

WOODBURN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
June 26, 2008

CONVENED The Planning Commission met in a regular session at 7:00 p.m. in City Hall Council Chambers with Vice-Chairperson Bandelow presiding.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow announced that Chairperson Lima's wife, Ann, passed away recently and sympathies are expressed from both the Planning Commission and the Planning Division.

Commissioner Jennings led the salute to the flag.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow questioned members of the Planning Commission having potential conflicts such as family, financial, or business relationship with any of the applicants or with regard to the project in question. If such a potential conflict exists, she asked whether the commissioner in question believes he or she is without actual bias or whether he or she would like to step down from the Planning Commission during the case. There were none. There were no objections from those present.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow announced: agenda is available at the back of the room. We will consider cases one at a time according to the order listed in the agenda. We will follow the hearing procedure outlined on the public hearing procedure board. All persons wishing to speak are requested to come to the podium and give their name and address. Any individuals speaking from other than the podium will not be recognized.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson	Lima	A
Vice Chairperson	Bandelow	P
Commissioner	GrosJacques	P
Commissioner	Vancil	A
Commissioner	Grigorieff	P
Commissioner	Hutchison	P
Commissioner	Jennings	P

Staff Present: Jim Allen – Community Development Director
Natalie Labossiere – Senior Planner
Don Dolenc – Associate Planner
Jonathon Stuart – Assistant City Attorney
Marta Carrillo – Administrative Assistant

MINUTES

A. Woodburn Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2008.

Commissioner Jennings moved to accept the minutes. Commissioner GrosJacques seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

None.

COMMUNICATIONS

- A. Woodburn City Council Meeting Minutes of May 12, 2008
- B. Woodburn City Council Meeting Minutes of May 27, 2008

No comments were made.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow re-opened the hearing for:

- A. Woodburn Crossing – George F. Brice III, Applicant
Design Review 2008-01, Exception 2008-03 and Variance 2008-04

The applicant requests a design review for a 14,820 square foot pharmacy and a 2,930 square foot restaurant; requests an Exception to Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements for Evergreen Road, Country Club Road, and Country Club Court; and requests a variance from landscaping requirements.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow announced that the applicant had requested a continuance from the June 12, 2008 Planning Commission meeting.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow asked if anyone had any conflicts, ex parte contacts, and/or declarations.

Commissioner Jennings stated that he knew George Brice, III personally, but would be unbiased on his decision.

Staff Report

Associate Planner Dolenc read the applicable ORS then commenced his presentation.

Woodburn Crossing is located at the cross section of Hwy 214 and Evergreen Road; Hwy 214 and Country Club Road; and abuts Country Club Court. It is developed with multiple buildings such as: US Bank, Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC), and the Mai Thai Restaurant, that are on separate parcels from the Woodburn Crossing property. It is developed with four (4) major buildings. Being presented is a development area that has changed from the previously submitted package proved to the Planning Commission. The applicant and Staff have been discussing the revised proposal as late as this morning. The current proposal is to remove the restaurant from the property due to several impacting issues with Evergreen Road. The Walgreen's portion of the project could proceed without the restaurant and be much less of an impact and alignment issues on Evergreen Road.

The current proposal does not include a re-development of the KFC Restaurant.

The proposed development area does not constitute the entire parcel, which would typically be considered as a whole. Due to only a portion of the property being developed at this time, the Planning Division is requesting from the Planning Commission to require a Phasing Plan prior to occupancy. The Phasing Plan would not specify uses of buildings or timetables, but would identify conceptual areas for redevelopment. The purpose is to insure that all the site is included in the development area and when the area is developed, the issues such as the street

improvements are to be considered at that time. The phasing plan will also will bring the non-conforming parking and landscaping to standard in stages.

The current proposal is to demolish the existing Henry's Furniture and Ben Franklin structure and redevelop the southwest portion of the property with a Walgreen's Pharmacy building, which will be approximately 14,000 square feet. The building is a prototypical design. Walgreen's will customize some facades. The façade facing Evergreen Road is architecturally diverse with limestone siding, brick siding, stone base course, tile or slate roofing in the tower, split face CMU band, and green metal awnings around the walkways. The building has horizontal and vertical articulation of the roofline. The façade facing Hwy 214 is similarly treated. The areas of the rear and the side are less architecturally diverse, but exhibit the cornice and varied roofline. The building meets the architectural guidelines and standards.

