IVINS CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
February 16, 2021
435-628-0606

1) WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN AND COMMISSIONERS: The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. All present included Chairman Bryan Pack, Commissioner Doug Clifford, Commissioner Bob Morris, Commissioner Jeff Loris, and Commissioner Lance Anderson.

Staff Attending: Dale Coulam-City Manager/Attorney, Mike Rodriguez and Cody Mitchell-Building and Zoning Administrators, Chuck Gillette-City Engineer and Public Works Director and Sharon Allen-Deputy City Recorder.

Audience Attending: James Shumate and Lorrie Morris. John Hawkins and Gwenn Davies attended through Zoom.

A. Acknowledgement of Quorum

B. Invocation--Commissioner Jeff Loris

C. Disclosures

Commissioner Lance Anderson stated he has a conflict with Item 3A and 3B. He also disclosed that he focuses on low-lighting development in Ivins. **Commissioner Bob Morris** disclosed that he is an electrician employed by Red Mountain Electric, and a member of the union. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated those disclosures have been made in previous meetings as well. He reminded the Commission to give the city recorder their annual written disclosures.

2) REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS -None

3) PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION ITEMS—For those desiring to attend, the Council Room will have 12 seats available. All other comments will be supplied via email prior or on Zoom during the meeting.

A. Public Hearing regarding on recommendation to approve a Concurrent Land Use Amendment from RC (Commercial Resort) and LDR (Low Density Residential) to RC (Commercial Resort); and a Zone Amendment from RC (Commercial Resort) and RE-43 (Residential Estates District, minimum lot size 43,000 sq ft) to RC (Commercial Resort) on approximately 1.471 Acres. RT Marten UT LLC-Owner. Lance Anderson-Applicant.

Commissioner Lance Anderson recused himself. **Cody Mitchell** stated that this is a concurrent land use and zone amendment. This is just over 1.5 acre parcel located northwest of Coyote Gulch. The current land use is Resort Commercial and Low Density Residential and the current zone is Resort Commercial and RE-43. The applicant's desire is to change that to Resort Commercial for land use as well as the zoning. The owner is RT Marten and Lance Anderson is the applicant. The south section is about 3800 sq ft that has the Resort Commercial zoning and land use designation, so this would just go with the 1.84 acres South section has the Resort Commercial zone and land use and 3800 sq ft and the rest would make the 1.84 acres to have them both amended. Lance Anderson stated that we have the apparatuses that we use for firefighting, and there are trailers parked out there for Whitaker Studio. Every year we have frozen pumps on the firefighting apparatuses, and just for a visual, we would like to build these two commercial buildings to park them in. They could become something else in the future, but

