



**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, JUNE 12 2019, 6:00 pm**



I. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular meeting of the Manitou Springs Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers @ 606 Manitou Avenue. Chairman Delwiche called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm and declared a quorum present. The following Commission members attended:

- PRESENT:** Chair ALAN DELWICHE
Vice Chair JEANNE VROBEL
Commissioner JULIA SIMMONS
Commissioner WHITNEY LEWIS
- ABSENT:** Commissioner MIKE CASEY (excused)
Commissioner JULIE WOLFE (excused)
Commissioner BRYANT “TIP” RAGAN (excused)
- STAFF:** Kimberly Johnson, Planning Director (6:49 pm)
Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner
Dylan Becker, Planner I
- GUESTS:** David Chorpenning, Community Engagement and Governance Workgroup
Coreen Toll, Housing Advisory Board

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ITEM 1. May 8, 2019

MOTION:

Vice Chair Vrobel moved to approve the May 8, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes of the City Planning Commission, as presented.

SECOND:

Commissioner Simmons seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 3-0. Commissioner Lewis abstained as she was not present for the May 8, 2019 Regular Meeting of the City Planning Commission.

III. NOTICE OF COUNCIL ACTION

ITEM 2. Ordinances Repealing and Reenacting Title 16 (Subdivision) and Title 18 (Zoning) of the City of Manitou Springs Municipal Code to Implement Hazard Mitigation Provisions. At First Reading on June 4, City Council approved both ordinances, 6-0. Second Reading was scheduled for June 18, 2019.

ITEM 3. Ordinance Amending the City's Medical and Recreational Marijuana Regulations. City Council considered and approved the code amendments to only allow medical and recreational marijuana in the same facility, thereby having a maximum of two facilities at First Reading on May 21. The regulations were approved at Second Reading held on June 4.

At this time, Chairman Delwiche reviewed the meeting procedures for those present in the audience and asked if any Commissioner had Ex Parte Contacts or Conflicts of Interest to declare. Hearing none, the meeting continued.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ITEM 4. MNS 1801 – Minor Subdivision (Replat) – 708 Manitou Avenue – Kyle Fenner on behalf of the City of Manitou Springs Metropolitan District **POSTPONEMENT TO JULY 10 REQUESTED**

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Memorandum dated June 6, 2019. Ms. Anthony stated the Applicants were requesting postponement until the July 10, 2019 Regular Meeting of the City Planning Commission in order to work out the finishing details of the final plat which will be presented to the Commission.

Ms. Anthony stated she had just received the final plat from the Applicant, but it required review before it was presented to the Commission at the next meeting.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Vrobel moved to postpone MNS 1801 for a Minor Subdivision to replat 708 Manitou Avenue to the July 10, 2019 Regular Meeting of the City Planning Commission.

SECOND:

Commissioner Lewis seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 5. RE 1901 – Rezone (Commercial to General Residential – Public Hearing) – 17 Mayfair Avenue – Joshua and Aaron Smit on behalf of Richard and Sharon Smit, Owners

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated June 3, 2019.

Hearing no questions for Staff, Chairman Delwiche invited the Applicants to the podium.

Aaron Smit, 17 Mayfair Avenue, stated he was amenable to the statements and conditions made in the Staff Report.

Hearing no questions for, or comment from, the Applicants, Chairman Delwiche opened the Public Hearing for public comment. Hearing none, the meeting continued.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Vrobel moved to forward a recommendation for approval to City Council of RE 1901 for the Rezoning 17 Mayfair Avenue from Commercial to General Residential with the following findings:

- A. The request complies with the purpose and intent of Plan Manitou;
- B. The request complies with all applicable statutory provisions and the request is justified based on sound Zoning practice;
- C. The character of the property, and much of the immediate, surrounding area, is residential, with long-standing, single-family and townhome development on Mayfair Avenue and El Paso Boulevard;
- D. The subject site is developed and has existing utilities and access to the maintained public street; the rezoning will have no adverse impact on the provision of public facilities and services;
- E. The proposed rezoning is compatible with the surrounding land uses;
- F. The subject land is suitable for the intended, residential use.