A major issue is the Hwy 214 reconstruction due to the Interchange Project. The aerial photo is from the Revised Environmental Assessment (REA) and depicts Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) alignment and has not been surveyed on the ground to determine where it exists.

The property is large and is surrounded by other property with separate ownership. The Transportation System Plan (TSP) and the REA show a road going through the Evergreen Road area with no right of way and it is of concern to the Planning staff. The concern is providing a safe driveway entrance by either in a dedicated right of way or on the applicant's property. The applicant's engineer has worked on that concern, but has not supplied final drawings.

The condition that is in the Staff Report will show that it can be done on the public right of way or moved on to the owner's property.

A second condition would be that the property owner shall dedicate the full right of way required of the subject property for Evergreen Road from the Highway 214 intersection to the northern boundary of the current development area. Dedication of a portion of the alignment is required by the TSP. The dedication would be from the intersection to the Northern boundary of the development area, which is the Northern boundary of the driveway. This would address the concern on the property owned by Brice Corporation and not the adjoining property.

A condition would be that the property owner shall construct at least the minimum driveway improvements for the proposed driveway. The proposed driveway configuration is temporary and would be redesigned when Evergreen Road is extended to the north. There appears to be plenty of room for the improvements and the applicant's engineer has provided preliminary drawings.

Evergreen Road is currently improved with a sidewalk on one side and a turning lane at the Hwy 214 intersection and sufficient driveway width and can be improved without too much of a problem. The applicant has proposed a temporary alignment that would be redone, when Evergreen Road would be extended further North at a subsequent development phase. Staff is in support of a temporary alignment as long as it meets the minimum safe standards.

Street trees are required. The decision to plant trees with the knowledge that ODOT may be required to remove and replace the trees, once their improvement project begins, is up to the applicant.

The property owner shall provide street trees or a performance guarantee under WDO 4.102.07 for the installation of street trees when ODOT improvements are completed along Highway 214

and Evergreen Road.

The Planning Division recommends approval of case EXCP 2008-03 subject to the following conditions of approval:

- The property owner shall dedicate the full right of way required of the subject property for Evergreen Road from the Highway 214 intersection to the northern boundary of the current development area.
- The property owner shall either (1) redesign the project to locate the minimum street improvements for Evergreen Road (to the northern extent of the proposed driveway) on the subject property, or (2) show that the minimum street improvements would be located entirely within existing dedicated right-of-way or existing recorded public use easements.
- The property owner shall construct at least the minimum driveway improvements for the proposed driveway accessing Evergreen Road.
- The property owner shall provide street trees or a performance guarantee under WDO 4.102.07 for the installation of street trees when ODOT improvements are completed along Highway 214 and Evergreen Road.

Another issue to be discussed is the Interchange Improvement Project. As a part of the Interchange project would be to add travel lanes, which would result in moving many of the existing private improvements and underground of currently above-ground utilities, pole signs, the structures that are up to the right of way would need to be moved back, landscaping and street trees would be added. This is a unique opportunity to bring a long commercial corridor at a heavily-travelled entrance to the community into compliance with current landscaping, architectural, and site design standards.

Another issue that continues to arise is off street parking and storage being prohibited within a "required yard or special setback" EXCEPT for parking and storage adjacent to a wall. [WDO 2.106.05.C.1.b.1]. The term is "required yard" is an ambiguous term and the Planning Commission has the authority to interpret the ambiguities. Does the term "required yard" refer to the yard or to the setback? On Figure 6.3, the diagram depicts where the "required yard" as indicated is more extensive than the "setback" area, therefore, a wall would be required along the Hwy 214, Country Club Rd and a portion of Evergreen Road.