right now that is our goal. That is right across from the Kayenta Development Office. It is next to Kayenta Center for the Arts. It is just a parking lot out there. This would just finish off the commercial space on both sides of the street. **Chairman Bryan Pack** inquired what is to the North of this? Lance Anderson stated homes and the SITLA property we control. They are using the wash and its 65-70 feet between that and the houses on the other side to protect them. These buildings will look like Coyote Gulch housing and then the wash will distance between them. That is more than you need to know on a zone change but that is our goal. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated that the road continues up to Tuweap Drive. Is that going to connect? Lance Anderson stated we don't know. We are gathering opinions from homeowners. If it doesn't bring commercial traffic in, it is a possibility. **Chairman Bryan Pack** opened the Public Hearing. John Hawkins stated that he lives on Two Moons Circle. He asked for an explanation of orientation on the detailed map in gray, pink and green and the other one that was the rezoning map. **Chairman Bryan Pack** showed that north on that picture goes to the right. John Hawkins stated he will continue to listen in. James Shumate stated his lot is not visible on the maps provided. His house is northern-most on Kotori Court. The subject property is at the end of Art Village Way. Lance Anderson and Terry Martin met with Ron Marionetti whose house borders the subject property, and that is where he received the drawing we have all been referring to. It is very detailed and very useful. The property as it lays now has a water truck and various vehicles and trailers that have been an eyesore visible from Marionetti's home. The proposal as shown by Terry Martin is highly useful in that it rounds out the end of Art Village Way and finishes off that commercial area very nicely. It is an accessory building for all of this equipment and it makes really good sense and is the highest and best use. The location of the wash behind it keeps the setbacks appropriate for the border between Resort Commercial and residential properties. The other use will house all the equipment that exists as an eyesore. It puts a nice finishing touch to that northwest corner of the Art Village area. Hackles are raised by the land owners surrounding this idea, but it is the only way to put in a garage. They can't do that with an RE-43 combined use and it solves a multitude of problems and puts a nice period at the end of the sentence that describes the Art Village. He knows from other residents that live around the area that is the Trust Land that Terry Martin has options there. The minute he talks about anything other than RE-43 hackles will rise, but for this parcel, he supports the zone change. Gwenn Davies stated that she lives on Kwavasa Drive and she submitted information with photos with the area in question and how it has been promoted through sales materials as Low Density Residential, and she is against this change because there are other Resort Commercial in that area that could be used for garages. It concerns her that 1.47 acres is needed for garages. That tells here that there must be a lot of equipment to be stored and that would contribute to noise. Hearing no further comments, **Chairman Bryan Pack** closed the Public Hearing.

B. <u>Discuss and consider recommendation of a Concurrent Land Use Amendment from RC (Commercial Resort) and LDR (Low Density Residential) to RC (Commercial Resort); and a Zone Amendment from RC (Commercial Resort) and RE-43 (Residential Estates District, minimum lot size 43,000 sq ft) to RC (Commercial Resort) on approximately 1.471 Acres. RT Marten UT LLC-Owner. Lance Anderson-Applicant.</u>

Commissioner Doug Clifford stated that comments that came in today referred to other locations that he is not aware of their proximity to this, but were and of those alternatives mentioned possible? Lance Anderson stated that the goal right now is to deal with the fire apparatuses and trailers for Whitaker Studio, which is right there. We were going to check if they had to move their trailers based on their conditional use permit since they are part of their daily

DRAFT

activity. We are trying to help solve the problem. Everything in Coyote Gulch has eventually become something else but if you look at the annexation plan, Terry Martin had 20 acres of commercial on it back when Kayenta was annexed into Ivins. This is not a new plan, just revised. That zoning got put on in 2005. We have given up a lot when that zone was put in. That bubble for the land use is not extending. It is finishing off that area, and putting buildings there to look like houses out on the end. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated the area that is zoned commercial now is Crescent Moon. Lance Anderson stated that is down by the reservoir. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** inquired what would disadvantage of storing materials there? Lance Anderson stated where we are proposing is easy access for fire. It is also to finish off Coyote Gulch too. Whitaker Studios have their trailers parked there for daily operation. We are trying to work with them to get those hidden inside. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that one letter was worried these would become permanent storage facilities, or RV garage rentals, but it sounds like the intention is to eventually develop into commercial use and shops. Who would want to buy it if they left it residential who would want to live by a parking lot on the same side of a gully. He agrees with James Shumate and it seems like a better way to finish it off. If they will put a house finish on it, then it definitely makes sense to consolidate their commercial activities. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated that the buffer between residential and commercial is well placed. The buffer with the wash and the elevation change is an excellent buffer between commercial and residential. It is what we ask for in our codes and ordinances. It matches with similar uses next to the adjacent property. It fits with ordinances and elements we have in place.

MOTION: Commissioner Jeff Loris moved to approve recommendation of a Concurrent Land Use Amendment from RC (Commercial Resort) and LDR (Low Density Residential) to RC (Commercial Resort); and a Zone Amendment from RC (Commercial Resort) and RE-43 (Residential Estates District, minimum lot size 43,000 sq ft) to RC (Commercial Resort) on approximately 1.471 Acres. RT Marten UT LLC-Owner. Lance Anderson-Applicant.