And the following condition(s):

- 1. Prior to the Planning Commissioner recommendation and the Rezoning Ordinance being considered by the City Council, the Applicant's surveyor will confirm the accuracy of the current legal description of the property and provide any corrections to the Planning Department. A rezoning graphic of the property shall also be provided to accompany the Rezoning Ordinance. This information is necessary no later than Friday, June 21, 2019, in order for the request to be heard at the July 2, 2019 City Council Meeting.

SECOND:

Commissioner Lewis seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

V. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 6. MiCUP 1903 – Minor Conditional Use Permit (Amendment of MiCUP 9004) – 10 Otoe Place – Christopher Dwyer, Applicant

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, stated the Applicant was requesting postponement to the August 14, 2019 Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission due to complications they had run into pertaining to Building Code issues with the Pikes Peak Regional Building Department in changing the structure to a residential use.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Vrobel moved to postpone MiCUP 1903 for a Minor Conditional Use Permit at 10 Otoe Place to the August 14, 2019 Regular Meeting of the City Planning Commission.

SECOND:

Commissioner Lewis seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 7. SP 1907 – Planned Sign Program (Billboard Sign) – 301 Manitou Avenue – Robert Hefner, Applicant.

Michelle Anthony, Senior Planner, presented the Staff Report dated June 5, 2019.

Vice Chair Vrobel inquired if both sides of the sign were to be split in half, in which one side and one half of that side would say “Welcome to Manitou Springs”, as an official sign put up by the Chamber of Commerce, and on the other half would advertise for the Manitou Cliff Dwellings, while the reverse side of the sign, also split in half, advertised for the on-premise business, Savelli’s, and another official City sign on the other half of the split. Ms. Anthony responded the signs needed to be the same on both the front and reverse sides of the billboard so it contained the same information on either side in which both sides advertised for the Chamber of Commerce and the Manitou Cliff Dwellings on both sides or the Chamber of Commerce and Savelli’s on both sides of the billboard.

Vice Chair Vrobel inquired if it was possible to advertise for the Chamber of Commerce, the Manitou Cliff Dwellings, and Savelli’s on both sides of the billboard in which the panels would be split into thirds, as opposed to halves. Ms. Anthony responded this was possible and was made easiest if the Commission designated whatever portion, whether that be a half or a third, as an official City sign for the Chamber of Commerce, as it took this portion or square footage of the allotted signage out of the mix. Ms. Anthony stated this helped the overall application and was justifiable under the current Code.

Vice Chair Vrobel stated she felt it seemed only right, since the billboard was located above Savelli’s, that it also advertise for their business as well. Ms. Anthony stated the Commission had the ability to craft the conditions of the approval in a manner which allowed the flexibility to do so, but had to ensure whatever was crafted only allowed the Manitou Cliff Dwellings portion of the sign not to exceed thirty-two square feet (32 ft.²) in size. Ms. Anthony stated the other caveat was, if Savelli’s decided to advertise on the sign, their total allotted square footage for signage was not permitted to exceed one-hundred and fifty square feet (150 ft.²) in area.

Chairman Delwiche stated, due to recent Supreme Court decisions, the requirement to remove these types of signs had been removed from the City’s Municipal Code, but the City still had the authority to say whether or not the sign was permitted to be utilized or not. Ms. Anthony responded this was essentially where the City had been for the past several years regarding the matter.

Chairman Delwiche inquired if the City was specifically able to disallow the usage of the sign for marijuana advertisements. Ms. Anthony responded the City was permitted to do so as marijuana businesses were not federally protected businesses and this allowed the City to be more restrictive regarding the signage for these types of businesses.

Chairman Delwiche inquired if the off-premise sign provisions allowed signage from businesses located anywhere in the State of Colorado. Ms. Anthony responded the City was only controlling off-premise signs located within its jurisdiction, but it was possible for a business located outside of the City to advertise using one of these billboards so long as the advertisement did not exceed thirty-two square feet (32 ft.²) in size as permitted by the off-premise sign provisions of the Code.