When the ODOT acquisition occurs, the parking spaces facing Hwy 214 would become non-conforming because the spaces would not meet minimum setbacks from the front property line. This issue should be addressed at this time by the Planning Commission.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow inquired about Figure 6.3 depicting the setbacks and yards and the applicability difference between a Single-Family Residential (RS) lot and Commercial General (CG) lot. She also asked about the wall being required on the West and South ends of the lot.

Associate Planner Dolenc stated that the setback and yard diagram is for both types of zoning. He explained the difference of a setback and yard and the determination of a required wall based on the ambiguous determination of the words, setback and yard.

Commissioner Jennings inquired about the necessity of a wall between Hwy 214 and the south parking lot of the property.

Community Development Director Allen stated that the terms are ambiguous because a setback is distance and a yard is an area. The Planning Division is requesting the Planning Commission determine whether “required yard” does not mean “required setback”, which then would require the applicant to build a wall.

Commissioner Jennings stated that deciding on determining a yard to mean the same as a setback; it will require the applicant to build a wall along the south and west end of the property.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow stated that the understanding of the required wall needs to be known prior to making a decision, regardless of the acquisition by ODOT.

There was discussion amongst the Planning Commission with regards to the ambiguous terms.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow stated that the consensus of the Planning Commission is to interpret the ambiguous terms of “required yard” and “required setback”, which mean the same, therefore, no wall is required, until the acquisition by ODOT.

When ODOT acquires the right of way, staff requests that the Commission interpret the WDO to require a 42-inch wall that meets the color and texture requirements of an architectural wall on at least the side facing away from the proposed buildings and constructed of similar materials to the buildings. The purpose of the 42-inch required wall would be able to cover the headlights and would serve as a barrier to the pedestrians. The vegetation would serve as a 42-inch screen, but not replace the required wall.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow inquired about the required parking for the South end of the property and the impact by the eventual ODOT acquisition.

Associate Planner Dolenc stated that there are 16 spaces on Hwy 214 and all impacted and 14 parking spaces on Evergreen Road, of which only 4 are expected to be impacted.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow stated that there is no consensus to require a 42-inch wall after ODOT has acquired the right of way.

Associate Planner Dolenc proceeded with the variance case on landscaping requirement. If the landscaping variance was based on the ODOT acquisition, staff would support the proposed landscaping plan. The landscaping variance is based on the density of the area. The WDO states that the yard must be landscaped and requires one plant unit 20 per square feet, which equals to 1,832 plants in the front yard and 494 plant units are proposed by the applicant, which is a reduction of 73% requested by the applicant.

If there were large shrubs planted (noted in red) of 4 feet across, which would also meet the 42 inch vertical buffer, this would be 182 plant units provided by the applicant. There remaining setback area could be planted in small shrub plants (noted in yellow) of 18” across, which would be 1,784 small shrub units. This would be 1966 plant units located in the required setback area. It is possible to meet the required landscaping within the setback area, therefore the variance would not be needed.

There are other options to locating the buildings. If the pharmacy was brought up to the side, located at the entrance is off of Hwy 214, the drive aisle could be a bypass lane and circulation would come out on the north end. Another configuration could be a restaurant where the bypass lane would be part of the shared area of the loading zone and the bypass lane being the

same as a traffic lane. To the south west of the property, a third building could define the yard and the landscaping requirement on the west side of the property.

The plan indicates a recent construction of a Walgreen's located in Sandy, Oregon. The building is brought up close to the street with a drive aisle in the front and serving an entrance for the drive thru and a building on a corner that would define a yard.

1. The variance is necessary to prevent unnecessary hardship relating to the land or structure, which would cause the property to be unbuildable by application of the *WDO*.
2. Development consistent with the request will not be materially injurious to adjacent properties.
3. Existing physical and natural systems, such as but not limited to traffic, drainage, dramatic land forms or parks will not be adversely affected because of the variance.
4. The variance is the minimum deviation necessary to make reasonable economic use of the property.
5. The variance does not conflict with the Woodburn Comprehensive Plan.
 - The request is for a 69% to 73% reduction in landscaping density.
 - The application does not meet criteria 1, 4, and 5 of WDO 5.103.11.C, and may meet criteria 2 and 3.