SECOND: Commissioner Bob Morris

VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Bryan Pack	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Bob Morris	AYE
Commissioner Jeff Loris	AYE
Commissioner Lance Anderson	RECUSE

4) DISCUSSION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS--

A. <u>Discuss and consider recommendation of proposed amendments to the current Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.</u>

Chairman Bryan Pack stated that this is a continued discussion. We had our Public Hearing last week and received numerous emails over the last couple of months and a few more the last couple of days that came in and he has reviewed them as they have come through. The rest of the Commissioners have done the same. We are really at a point now where we can finalize this and move something forward to City Council. The version is the ordinance that was attached to the agenda is the same version as the last couple of meetings. Showing in the blue text are the portions that are changed where at least three of the Commissioner have expressed they are in favor of. The blue text that is highlighted is language where there were not three of us in favor. Any text where three of us voted against have been taken out. As he goes through the ordinance,

DRAFT

he sees just a couple of spots that need further discussion to move forward. Home accent lighting and the concept of CRI and whether to rely on that definition in this ordinance, and Section 16.23.106 need further discussion. For those listening the main changes in this ordinance from the one that already exists being primarily the raising of the CCT from what was 2200 on residential and 2700 commercial, and raising the limit to 4000 in both settings. The key provisions of night sky protection being downlighting and prohibiting light trespass are remaining the same. We are not tightening or loosening those restrictions. There was a reference to a maximum of two initial lumens per sq ft of parking lot surface, and Commissioner Bob Morris had suggested three. That is staying the same. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated he submitted that three was allowable per the Electrical Engineering Association of America, in cases of need for safety and security. If we don't say we can have three, we are going against the engineering recommendations for safety and security. Commissioner Lance Anderson stated CRI definition is, but the more he looks at it, the more he wonders what it does for us. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that he would agree that it adds another layer of complexity to the ordinance that we don't want to add at this point and perhaps we move this forward without the definition, but recommend to City Council if they feel it is important or want to get an expert or invite us to engage in an expert to help pin that down more. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** inquired we aren't using it, so why put it in? Is there some level of measurement that we want to add? **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated so we will carve that out of the ordinance. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that so long as we stay with 4000 kelvin, 3200 to 4000 kelvin allows a color rendering above 50 and that is what is required to see color. But if we push that 4000 kelvin down, you can't see color. At 4000 kelvin, there is no need for color rendering, but if you look at residential it says a porch light has to meet the commercial. A porch light is exempted from the 2700 and has to meet 2200 and so you would then need Color Rendering Index for your own safety. If we push it forward with the 4000 it is unnecessary. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated there are at least three of us willing to push this through with the 4000 kelvin at this point. **Commissioner Lance American** stated the American Medical Association recommends 3000. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** inquired for exterior lights? **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated yes it was brought up by someone in the Public Hearing. Chairman Bryan Pack stated that the next item is home accent lighting and trying to nail it down and make sense. There are still issues here. First is the definition is and the one that Commissioner Bob Morris had been contemplating was just the very small accent lighting in the eaves and no glare or bulb exposed. He knows that Commissioner Doug Clifford was concerned that the definition was too broad and if that is all we are referring to, it should be renamed. This could mean shrubbery. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated that home accent lighting should be defined as lighting of building surfaces, landscape features, statues and similar items for the purpose of decoration and ornamentation, or lighting that does not contribute to safety and security of residents, guests, employees or customers on the property. **Commissioner Bob Morris** agrees until safety and security was thrown in. Landscape lighting does make your property safe from tripping, for example. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated that is the point he is making. It doesn't have to. Safety and security will be in another definition. This is just for home accent lighting. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that is fine. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated so the way this reads now, that definition would be exempt from this ordinance. You want to define it this way, but make it subject to the downlighting and light trespass requirements. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated exactly. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated what is the light color? Are we sticking to 2700? **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that 4000 is what we have

