

ROUTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

JUNE 3, 2021

The regular meeting of the Routt County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Chairman Steve Warnke and Commissioners Greg Jaeger, Andrew Benjamin, Linda Miller, Bill Norris, Brian Kelly, Paul Weese, Jim DeFrancia. Peter Flint and Roberta Marshall. Ren Martyn was absent. Planning Director Kristy Winser and staff planner Alan Goldich also attended. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

MINUTES – April 1, 2021

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the above cited minutes, as written. Commissioner Benjamin seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

MINUTES – April 15, 2021

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the above cited minutes, as written. Commissioner DeFrancia seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

MINUTES – May 6, 2021

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the above cited minutes, as written. Commissioner DeFrancia seconded the motion. **The motion carried unanimously.**

ACTIVITY: PL-21-108 & PL-21-109

**PETITIONER: Eagle Land Development Inc. (tabled from May 6, 2021)
Landaulet View Subdivision**

**PETITION: 1. Sketch Subdivision review for a 9-lot subdivision
2. Zone Change from General Residential to Medium Density Residential**

LOCATION: Approximately .5 miles east of the intersection of CR 16 and CR 212 in Stagecoach

Commissioner Weese stated that due to a conflict of interest he would be unable to participate in the consideration of this request. He recused himself. Commissioner Benjamin stated that he works with Four Points Surveying, which is representing the petitioner. He said that he has not worked on this project and has not discussed it. He stated that he would be able to evaluate the petition without bias. There were no objections to Commissioner Benjamin's participation.

Chairman Warnke noted that Mike Farrell, an adjacent property owner of the subject parcel, had submitted a written request that the petition be tabled. Chairman Warnke reviewed the notification process for the petition, which had been tabled at the May 6, 2021 hearing to allow the petitioner to revise the proposal. In response to a question from Commissioner Benjamin, Mr. Goldich confirmed that all noticing requirements for the petition had been met.

MOTION

Commissioner De Francia moved to deny the request to table the petition. Commissioner Kelly seconded the motion. Chairman Warnke asked for a roll-call vote. **The motion to deny carried 9 – 0, with the Chair voting yes.**

Mr. Goldich reviewed that Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners, which is the deciding body on the Zone Change and the Sketch Subdivision petitions. The Board of County Commissioners will hear the petition on June 15, 2021.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the original petition and noted the changes that had been made since the project was presented to Planning Commission on May 6th. He presented a site plan of the revised proposal, and an aerial view of the property and the surrounding area. He then presented a site plan of the approved, but not yet recorded, subdivision of the property into four lots, zoned General Residential (GR). A maximum of eight units would be allowed under the approved subdivision. Under the revised proposal being reviewed the entire property would be re-zoned to Medium Density Residential and, based on the revised sizes of the lots, a maximum of 14 units would be allowed: four duplexes and six single family residences. The original proposal would have allowed a maximum of 22 units.

Mr. Goldich stated that in addition to the letter submitted by Mr. Farrell requesting a tabling, letters from the Stagecoach Property Owners' Association (SPOA) and Mr. John Lanterman had been received after the staff report had been sent out, but before the 72-hour cut-off, and had been distributed to Planning Commission on Tuesday.

Mr. Goldich stated that the reduction in the density of the revised proposal is anticipated to have a corresponding reduction in impacts. He said that staff comments and analysis of the proposal as included in the original staff packet had not changed. Mr. Goldich said that the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) included in the Stagecoach Community Plan (SCP) shows this property and the surrounding area as "existing residential," which is described as no change to the existing zoning should occur as the existing zoning provides for a variety of housing types and densities. Mr. Goldich said that SCP, like all development plans in Routt County, is advisory and intended to serve as a guide for decision makers. He said that there are many different policies in the SCP and that not all of the policies need to be met in order for a proposal to be in general compliance with the plan. He said that non-compliance with a single policy could be reason for denial, but non-compliance with one aspect of the plan does not require a denial. Mr. Goldich said that it is staff's opinion that the proposal is in compliance with the SCP.

Mr. Goldich presented a map of Stagecoach indicating the location of the 250 vacant units that are able to be served by central water and sewer. He said that in Stagecoach a total of 30 new housing units had been started from 2017 to 2020.

