrow. It has to be done in public hearing, through public notice, through the public, and made accountable to the public. He didn't see any difference in that issue. People buy property expecting it to be residential forever, next to them, and it can be changed tomorrow by the Assembly through a public process.

Hernandez expressed that the Comprehensive Plan, in this particular case, takes many years to prepare and his concern also was that when they work on a rezone and can change the Comprehensive Plan with one public hearing as compared to the time it took to create the Plan there seems to be a problem.

Miller stated that you don't change the Plan, you change the zone. You change the zone, not in accordance with the Plan, which is done at times. Every once in awhile there is a rezone that busts the Comp Plan and it is done for good reason. That would be the same with the Vision Fairbanks plan. We would have a guide that would fit 98% of the time, but they don't want to hamstring someone that says you must use this or you can't do it. It's the same problem they have with the variances at times. The State law hampstrings them from doing some things that are really appropriate.

Hernandez said then that might be the issue. It is a very specific plan.

Miller said it may be too specific. There may be small spots that need to be tweaked for the realities of things in five years. It may not be constructable and they may not have the tools to do it when the time comes.

Sims commented that he agreed, to a point, but there comes a point with the Vision Fairbanks Downtown Plan when the implementation of it is entirely different than a Regional Borough Comprehensive Plan and this implementation speaks to it; what Bernardo was speaking about on the partnerships that are necessary with the private sector developer. If that developer sees that this is kind of a wishy-washy semi-volatile type of document, he might take his \$2million elsewhere to develop the Sadlers parking lot with the transit center, etc. and etc. If there's no predictability to it, he will take off and leave. It's entirely different than what the current plan is about and a huge difference to him. However Chris was correct with regard to changing Comprehensive Plan when reviewing rezones.

Hernandez said he just wanted the Commission to know what was happening.

Bratcher clarified that this was an attachment that would be recommended for inclusion with the Comprehensive Plan.

Hernandez said that was correct. It will be added to the Vision Fairbanks Downtown Plan at the time of adoption.

Bratcher asked about dates of Assembly.

Hernandez said the Plan was introduced Thursday. First worksession COW for Assembly would be July 17th, worksession on August 7th and Public Hearing on August 21st.

Miller asked where the line was that was created to designate plan area.

Hernandez said they took the map and made a definitive line. There were no significant changes from original plan. It showed the new proposed land uses for downtown; residential areas, commercial areas and so forth. The legal department wanted to have a very specific line as to where the Plan would incorporate the land uses and if looking at plan you would know exactly which lots were involved.

Miller commented that was opposite of what he was previously saying because that was also too specific for a 10% plan. It didn't make sense. You need to keep it fluid, and then draw a very specific line where it goes. It was two diametrically opposed thoughts.

Bratcher said that since the plan could be adjusted, she was sure they would be adjusting the lines at some point.

Hernandez said he would recommend that if any Commissioner was concerned about the amendment or the Plan that they testify before the Assembly. He felt Mr. Miller should be at both work sessions.

North Pole Land Use: Mr. Hernandez asked if they wanted to have a work session on August 15th. It was agreed to, but members would like some information before hand.

CPAB:

Jennifer Peterson said they were concentrating on methodology for coming up with a Land Use map. Susan Todd, UAF, came to last meeting and gave a presentation on Willamette Basin in Oregon. At the next meeting they hope to finalize an approach they want to take on land use and planning.

OTHER:

It was noted that microphones were turned up again – very loud.

Peterson mentioned light work load and asked if the Platting Board was light also.

Hernandez said there were very few zoning permits and applications at the platting and zoning level. He thought people were bracing themselves right now, particularly with the fuel costs and other issues that are out there.

Miller commented that was the perfect lead into what they were just discussing. The Vision Fairbanks Plan was great, when they were growing. When consolidating, it might be a completely different plan because they are not expecting WalMart to move into downtown with an urban store when the whole community is consolidating. Everyone is trying to move into residential areas downtown because they want to quit driving in from their current homes. Things change.

Hernandez replied that he believed that in difficult times like this, precisely when land uses are not working with transportation system, we need to start planning for that. We can't plan in 3 or 4 years, but rather they need to now; and to start implementing that now. It was very important.

Miller said he had no argument in planning. He was just suggesting that the plan may be based on some growth assumptions, and they may find that opposite things were happening, real soon.

Hernandez said they also need to remember that because of the energy issues in the community, and because gas was so important, they need to get the community positioned for when gas line does come through, whether 5 or 15 years from now. Planning and land use has to be ready for that. It can't be done the year before.

Miller referred to Crandall Arambula and their talking about retail hot spots being the most important thing. He could see the tides turning right now. The most important things were high density residential and the railroad yard. That's what the people want and will get behind that. They don't need another store; they don't have money to buy anything with. What is needed is housing that they don't need to drive 30 miles from, to get to work.

Bratcher commented, what's going to follow high density residential?

Miller responded retail. Those things change as the economic conditions change. He felt that was the point that the Mayor was getting at. We said that was the first thing we were going to do, but ... The Plan is still there, but they can work on this part of the plan instead of that and execute those kinds of things. Work on South Cushman with some more high density residential. Get some renewal going on. Those things will bring the retail hot spot, instead of trying to force it into place. When no one is investing in new retail space in an economic slow down, let's go get the thing that people want, which is high density residential, condos.

Sims commented there was a new hotel going in across from Fred Meyers West, Sports Authority was going in by Old Navy. Plumber and Steamfitters had new Union Hall near Freddy's West.

Bratcher said she would like to know, at a future meeting, the process to install the OSB talked about earlier, and where were possible other OSB's that could be saved in the future.

Sims said the subject OSB came into play when MFO was adopted there.

Hebert said he would speak to the OSB in a few weeks, after CU is handled. He found the dialogue with Vision Fairbanks very interesting. As a developer/private citizen, he thought the Vision Fairbanks Plan had value in the excitement that it brings to downtown also. If your goal is for higher density residential use inside a certain area of the Borough, he didn't think anything that brings attention and excitement to the area should be discounted.

Hernandez said his concern was if someone wanted to put a used car lot in, the Assembly could view it as economic development and okay it. The Plan was crafted where all the elements fit together to make it work and if you introduce something into that, it may be very difficult for the plan to work as a whole, into the future. If it's not right, it doesn't work. They built a new transit center, but is it in the right place?

Miller asked Bernardo to call Crandall Arambula and ask to see their plan for Racine, and see if it got executed exactly the way it was drawn.

Hebert noted that it would still be a public process, regardless. Whenever you have a vision, at least it gives you a framework to move toward.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.