DRAFT

said. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated while listening to the Public Hearing, there was confusion in the old part of town about what we are trying to accomplish. They can have lights out in their yard to play games. No one was trying to take that away. That is already in the ordinance. Regarding the group with the survey, no one had ever complained about parking lot lights. No one has ever come to us wanting them brighter. What we have got is working. No increase of theft or robbery, why change it to 4000? This should not be an exemption, it should just meet the same criteria as the intent of the ordinance was when it was written way back when Carol and George did it. It has been working for a lot of years. It has been implied. That is why we have people moving to Ivins. He just wants to be careful. **Chairman Bryan Pack** inquired if Commissioner Lance Anderson's definition covers the type of lighting that we see on houses in that definition? Is it covered under lighting building surfaces? **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated that oftentimes we have a rule and three pages on why the rule is there. We need to understand the intent. He is for holiday lighting, we just need to define what holiday lighting is. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that when someone wants to play in their backyard it is not allowed in our current ordinance. It is limited to an average of one lumen per square foot. We debated it in the ordinance, and changed it as a maximum of one lumen to an average of one lumen. A maximum would be one and a half watt LED lamp. So there are things in our ordinance that makes lighting up their backyard to play games illegal. There is no grandfather clause in the existing ordinance and everyone is bound to that new 2200 kelvin. Not the way the ordinance is written. **Dale Coulam** stated in red was a change towards the end of the ordinance to address that, to make it clear that any changes we are making right now apply prospectively, not retroactively. **Chairman Bryan Pack** inquired as it currently exists and someone that pre-dates this ordinance, would we require them to change it to the lower kelvin? **Dale Coulam** stated no. The current ordinance was adopted in 2007 so if your house was built before then, it doesn't apply to that house. Any changes made now will apply from year 2021 forward. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that is his understanding of how the law works. We are adding that clause to make it very clear and eliminate the argument altogether. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated a year ago that same question was posed and the answer was yes. **Dale Coulam** stated an ordinance that is passed begins from that point forward. We added that clause so it would be perfectly clear. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated that if you were doing something wrong before this ordinance, you still can't continue to do it wrong. You have to meet the ordinance that you fell within. You can maintain, but you cannot expand. If you want to expand the use in your yard, then you have to meet the new criteria. **Chairman Bryan Pack** inquired if Commissioner Bob Morris was okay with the home accent lighting definition and have it still be subject to the downlighting and light trespass restrictions? **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that it is a good definition. **Chairman Bryan Pack** inquired if Commissioner Lance Anderson could email that definition and he will change out the current definition of home accent lighting, add this one in, and remove that exception? The other change is on Pg 11 Section 21 G he will take that out on Line 426. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that by changing the definition and dropping the exemption, do we have an issue where he can light up his fountain with a 300 watt bulb? **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated it is not exempting. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that it talks about how many lumens per sq ft and as long as we stay at 4000 kelvin, that gives people the ability to light it. Everlights and things like that are allowed in our lighting ordinance. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that the landscape lighting section on Lines 300 to 314 we changed the average footcandle permitted on the ground for pathway lighting as an average of one horizontal