Ms. Rebecca Lindeman of Four Points Surveying and Engineering, representing the petitioner, reviewed the revised proposal and the reduction in density from the original proposal. She stated that no variances are being requested in conjunction with the proposed re-zoning and subdivision. She noted the lack of attainable housing options in the community and stated that the intent of the property owner is to build units that are reasonably priced. Ms. Lindeman presented a site plan and

reviewed the location of the proposed duplex lots, the single family residence lots, the access roads, open space and trails. She noted that a guest parking area had also been added to the plan. She offered that the proposal is compatible with the surrounding area, noting that the size of the single family lots is similar to the lot sizes in Young's Peak Preserve and the duplex lots are similar in size to the lots in Red Hawk Village. Ms. Lindeman stated that the Morrison Creek Water and Sanitation District will provide water and sewer service. A traffic study based on the original proposal of 22 units indicated that the proposal would have little or no impact on the existing traffic. Acknowledging the concerns regarding the visual impacts, Ms. Lindeman stated that the duplex units would be sited on the lower portion of the property and that under the MDR zoning the maximum height of the structures would be the same as the single family homes. She added that the project would provide infill development that is in line with the character of the community.

Mr. Kris Rainsberger, the property owner and local builder, noted the need for housing for the local workforce. In response to a question from Commissioner Flint, Mr. Rainsberger stated that he had purchased the property in November of 2020 and was aware of the existing zoning. He said he was also aware that a re-zoning of the property could be requested to allow for the construction of attainable units in this area.

Commissioner Jaeger asked for a review of a history of the previous zone change from High Density Residential (HDR) to the current GR zoning. Ms. Winser stated that it was the understanding of the general manager of the Morrison Creek District that the owner of the property at the time had requested the zone change because single family residences were more desirable at that time.

In response to a question from Chairman Warnke, Mr. Goldich stated that the average lot in Red Hawk Village is approximately 0.13 acres and the average lot size in Meadowgreen is 0.3 – 0.5 acres.

Commissioner Miller asked when the previous owner had requested the zone change to GR from HDR in relation to the update of the SCP. Ms. Winser stated that the zone change was requested prior to the SCP update in 2017. Mr. Goldich said that the property was rezoned in 1998. Ms. Winser reviewed the history of the SCP update, noting that there was initially little appetite for including a FLUM. The FLUM was added very late in the update process, after the County had postponed the update hoping that a potential new developer of the Wittemeyer property would participate. Ms. Winser added that the Morrison Creek District is in support of higher density development in the areas of Stagecoach that can be served by the District. She noted that the waste water treatment plant was designed for very high density development, and the low usage rate has extended the life of the plant.

Commissioner Benjamin stated that zone change requests are very commonly requested in conjunction with subdivision petitions. He also noted that there was a lot of pushback from the neighbors when the Red Hawk Village development, which also involved a zone change, came through the planning process. Ms. Winser stated that the most recently approved subdivision in the area is Young's Peak Preserve, which also required a zone change.

Chairman Warnke asked about the condominiumization of the duplex lots. Mr. Goldich confirmed that the plat would reflect the division of ownership of the lots. A suggested condition of approval (COA) to address this has been included.

Commissioner Kelly offered that the issue that needs to be decided is whether the proposed development is an appropriate alternative to the already approved plan that would allow a maximum of eight units on four lots with no restrictions on the location or the height of the structures.

Public Comment

Mr. Mike Farrell, a resident of Meadowgreen, stated that he had gathered 110 signatures of nearby residents who are in opposition to the proposal, and would have been able to collect more if he had been allowed additional time. He said that he does not think the project is in compliance with the SCP, adopted in 2017. He cited the Future Land Use Map included in the SCP and stated that the policy of the plan is for the zoning in this area not to change. He said that the SCP states that the existing zoning in Stagecoach can accommodate a variety of housing types and development densities. He stated that the current zoning is appropriate. He noted approved density of eight units is enough for this parcel. He said that the property is located on a very visible hilltop knoll and the proposed development would have significant visual impacts on the surrounding area. Mr. Farrell added that there are many available, buildable lots in Stagecoach without further subdivision. He added that he wants the County to follow the SCP.