Staff is recommending approval of Design Review subject to the conditions of approval and approval of Exception to the street right of way and improvements to Evergreen Road and denial of the variance for the landscape areas for this project based on the revised proposal without the KFC Restaurant as a part of the project.

Associate Planner Dolenc concluded his staff report and was available for questions.

The Planning Commission inquired about the ODOT acquisition and the required setbacks and the effect of the Walgreen's Pharmacy; the street trees removed or remaining and confirmation of the KFC restaurant not being a part of the proposed development.

Associate Planner Dolenc stated that the required setbacks would be met and the landscaping options are conforming alternatives for the applicant. He confirmed that the KFC restaurant is not part of the proposed development.

Associate Planner Dolenc referred to Condition of Approval #24 and stated that it should have had an "or" between the two sentences instead of two separate sentences.

Condition of Approval #25 should have been deleted as it is duplicative.

Community Development Director Allen explained and stated that the guidelines and regulations are based on the current *WDO* and are subject to those requirements and are not subject to text amendments. The changes that are proposed with regards to the street trees is the removal of trees from the list, but not a removal of a requirement to have street trees. This will allow an applicant to have a larger variety of street tree types.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited the applicant for testimony.

George Brice, III, Woodburn Crossing Center, Woodburn, OR 97071, owner of the property. He stated that Leeka Architects has been involved from the pre-application meeting through the public hearing. The project is to demolish the grocery store and furniture store and build a new Walgreen's Pharmacy. He gave some history of the property and the change of hands between owners and has been in constant contact with ODOT for several years. The design of the center is an outdated design and is functionally obsolete. With the orientation of the buildings, it has been difficult for merchants to be visible to the public. The intention is to move forward with the project and design to modern standards required by the WDO. The project will be a nice improvement to the entrance of the City. He was open for questions.

Commissioner Hutchison inquired about the KFC Restaurant being moved to another location with the lot in the future after the portion of the project is completed.

Brice stated that due to the acquisition of Hwy 214 by ODOT; the restaurant will encroach into the required setback and there have been discussions with the restaurant owner on options for redevelopment and would possibly be located on the end of the proposed Walgreen's pharmacy building.

Frank Angelo, Angelo Planning Group, 921 SW Washington Street, Suite 648, Portland, Oregon, 97205, consultant for the project. There has been much discussion with the Planning Staff with regards to the redevelopment of this project.

He stated that he was in agreement with the Planning Commission's interpretation on not requiring a wall. With regards to the plant density and the requirement, he requested the record be left open for 7 days and return the next Planning Commission meeting to address the landscaping issue.

Commissioner Hutchison asked the consultant about the frontage street trees and whether or not the applicant would be planting those trees because of the future acquisition by ODOT.

Angelo stated that the options he was presented with was to plant the street trees now or place a performance bond in lieu of planting now.

He discussed the ambiguity applicability in WDO section 3.106.01 refers to the applicability of landscape in the code. The ordinance requires that, if the area is covered by structure and parking that is increasing by over 50% or more than the density area of landscaping would apply. The proposed project shows that it is decreasing and not increasing.

He inquired about the criteria which would be used to evaluate the project and require a phasing plan once submitted. The condition of approval is tied to a phasing plan, but there is no criteria defining the purpose of the phasing plan.

He requested that the record be left open for 7 days to submit information to address the phasing plan issue at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Associate Planner Dolenc stated that the intent of the phasing plan would be to make improvements as phases are completed, which would include the dedication, street improvements, parking and landscape on that particular phase. As each subsequent phase is submitted for redevelopment, the dedication, street improvements, parking and landscaping would be addressed for only that phase. He also noted that the Planning Commission had

previously ruled on 3.106.01, applicability, and that subsections A and B could not both be applicable because they are disparate and therefore only A or B need apply. In this case, subsection A is applicable.

Commissioner Jennings inquired about the phasing plan and the road improvements for each phase. He asked if the applicant must improve the cross streets of Evergreen Road, Country Club Road and Country Club Ct. and disagreed with the word "shall".