Hearing no further questions for Staff, Chairman Delwiche invited the Applicant to the podium.

Robert Hefner, 7674 Double Barrel Heights, Colorado Springs, representative for the Manitou Cliff Dwellings, stated this request was initiated by graffiti which appeared on the billboard and he had thought this was a reasonable way to deter further vandalism of the sign space.

Chairman Delwiche inquired Mr. Hefner's thoughts regarding the Staff Report. Mr. Hefner stated he had several questions.

Mr. Hefner inquired, regarding the requirement to affix the sign in a static and stationary position, whether the City preferred the sign to be affixed parallel to Manitou Avenue or parallel to Crystal Park Avenue. Ms. Anthony responded it was preferred that the sign be affixed parallel to Crystal Park Road as this made both sides of the billboard sign visible from both directions of travel on Manitou Avenue.

Mr. Hefner inquired, regarding the lighting of the billboard sign, whether it was possible to defer their decision regarding whether it would be lit or not until a later date, as he had concern surrounding residents may be impacted. Ms. Anthony responded this was not an issue.

Commissioner Simmons inquired if the Applicant felt the lighting would be beneficial in deterring further vandalism. Mr. Hefner stated he did feel this may be the case.

Chairman Delwiche inquired if it was a good idea to install a motion detector light on the billboard to deter vandalism. Ms. Anthony responded lighting tended to be more noticeable and impactful when it came on and off, as opposed to remaining on at a reasonable level, and commented even a low lit billboard was beneficial in deterring further vandalism.

Hearing no further questions for, or comment from, the Applicants, Chairman Delwiche opened the Public Hearing for public comment.

Coreen Toll, 457 Crystal Hills Boulevard, stated she was in favor of the request and inquired if there were any Code provisions regarding the amount of time a sign was permitted to remain in place, or whether once a sign was approved, if it was permitted to remain in place indefinitely. Ms. Anthony responded only once a business was no longer in operation, was the City permitted to require the sign be removed or flipped over so it was not advertising for a business which was no longer there, but could not require the sign structure to be removed.

Ms. Toll inquired if it was possible for products, such as Coca-Cola, to advertise on these types of signs in the City. Ms. Anthony responded this was permitted under the current Code per the off-premise sign provisions.

Hearing no further comment from the public, Chairman Delwiche closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Lewis inquired if the Commission was in favor of approving the sign to be split in two (2) or whether they were in favor of splitting the sign into thirds. Ms. Anthony responded that allowing the sign to be split into thirds or halves allowed some flexibility to work with the entities involved should all of them choose to advertise on the sign. Commissioner Lewis stated she was not in favor of permitted there to be more than two (2) advertisements on each face of the billboard, as allowing more than this was distracting.

Commissioner Simmons stated she agreed with Commissioner Lewis and felt it was too much to allow more than two (2) entities to advertise on a single side of the billboard.

Vice Chair Vrobel stated she was amenable to approving the request only if both sides of the billboard sign were required to be identical, but did not have an issue with there being more than two (2) entities advertised as long as it was reviewed and approved by City Staff.

Chairman Delwiche commented he was in agreement with Commissioner Lewis as well.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Vrobel moved to approve SP 1907 for a Planned Sign Program at 301 Manitou Avenue with the following conditions:

1. If use of a portion of the sign is for the on-premise business, that sign area may be ½ of the total sign face (70 square feet), which is not more than three signs and 150 square feet in total sign area.
2. If use of a portion of the is for an off-premise business, the sign area for such business shall be no more than 32 square feet in size and the remainder of the sign area shall be used as an official sign.
3. The sign faces shall be identical on each side of the freestanding sign.
4. If an off-premise sign is proposed on a portion of the existing sign face(s), then use of the existing roof sign rather than a freestanding signs is approved.
5. The use of the existing sign structure, which does not meet the restriction on square footage above the highest point of the building's roof for a Roof Sign, is approved.
6. The sign structure may not move and must be anchored to a static position.
7. Lighting of the sign is allowed and shall meet the Sign Code provisions if lighting is provided.