Ms. Jennifer Wertz asked if there would be an impact on current residents' water and sewer rates as a result of the proposal. She also asked why water cannot be provided to more existing lots in Stagecoach. She noted that vacant lots, not developed houses, were sold at Young's Peak Preserve, which is quite different and shouldn't be compared to the present proposal. Ms. Wertz asked what would prevent the developer from repeating this development model on other nearby parcels in the future. She expressed concern regarding traffic impacts and stated that the dog park was unnecessary.

Mr. John Lanterman reviewed his experience as a land use planner and landscape architect. He acknowledged that land use plans are advisory, but stressed that they reflect the desires of the community and are the result of significant community involvement and input. He stated that it is important that land use plans be adhered to because the citizens need to have confidence in the plans. He stated that the SCP identifies this property as "existing zoning" and states that the existing zoning should remain in place, citing that it allows for a variety of housing types and densities. Mr. Lanterman stated that the SCP states clearly how this parcel should be treated. He also cited Section 8.2.1 of the Routt County Zoning Regulations and stated that this request does not meet the criteria for a zone change because it is inconsistent with the Master Plan and the SCP. He added that the advantages of the zone change do not outweigh the disadvantages. He noted the significant community opposition to the zone change and offered that the Planning Commission needs to listen to the community.

Ms. Molly Wojcik, noting that the proposed development has been described as a part of a solution to the attainable housing shortage, asked what the price point of the units would actually be. She also asked that Planning Commission consider asking Commissioner Benjamin to recuse himself.

Mr. James Zimmerman, a resident of Redhawk, stated that Planning Commission is being asked to ignore the SCP, which states clearly that this parcel should not be rezoned. He also noted the significant negative visual impact of development on this ridge, particularly as seen from Redhawk Village. He said that without viewing this property from Redhawk Village, it is impossible to understand the impact the proposed development would have. He asked what "attainable" actually means, noting that Redhawk is no longer affordable. Mr. Zimmerman added that none of the surrounding developments (Redhawk Village, Young's Peak Preserve, Wagonwheel, Willow Island) have any impact on the views of others, but the proposed development would. He expressed concern with the headlights shining into windows of existing homes. Mr. Zimmerman stated that if Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners follow the Master Plan and SCP, they must deny this petition, particularly the duplexes on the ridge. He added that the retaining wall that would be needed would add to the cost of the homes.

Mr. John DiNickolas, a member of the SPOA board of directors, stated that he is speaking on his own behalf. He stated that he had participated in the update of the SCP and that the only discussion of rezoning was related to the creation of more Commercial zoning. He stated that Stagecoach does not need more density. He added that he is concerned with the additional traffic that the development would generate, as well as the impact on the roads.

Mr. Thomas Taggart, a resident of Young's Peak Preserve, stated that the SCP is very clear and that Planning Commission should follow it. He noted that if Mr. Farrell had had more time, he could have collected many more signatures of residents who oppose this development. He asked Planning Commission to listen to the people who live in the community. He offered that eight units is enough for this property.

Ms. Betsy Blakeslee stated that her house looks directly at the ridge being proposed for development. She said that she had purchased her property two years ago and if the SCP had called for development of that ridge, she might not have purchased her home. She stated her agreement with the previous comments regarding the importance of following the SCP so that residents know what to expect. She urged Planning Commission to follow the SCP.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

In response to the reference to the thousands of lots available in Stagecoach, Mr. Goldich noted that the majority of them are not served by access roads, water, sewer, electric, etc. These lots are essentially undevelopable in their current state. Mr. Goldich said that while any developer would be allowed to extend the infrastructure to the existing lots, doing so would be prohibitively expensive. Regarding the capacity of the infrastructure and the impact of the potential development on current residents, Mr. Goldich stated that the discussion had been about the waste water treatment plant and how the low usage rate had extended the life of the plant and, therefore, delayed the need to replace it. He said that eventually the aging plant would need to be replaced, however. He added that the more residents being served to share the cost, the lower the expenses for each resident of operating and replacing the plant.