Community Development Director Allen stated that the applicant must improve each cross street, during each phasing stage.

Assistant City Attorney Stuart stated that perhaps removing the phrase "shall provide" and replacing with "will discuss" improvements at each phasing plan.

Angelo requested further clarification on the statement. He requested the record be left open for 7 days to provide further information with regards to the Phasing Plan.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited proponents of the application.

Associate Planner Dolenc stated that Alan Fox from ODOT would be presenting on the project and Randy Rohman from Public Works would also be available for questions.

Garry Lapoint, 850 Lawson Avenue, Woodburn, OR 97071, property owner, tenant is the Conoco/ Circle K Gas Station. He stated that he is in favor of the Woodburn Crossing development. He commented that he disagreed with the wall requirement and he preferred the landscaping.

Alan Fox, 885 Airport Road SE, Salem, OR 97306, project manager for ODOT. He explained ODOT's procedures with regards to Hwy 214, Evergreen Road cross streets and the Park and Ride status. His role is to take a project from a fund approved status, ready to be built and accept bids. With regards to the Woodburn Interchange, there is some funding approved to begin designing the concept.

He introduced his presentation. There are three Woodburn projects that involve ODOT: the Woodburn Interchange, Park and Ride Project located at the Northeast quadrant of the interchange, and the Environmental Assessment, which is the widening Highway 214 from the end of the interchange to Park Avenue.

The Interchange Environmental Approval includes an Environmental Assessment, which was published in July 2005, and the Interchange Area Management Plan (IMAP) was adopted by the City of Woodburn and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on June 2006, and then published the Revised Environmental Assessment on November, 2006 and the published Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on December 8, 2006. These are authorities by the Federal government to proceed with the projects.

Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) Implementing Actions goal is to preserve the long term capacity of the Interchange and the construction and design of a park and ride. Along with the IAMP is the representation of the alignment of Evergreen Road from the intersection of Hwy 214 up to the connecting point of Country Club Court. The alignment was based on maintaining access to the existing building for large trucks. The interest for ODOT is the connection with Evergreen Road and that the lanes line up properly and the determination is that it does appear to connect property with no impact on the property.

The Park and Ride project will need to construct a facility with potential access. The southern west property is owned by ODOT. The design of Evergreen Road will not be started until the City of Woodburn has approved an alignment for that road. The objective of the Park and Ride project is to: design a fully improved P & R facility, connect Evergreen Road with Country Club Court, stakeholder involvement, landscaped buffer strip, design of shelter, potential public art, improved connectivity, aesthetics compatible with gateway location, interchange design, City development code, shelter & amenities, and complete construction documents package.

Current proposal is to work with City staff and the developer with the development and alignment of Evergreen Road. The design would be not started until an approved alignment has been determined by the City and provide support to the project. He concluded his presentation and was open for questions.

He stated that in an another project, a developer wanted to build a project, where ODOT described as an environmental impact assessment, had to obtain all the environmental permits that ODOT needed to obtain as if it were an ODOT project. With the alignment of Evergreen Road and the proposed Woodburn Crossing project, if an agreement is reach between both, ODOT and the developer, ODOT would then attain the required permits for construction and alignment of Evergreen Road.

Randy Rohman, Public Works Transportation Manager. He stated that the preferred alternative for the widening of Hwy 214 from the Interchange to the East is a widened North end with a gradual taper and shift to a center alignment with some flexibility with ODOT. With reference to Country Club Court and Country Club Road the access loop is part of the Transportation System Plan (TSP) as an access street or collector street with the function to allow flexibility of entry points on the North side to the commercial areas.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited additional proponents of the application.

Les Bachen, Country Club Court, Woodburn, OR 97071. He asked about Evergreen Road being built North will the road continue and connect to Country Club Court or will Evergreen Road end at the construction phase of Walgreen's building.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow stated that the phasing plan would include improvement of Evergreen Road up to the building access and as phases progress the improvements would be made to those applicable streets as well as the alignment of the street.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited additional opponents of the application.