Vice Chair Vrobel further offered the following findings:

1. For this specific application, splitting the area of the sign faces between two entities provides for conformance to the overall square footage restriction of a single sign not exceeding 100sf.
2. Any portion of the sign dedicated to use by the Chamber of Commerce shall be deemed as an Official Sign. As such, the Off-Premise Sign restriction in regard to sign size is not applicable to this area.
3. The proposed sign is constructed in a quality manner and of durable, quality materials.
4. The value and qualities of the neighborhood are not substantially impacted by the use of the proposed sign as approved.
5. The planned sign program application is compatible with the applicable qualities and character of the community in regard to scenic views, utility concealment, illumination and posting of street number.

6. The proposed planned sign program is compatible in function, scale and design with surrounding land uses.
7. The proposed sign will not create a visual distraction or traffic or safety hazards under the conditions of approval.

SECOND:

Commissioner Simmons seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Lewis asked if more than two entities could be featured on the sign and stated she did not feel the approval should be for more than two. After discussion, Vice Chair Vrobel and Commissioner Simmons agreed the motion should specify 2 entities on the proposed sign and both sides would be the same.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Delwiche stated the Short-Term Rental Ordinance discussion required the involvement of the Community Engagement and Governance Workgroup representative, David Chorpenning, who had not yet arrived to the meeting. Kimberly Johnson, Planning Director, stated the Commission could rearrange the order of the agenda through a motion to allow more time for Mr. Chorpenning to arrive.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Vrobel moved to discuss the 2020 Budget item, Item 8 on the official agenda, to occur prior to the discussion of the Short-Term/Vacation Rental item, Item 9, on the official agenda.

SECOND:

Commissioner Lewis seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

VOTE:

Motion passed, 4-0.

ITEM 8. 2020 Budget - Discussion Regarding Priorities and Requests

Kimberly Johnson, Planning Director, presented the Staff Memorandum dated May 8, 2019.

Ms. Johnson stated she had received cost estimates from Clarion and Associates regarding a number of upcoming Code changes and was glad to be sitting when she read them. Ms. Johnson stated the estimate for the Short-Term Rental Ordinance was a timeframe of five to seven months (5 - 7 mo.) at a cost of thirty to forty thousand dollars (\$30,000.00 - \$40,000.00). Ms. Johnson stated the estimate for the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance was a timeframe of seven to nine months (7 - 9 mo.) at a cost of forty-five to fifty-five thousand dollars (\$45,000.00 - \$55,000.00).

Ms. Johnson stated the City was intending to contract with a group known as the Council of Neighbors and Organizations (CONO) for the public engagement process on the Short-Term Rental Ordinance and there was need for some high level Code work to be done by Clarion, as well, and she estimated a cost of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000.00), which she intended to request during the 2019 midyear budget adjustments.

Ms. Johnson stated the 2020 Budget needed to provide for some high level Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances outside of the changes made under the Planning for Hazards amendments and Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance and would ask Clarion and Associates to provide a cost estimate for performing the work. Ms. Johnson stated Barb Cole, the previous Interim Planning Director, had done a significant amount of work on the Subdivision Ordinance, but did not complete the proposed updates prior to her departure, and the decision was made to pull those amendments from the Planning for Hazards Code changes. Ms. Johnson stated this was done in order to meet the required timeframe for the Planning for Hazards project, but much of the Subdivision Regulation changes and language were mostly completed due to Ms. Cole's efforts and the changes would move forward in the 2020 year.

Ms. Johnson stated she had also reached out to the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) who had informed her they were able to help with the wholesale changes to the Subdivision and Zoning regulations and would be able to match up to fifty percent (50%) of the funding required. Ms. Johnson stated she expected the cost of these big ticket item changes to be in the neighborhood of three-hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000.00). Ms. Johnson commented DOLA was unable to help the City with the smaller Code amendments she was proposing for the 2019 midyear amendments in terms of funding, but was able to help fund the larger amendments in 2020.