Regarding the comment that the developer could repeat this model of development in other nearby areas, Mr. Goldich stated that each petition is evaluated on its own merits; he stated that the comparison to Young's Peak Preserve was only that it also required a zone change. He agreed

with Commissioner Kelly's assessment that Planning Commission must evaluate this proposal on its own individual merits to determine if it is appropriate for this particular site.

Mr. Goldich stated that no retaining walls are shown on the site plan. He reviewed the three step review process for subdivisions, and stated that the specifics of the roads, the engineering, the landscaping, etc. would be required at the next stage of review. He added that an approval at the Sketch Subdivision stage does not mean that the proposal cannot be denied at the next stage. The Sketch Subdivision review is a high level review to determine if the proposal is in compliance with the Master Plan and SCP.

In response to a question from Commissioner Marshall, Mr. Goldich confirmed that under the current GR zoning, duplexes could be constructed on each of the four approved lots as a use by right. He also confirmed Commissioner LaFrancia's comment that the increase from a maximum of eight units to a maximum of 14 units is the only change regarding allowable uses.

Commissioner Norris offered that the community of Stagecoach could, at some point, consider incorporating.

In response to a question from Commissioner Flint, Mr. Goldich stated that although the proposed zoning (MDR) and the existing zoning (GR) would both allow for the same uses, the MDR zone district would allow for smaller lots and, therefore, an increase in density.

There was a discussion of the roads in Stagecoach. Most internal subdivision access roads in Stagecoach are private and are maintained by the subdivisions' HOAs.

Commissioner Benjamin asked about the FLUM. Mr. Goldich stated that the FLUM is one element of the SCP, which is an advisory document to be used by Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners as a guide. He reiterated that non-compliance with one element of the plan can be a reason for denial, but it does not require a denial. There are many policies in the planning documents, and it is the job of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners to interpret how those policies should be applied to an individual petition.

There was a discussion of the community engagement and participation in the development of the SCP.

In response to a request from Commissioner Jaeger, Mr. Goldich reviewed the map showing the vacant lots in Stagecoach that can currently be served with central water and sewer. He described the lot consolidation process through which smaller lots without central water and sewer can be combined into five-acre parcels to allow for individual wells and septic systems. Mr. Goldich also reviewed the Stagecoach vault agreement and discussed how the number of vaults allowed per subdivision was determined. Ms. Winser reviewed the current usage of vaults in neighborhoods that allow them. She also reviewed a map showing the location of the existing water and sewer lines.

Roundtable Discussion

Commissioner Benjamin noted that under the current zoning and approved plan, the developer could construct duplex units on the ridgeline. He offered that under the proposed plan, the duplex

units would be located nearer to the access road. He acknowledged that the proposed plan does not meet the aspect of the SCP that calls for no changes in zoning, but said that he likes that the current proposal is a compromise between the originally proposed higher density and the density allowed under the existing GR zoning. He stated his support for the allowing the petition to move forward to the next level of review.

Commissioner Kelly recognized the many volunteers and residents who had participated in the development of the SCP. He stated, however, that zone changes can always be requested. He noted that the neighbors are unanimously opposed to the zone change. Commissioner Kelly offered that if the Sketch Subdivision is approved, the County could consider reducing the maximum height of the structures as a condition of approval and that this would mitigate the potential visual impacts. Under the existing zoning and approved subdivision, there would be no such limitations on height. Commissioner Kelly stated that he likes the open space parcel and the lot layout included in the proposed plan. He stated that the location of the open space parcel would reduce the need for retaining walls. He also stated his support for the inclusion of trails. He stated that he is on the fence because, while he likes the proposal, the community is in opposition and the SCP states that the zoning should not be changed.

Commissioner DeFrancia stated his agreement with Commissioner Kelly's comments. He said that he feels the proposal does comply with the Master Plan and the SCP. He added that duplex units are certain to be more affordable than single family homes, and that there is a significant need for this type of housing. He stated that he is also on the fence regarding whether or not to vote to recommend approval.

Commissioner Jaeger stated that his concerns are the same as those he had at the first hearing. He cited Section 8.2.1.C of the Zoning Regulations and stated that he agrees with the points made by Mr. Lanterman. He stated that he does not think the advantages of the zone change outweigh the disadvantages, citing the large number of available lots served by central water and sewer in Stagecoach. Commissioner Jaeger acknowledged, however, that the petitioner is also a builder and intends to provide homes for sale and not only vacant lots. He stated that he is concerned with the community's comments. He stated that he remains opposed to recommending approval of the petition.