Associate Planner Dolenc presented the City's rebuttal on the project. The landscape requirements and applicability of the landscape requirement section 3.106.01A and Angelo read section 3.106.01.B, which applies to the entire area of the site development where the cumulative effect of additions to structures and/or parking areas increases the total area covered by structures and/or parking by 50% or more. The current development reduces the amount of area covered by structures, but the landscaping standards do apply under sub-section 3.106.01.A., which reads: To the site area for all new structures and related parking EXCLUDING single-family and duplex dwellings and accessory structures.

The applicant is proposing a new structure and related parking is the trigger for the requirement for landscaping.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow stated that a request by the applicant to leave the record open for 7 days.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow closed the hearing and opened for discussion amongst the Planning Commission members.

There was discussion amongst the Planning Commission members with regard to the request to leave the record open for the landscaping variance and the phasing plan.

Commissioner GrosJacques made a motion to leave the record open for seven (7) days until July 3, 2008 at 5:00 pm for additional information on the landscaping variance and the phasing plan requirement and review and deliberate on July 10, 2008 at the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Grigorieff, which passed unanimously.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow called for a short recess.

B. 2775 N. Front Street – Grading Pacific; William R. Pease, P.E. – Applicant
Design Review 2008-02, Exception 2008-07

The applicant requests a Design Review for a 3,750 square foot expansion to an industrial building authorized to expand to 42,500 square foot per case Design Review 2007-09 and requests an Exception to the Street Right-of-Way and Improvement Requirements for Front Street

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow asked if anyone had any conflicts, ex parte contacts, and/or declarations.

Staff Report

Associate Planner Dolenc read the applicable ORS and commenced his presentation.

The 2001 aerial photo shows the project under construction. There was extensive work done on the project, which included roofing, covering and an extension of the roof, but not enclosed on three sides. The request is to cover the three sides and lay a concrete pad for parking and moving the parking area to the West an additional 30 feet. The material would be of the same material and color as existing building. The Planning Division recommends approval of the Design Review subject to the conditions of approval.

Due to the expansion and the parking area moved, there is an increase in the plant unit requirement and only for the smaller areas to the north and south of the property. The variance is preserved for the rest of the undeveloped area.

The street exception is for the boundary street and connecting street on North Front Street. The boundary street frontage is 170 feet on North Front Street was a proportionate and reasonable share for the property to bare and execute a non-remonstrance agreement with the applicant. The current expansion doesn't change the conclusion. The Planning Division recommends approval of the Street Exception subject to the non-remonstrance agreement.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited the applicant for testimony.

William Pease, P.E, BMGP Engineers, Inc., 1045 13th Street SE, Salem, OR 97302, consultant for the project. He stated that he did not have additional comments and was open for questions.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow asked the applicant about the sloping of the property down to Shenanadoah Lane.

Pease stated that Grating Pacific property does not slope and is flat, but the property to the southwest corner behind Looscreen has a slope to the southeast corner of the property.

Associate Planner Dolenc announced that he did not have a Final Order for this project, but would be available for the next Planning Commission meeting.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited proponents of the application. There were none.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow invited opponents of the application. There were none.

Vice-Chairperson Bandelow closed the hearing and opened for discussion amongst the Planning Commission members.

Commissioner Jennings made a motion to approve Design Review 2008-02 and Exception 2008-07 and authorize Vice-Chairperson Bandelow to sign Final Order Design Review 2008-02 and Exception 2008-07 as prepared. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hutchison, which passed unanimously.

ROLL CALL

Chairperson	Lima	---
Vice Chairperson	Bandelow	yes
Commissioner	GrosJacques	yes
Commissioner	Vancil	---
Commissioner	Grigorieff	yes
Commissioner	Hutchison	yes
Commissioner	Jennings	yes

ITEMS FOR ACTION

None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

None.

REPORTS

Commissioner Jennings inquired about the Carl's Jr. Restaurant sign applicants.

Community Development Director Allen stated that the property owner is working with ODOT on access issues.

BUSINESS FROM THE COMMISSION

Commissioner GrosJacques announced the Chuck Wagon breakfast coming up soon.