Chairman Delwiche inquired if there was a budget for the Creekwalk Trail project. Ms. Johnson stated she was fairly certain this had been put into the budget and was aware of some funding issues regarding the initiation of the project. Ms. Johnson commented the City did not receive the grant it had applied for regarding Phase I of the project and was uncertain how this was intended to be paid for, as it was a fairly big ticket item.

Ms. Johnson stated she was also looking into the feasibility of the Planning Department obtaining a City vehicle for use by the department and Code Enforcement software for the Code Enforcement Officer to access property and permit information while in the field.

Ms. Johnson stated she also wanted to be sure there was enough money in the Planning Department's budget to provide training and professional development for Planning Department Staff.

Chairman Delwiche stated he felt it was wise to wait until the Short-Term Rental Ordinance was finalized and also felt it was best to not regulate bed and breakfasts, but to include it in the definitions. Ms. Johnson stated the Commission should discuss the details of those regulations under the discussion of the next item on the agenda.

Ms. Johnson stated if any of the Commissioners had any items they would like to add to the budget, an email of the information was sufficient. Ms. Johnson stated the deadline was July 31, 2019.

ITEM 9. Short-Term/Vacation Rental Ordinance – Discussion Regarding Public Engagement Process

Kim Johnson, Planning Director, presented the Staff Memorandum dated May 8, 2019.

Ms. Johnson went over the history of these regulations and some of the loopholes discovered by Staff. Ms. Johnson stated City Council had asked the updates to the regulations go through a public engagement process to ensure the desires of the public were heard, understood, and incorporated into the updates.

Chairman Delwiche stated, regarding the background information for this process in the email he had sent, there were numerous steps and ways in which an item was able to go through the engagement process, but did not feel these regulation updates needed a high level process for engagement.

Ms. Johnson stated it was originally the intention of the Community Engagement Workgroup and Staff to not open up the entirety of the regulations for discussion, but it was quickly determined the entirety of the regulations needed to be reviewed per the request of City Council.

Ms. Johnson went over the Community Engagement Worksheet included with the Staff Report pertaining to the level of community engagement needed.

Ms. Johnson stated she wanted the Planning Commission to discuss the role they would play in this process and to work through the worksheet provided.

Chairman Delwiche stated he felt, through serving on the Commission, there was an interest in preserving much of what took the Commission upwards of two (2) years to craft and which had an intense amount of public engagement through that initial process.

Ms. Johnson inquired, from the Commission's perspective, what concerns or opportunities needed to be addressed regarding the regulations. Chairman Delwiche responded he felt it was important to get feedback from the community regarding the five-hundred foot (500 ft.) separation distance requirement, as he had heard residents on both sides of the fence concerning the increase and/or decrease of this requirement.

Vice Chair Vrobel stated she was not in favor of altering the five hundred foot (500 ft.) separation distance because, if decreased, a whole new set of issues was created in terms of regulating and monitoring. Ms. Johnson responded it was possible the public may want to increase the separation distance in some zones, but decrease the distance in other zones.

Vice Chair Vrobel stated there had already been a massive public engagement process which took place when the regulations were originally put forward and felt the regulations were incredibly well crafted as they were. Vice Chair Vrobel stated she felt there only needed to be minor changes to close some of the loopholes and felt somewhat frustrated at the request to open up the entire regulations for amendment. Vice Chair Vrobel commented heavily revising the regulations only created new problems while minimally resolving the existing issues.

Chairman Delwiche stated this had been laid before the Commission by City Council and felt the Community Engagement process was to be of some benefit in determining the actual desires of the public regarding short-term rental operations.

Commissioner Simmons inquired if there was a need to look at socioeconomic data in terms of lot size, housing availability, home prices, and how these operations impact the neighborhoods in which they operate. Ms. Johnson stated she felt it was helpful to do so.

Chairman Delwiche stated it was worth looking into the disparity between the costs of operation of a hotel or motel versus a short-term rental operation, as vacation rental operations were taxed at a residential rate

whereas hotels and bed and breakfasts were taxed at commercial rates. Ms. Johnson commented this may be something for City Council to consider, but it did not pertain to the Zoning Code, of which the Commission was directly responsible.