Commissioner Flint noted that the petitioner had purchased the property recently when the SCP was in place and including the statement that the zoning should not be changed. He stated that he could not support overruling the SCP or the community's feelings. He stated that he opposes the proposal for more than the eight units allowed under the current zoning and approved plan.

Commissioner Marshall agreed that this is a difficult decision. She noted that the Sketch Subdivision is a very high level review and does not include many details that could reduce the impacts on the neighbors, citing the landscape plan, the building heights and the location of the cul-de-sac. She advised the petitioner to meet with the surrounding neighbors to discuss the possibility of mitigation. Commissioner Marshall acknowledged the advisory nature of the SCP. She stated that it is in the public interest to increase the availability of housing, and added that she is not opposed to duplexes. She also noted that the petitioner had reduced the density from his original proposal from 22 units to 14 units. She stated that she would be in favor of allowing the petition to move forward.

Commissioner Norris stated his agreement with Commissioner Marshall. He offered that the proposal would create a good transition between some of the high density development in the area and the larger lot, very expensive lots that are also nearby. He stated that such development is appropriate for the area and that he would support moving the project forward.

Commissioner Miller agreed that this is a difficult case and that she is on the fence. She cited the need to respect the community and the SCP, and stated that the increase in density is a very important issue. She noted that the SCP does cite the need for infill development, which this is, in areas served by central water and sewer. Commissioner Miller said she would like the opportunity to evaluate a more detailed proposal, but remains undecided. She said that this revised proposal is much improved over the original, but added that there is no guarantee that the units would be attainable once they are built, so that should not be used as a reason to approve the petition.

Regarding the comment that the advantages of the zone change do not outweigh the disadvantages, Commissioner Benjamin offered that there is an advantage in eliminating the possibility of duplexes on the ridgeline. He also discussed the need for attainable housing in the County.

Commissioner Jaeger agreed that locating the duplexes lower on the hillside was an advantage, but it was not enough to outweigh the disadvantages. He stated that there was no need to increase the existing density.

Chairman Warnke stated that he would like to see the details of the proposal that would only be available at the next stage of review. He added that one advantage of this review process is that mitigations could be required that would enable the County to exert more control over what is constructed.

MOTION

Commissioner Norris moved to recommend approval of item PL-21-108, the Sketch Subdivision for the Landalet Subdivision Plan, with the following findings of fact:

1. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Stagecoach Community Plan, particularly:
 - 1) 5.2.2.B, C, and E
 - 2) 5.3.1.1.A
 - 3) 5.5.1.A, J, and H
 - 4) 5.4.1.B and E
 - 5) 5.6.1.A and B
2. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan, particularly:
 - 1) 3.3.C

- 2) 4.3.D
- 3) 6.3.H
- 4) 9.3.F
- 5) 11.3.F, G, J, O, and W

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

General Conditions:

1. This Sketch Subdivision Plan approval is contingent on submittal of a complete application for a Preliminary Subdivision Plan within twelve (12) months. Extension of up to one (1) year may be approved administratively.
2. All federal, state and local permits shall be obtained, including but not limited to: Grading And Excavating, Work in the Right of Way, and Access permits
3. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit an electronic copy of the approved plat to the County Planning Department in a format acceptable to the GIS Department.
4. All property taxes must be paid prior to the recording of the final plat.
5. If applicable, the right of way for County Road 16 shall be appropriately dedicated on the final plat.
6. The Preliminary Plan submittal shall include the following detailed information:
 - a. Utility plans produced by a registered Colorado Engineer per the 2016 Routt County Road & Bridge Roadway Standards (roads, water, sewer, fire hydrants, grading and drainage, utilities, etc.)
 - b. Soils report
 - c. Landscaping plan
 - d. All lot dimensions
 - e. Site plan for the condominiumization of Lots 1-4
 - f. Plan showing land to be dedicated as open space in conformance with Section 3.5.1 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - g. Site plan showing land to be dedicated for public sites or calculation of payment in lieu in conformance with Section 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 5.3.4 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - h. Engineered drainage study of the site per 2016 Routt County Road & Bridge Roadway Standards.
 - i. A traffic study performed by a registered Colorado Engineer based upon the number of approved lots. Comments shall be obtained from Routt County Public Works, prior to submittal of the Preliminary Plan.