footcandle or less. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated there is highlighting below it on Line 308. We say only low-voltage systems are permitted. Would that be the same as landscape lighting? **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated home accent lighting and landscape lighting are two separate things. There is another area for landscape lighting. This intent is for statues and features. That is why safety and security is not affected by that. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated he believes that Line 300 through 314 are talking about landscape lighting that is defined as providing illumination to pathways, steps and entrances to buildings. There is a distinction between landscape lighting and home accent lighting as Commission Lance Anderson has defined it. Line 300 to 314 wouldn't apply to home accent lighting unless we specifically say that. We could call it landscape lighting and home accent lighting. Then the same restrictions of the maximum average footcandle permitted and the backlighting would apply to home accent lighting. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that if we change Line 300 the definition of landscape lighting to say the primary function of landscape lighting is to provide illumination for pathways, steps, highlighting of home features and entrances to buildings, because underneath it you have both of those. B has highlighting and backlighting, where we do have the maximum restrictions of footcandles and the light source. If we include B, it ties into landscape lighting and accent lighting. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated we need to keep them separated because they are for two different purposes. They are used differently in their application. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated so what he envisions is a specific definition for home accent lighting and in Line 300 he will change that to say landscape and home accent lighting to make it clear that these same standards apply to both landscape lighting and home accent lighting. They will be defined a little differently, but then they will both have standards apply to them and both be allowed with these standards. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated EC Item C talks about landscaping features, lighting and vegetation as defined in this chapter. Where in the chapter is that defined? **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated 11A and B define the standards that you have to meet as far as the average footcandle permitted on the ground and the highlighting. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** inquired if highlighting and backlighting are the same? Is it redundant to have Item C? Should it be included in Item B? If we are including vegetation and landscaping in the title, should three be two elements rather than three elements? **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that in his opinion we should leave it the way it is. Regarding holiday lighting Section 22 Line 427 to 433. The prohibited lighting section. Flashing, blinking, intermittent lights are prohibited or other lights that move or give the impression of movement are prohibited except during holidays. That is the way it is currently addressed. We desire to allow holiday lighting, but we need to better define that. Is it more broad than just flashing, blinking, intermittent lights? If we add a definition of when holidays are, that would then allow flashing, blinking, intermittent lights during that period of time. Is that a sufficient way to address it? **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that we define which holidays we will allow and the length of time prior and post-holiday. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that he had suggested last meeting two weeks before Thanksgiving to the first week after New Years. Then it was mentioned that Halloween ought to be included in that. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that would outlaw Halloween, which is huge. He wants neighbors to be able to agree. If a neighbor has a complaint, their first step should be with the neighbor, not the police department. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated maybe we could limit it to those holidays, and have people permit with the agreement of neighbors to have special lighting at a different period in time. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated he doesn't know whether we want another administrative bureaucracy, applications and fees and what percentage of neighbors have to approve, distance

of those houses. He doesn't like that idea himself. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated that City Council can decide and define those elements. We just leave it holidays and allow City Council to define it. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated if we say the week before Halloween to the week after New Years. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that he would be in agreement with not defining it. The technology today is to just punch a button to turn your lights on and it brings up a style for Valentines Day or 4th of July instantly on the eaves of your house. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated that if we have three in agreement either way, he is fine. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that if we limit it to Halloween to New Years, that hurts people with the technology. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated he is not in favor of being able to use the technology year-round. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated he is okay with it just saying holidays. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that a large part of him wants to allow the lights if they are subject to wattage and other requirements, but another part of him says leave it as holidays as defined. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated he would be in favor of leaving it to say holidays. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated we will leave it undefined then, but remove the capital "H" for holidays. Line 450 to 465, the changes generally realign what was already there but add nuance on 463, where the phrase "unless it compromises safety or security" was added. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** inquired what is our definition of safe? **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated if someone breaks into the outbuilding and you want a security light, but we are only allowed one lumen average per sq ft, and that kills security lighting. **Chairman Bryan Pack** inquired can you cover that with shielded downlighting? **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated we can't light up an area dim enough. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated if you go to Vegas website, there are 3000 cars stolen a day in the most lit-up city in the world. It is not proof that it does or doesn't give us security. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that he believes lighting contributes to security. There is reasonable discussion as to the level of lighting that contributes to security. Some lighting is better than no lighting for security. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated in Line 450 and 451 it talks about all exterior lighting. We don't know what that level is. It also has the use of motion sensors are encouraged and may be required. We should take out "may be required." It is required. If we are using high powered safety and security, then they should not be on all the time. My level of safety and security may be totally different than someone else. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated we are talking about light on your own property, because you can't trespass light and that is covered in other sections. We are trying to stipulate how much light they can have? What if I can't see well and need more light to keep from tripping? There are other ordinances in place to prevent glare and neighbor complaints. Once again if it is your property and you are lighting it up we should not have any issue with that. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated he can promise that if your security light comes on, it will trespass to the neighbors. There is a light in Santa Clara that borders Ivins on a 25 foot pole and when he turns it on, it brightens up the whole community. That is trespass. When we add light, we have to add more light to be brighter. When we are in the dark, a little bit of light looks very bright. It is all relative and what you are used to, and how we do it. We don't have a lot of break-ins, so he doesn't know why we are talking about something that isn't an issue to solve. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated that pole in Ivins would not be allowed with the ordinance we are putting forward. It would require if you want to have extra security to have a cut-off fixture, no glare, no visible bulb to a neighbor, it is all in this ordinance. People are afraid of light bouncing off the ground and ruining their stargazing. We have no legal right to a view. Stars are a view. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated that he means it is not a property right that can be enforced. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated along our corridors we have viewsheds. We