Chairman Delwiche inquired what other issues needed to be addressed. Ms. Johnson responded the definitions section needed to be amended and the determination as to whether bed and breakfasts would be treated the same as vacation rental operations or differently. Chairman Delwiche commented he had heard from one of the residents this was something they were interested in considering, as this individual felt vacation rental operations and bed and breakfasts were different animals, and wondered if bed and breakfasts should be included and counted toward the two-percent (2%) threshold.

Ms. Johnson stated the Commission may consider looking at bed and breakfast operations and separating them into two distinct categories; one of which operated more like a vacation rental and those operations associated with other or additional uses. Ms. Johnson stated one type would be considered for Minor Conditional Use Permit and the other for Major Conditional Use Permit. Ms. Anthony responded the Code already provided for a Multi-Use Inn, which covered bed and breakfast operations with additional uses and was considered under a Major Conditional Use Permit.

Coreen Toll, 457 Crystal Hills Boulevard, stated she had three (3) suggestions. Ms. Toll stated her first suggestion was to obtain a list of the current operations with all of the complaints and issues listed to provide background on the impacts of these operations on the community.

Ms. Toll stated her second suggestion was to look at the two-percent (2%) threshold and whether the current separation distance requirement made things too difficult to reach that threshold.

Ms. Toll finally suggested looking into neighborhood character and performing some studies to determine the impact on the neighborhood if the regulations were amended.

Ms. Johnson commented it may cost a significant amount of money to find the answers the community needed to make an informed decision.

Ms. Anthony commented it was probably best to look at the separation distance by zoning designations as opposed to doing so by neighborhood.

Chairman Delwiche stated one of the things which had precipitated the regulations initially was the dense concentration of short-term rental operations on Ruxton Avenue and was concerned about oversaturation, neighborhood degradation, and a depleted housing stock as a result of amending the separation distance requirements for certain areas of town.

Vice Chair Vrobel stated she also wanted to look into the owner/management location for these operations to firm up the loose language in the regulations and to ensure if there was an issue at one of these operations, someone could be on site in a reasonable amount of time.

Commissioner Simmons inquired how Staff wanted the Commission to complete the Community Engagement Worksheet. Ms. Johnson responded the idea was for the Commission to identify the issues, as the Commission perceived them, within the current regulations for discussion with the public.

Ms. Johnson inquired if there were any items identified by City Council which the Commission felt did not need to be discussed regarding the regulations. Commissioner Simmons stated she did not feel it was necessary to revisit the entire ordinance.

Ms. Toll stated there had been a lot of discussion in the community in recent weeks regarding integrity and felt it was important not to include anyone who owned one of these operations or had something to gain from the regulations on the project team. Ms. Johnson responded it was important for those on the project team to know their role in terms of guiding the process while not maintaining the authority to render any decisions.

David Chorpenning, 5110 High Ridge View, stated he felt it was important for the Planning Commission and City Council to be on the same page through a collaborative process. Ms. Johnson responded it was her understanding from City Council that if the Planning Commission was not comfortable revisiting the entire ordinance, they would be amenable to discussing the matter which was the purpose behind this discussion and worksheet.

Mr. Chorpenning stated there were two (2) parts to this, one of which was determining the level of engagement and the engagement process the updates should be put through and the project team was only responsible for putting together a robust engagement process.

Chairman Delwiche stated he felt, given the discussion this evening, the Commission was essentially reconsidering the entire ordinance. Ms. Anthony responded she did not feel the Commission was opening the entire ordinance for revisitation, but some specific aspects of it.

Ms. Anthony stated the language regarding the parking requirements for these operations was clarified in the current proposed ordinance, as well.

At this time, 8:06 pm, Commissioner Simmons excused herself from the meeting.

The Commission went through the worksheet completed by City Council, item by item, with Staff and determined which items they had identified were relevant in determining the level of community engagement desired.

Mr. Chorpenning stated he was excited for the Commission to try out this process and he felt it was a good way to show the community how the City will engage and collaborate with the public moving forward.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business before the Commission, Chairman Delwiche adjourned the meeting at 8:14 pm.

Minutes Prepared by Dylan Becker, Planner I