DRAFT

as a community have chosen as night sky. He totally disagrees. Everything we do is driven off viewshed and the protection of the night sky. It has been that way since 2003. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated it is not a property right. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated he is not willing to accept this section as it is drafted. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated it is not binding. There is no ruling or limits. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated we don't need to reiterate the lumens per sq ft in this section. Whatever the issue is, let's remove that and pass it forward. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated he doesn't like where it says unless it will compromise safety or security because it makes an exception that swallows the rule because everyone could come up with a safety or security argument to eliminate downlighting. He also doesn't like where it says unless they will detract from the objective of aesthetically pleasing illumination. **Commissioner Doug Clifford** stated that is in the eye of the beholder. Warm lighting colors are encouraged was in the old ordinance. He is not sure that should be a holdover from the old ordinance and we could take it out. **Commissioner Bob Morris** stated he agrees. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated as he has looked at the kelvins spectrum to see the difference between what we allow now and what we want to allow. Warm lighting is between 3-4000 kelvins. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated we have three votes on that. We are in favor of raising to 4000 kelvins throughout the City as an option. People have the ability to go up to 4000 kelvin on their house if they want to. Commercial as well the way it is currently drafted. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated that he disagrees with that. **Commissioner Jeff Loris** stated if we don't like that statement about safety and security and how it can be defined in any way, take out 5 completely. It is just a reiteration of the previous 1. If we take out the stricken language in 1 we will have 5. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated he has an issue with the language in 1 as well. **Commissioner Lance Anderson** stated instead of downlighting it should say shielded. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated so take out 5 and it is already subject to shielded lighting and then take out 3. On item 1 he is okay with the way it is drafted if we say safety and security lighting has to use a motion sensor so it is not on all the time. The safety light comes on only when there is a safety issue, motion or activity. **Chairman Bryan Pack** stated it is still subject to shielding, and light trespass is prohibited. That is still broad. We will continue with these changes for the next meeting.

B. <u>Discuss and consider approval of the Ivins City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2021.</u>

MOTION: Commissioner Jeff Loris moved to approve the Ivins City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for February 2, 2021.
SECOND: Commissioner Doug Clifford
VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Bryan Pack	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Bob Morris	AYE
Commissioner Jeff Loris	AYE
Commissioner Lance Anderson	AYE

5) REPORTS

A. Planning Commission

B. Chairman

C. <u>Building and Zoning Administrator, Mike Rodriguez</u>

Cody Mitchell stated that upcoming agenda items will be Red Desert Phase 3 and Azalea Townhomes Phase 5 final plats.

D. City Attorney, Dale Coulam

DRAFT

E. Items to be placed on future agendas

6) <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

MOTION: Commissioner Lance Anderson moved to approve ADJOURNMENT

SECOND: Commissioner Jeff Loris

VOTE: The motion carried.

Chairman Bryan Pack	AYE
Commissioner Doug Clifford	AYE
Commissioner Bob Morris	AYE
Commissioner Jeff Loris	AYE
Commissioner Lance Anderson	AYE

DRAFT