- j. Road construction plans and specifications for the interior access road which meet the minimum requirements of the Oak Creek Fire Protection District, Routt County Public Works Director, and the Routt County Board of County Commissioners. Plans and specifications shall carefully consider minimizing cuts, fills and visual scarring.
 - k. Engineer drawings for connection to the central water and sewer system.
 - l. Draft Covenants
 - m. Wildlife Mitigation Plan approved by Colorado Parks and Wildlife.
 - n. Wildfire Mitigation Plan, if applicable
7. The Final Plat notes shall include, but are not limited to:
- a. Routt County is not responsible for maintaining or improving subdivision roads. The roads shown hereon have not been dedicated nor accepted by the County.
 - b. Existing and new accesses shall meet access standards set forth by the Routt County Public Works Department and Fire Prevention Services.
 - c. Routt County (County) and the Oak Creek Fire Protection District (District) shall be held harmless from any injury, damage, or claim that may be made against the County or the District by reason of the County's or the District's failure to provide ambulance, fire, rescue or police protection to the property described on this plat, provided that the failure to provide such services is due to inaccessibility of the property by reason of internal roads being impassable. This conditions shall not relieve the County or the District of their responsibility to make a bona fide effort to provide emergency services should the need arise.
 - d. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and opaquely shielded.
 - e. Address signage shall be in conformance with Routt County Road Addressing, Naming, and Signing Policy shall be located at the entrance to the driveway.
 - f. A current soils test showing that the soils are sufficiently stable to support development will be required before obtaining a building permit.
 - g. Revegetation of disturbed areas shall occur within one growing season with a seed mix that avoids the use of aggressive grassed. See the Colorado State University Extension Office for appropriate grass mixes.
 - h. All trails are open to the public.
8. A 'no build' zone shall be indicated on the plat to avoid construction of structures, septic fields and roads in areas including, but not limited to 30% or greater slopes. The "no build" zones shall be defined on the plat and approved by the Planning Director before the plat is recorded.
9. The open space parcels shall be deeded to the property owners' association and such deed shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Plat. The plat shall indicate that the Open Space parcel is open to the public.

10. The Final Plat shall show a 10' public utility easements along the interior of all lot lines and such shall be dedicated appropriately.
11. Covenants shall include:
 - a. Requirement to control noxious weeds
 - b. Roads will be privately maintained
 - c. No on street parking
 - d. All restrictions referenced in CPW's letter dated March 31, 2021

Commissioner Marshall seconded the motion.

Chairman Warnke called for a roll call vote.

The motion carried 8 - 1, with the Chair voting yes. Commissioner Flint voted in dissent.

Commissioner Flint stated that his opinion was stated in the Roundtable Discussion. He reiterated that the petitioner purchased the property knowing that the parcel was zoned GR and that the SCP stated that the zoning should not change. He added that the proposal is not in compliance with the SCP.

MOTION

Commissioner Norris moved to recommend approval of the Zone Change from GR to MDR for item PL-21-109, the Landalet Subdivision Plan, with the findings of fact that the proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan and Stagecoach Community Plan and is in compliance with the applicable provisions of Sections 4 and 8 of the Routt County Zoning Regulations.

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The change of zone from General Residential to High Density Residential and Medium Density Residential shall become effective upon signing of a resolution amending the Official Zoning Map by the Board of County Commissioners. Said resolution shall be recorded in the Routt County Clerk and Records Office concurrently with the final plat.
2. This approval is contingent upon gaining final approval for the subdivision of this land.
3. Minor changes that do not affect the allowable density of the project may be approved by the Planning Director, without notice, prior to the recording of the zone change resolution.

Commissioner Kelly seconded the motion.

Chairman Warnke called for a roll call vote.

The motion carried 7 – 2, with the Chair voting yes. Commissioners Flint and Jaeger voted in dissent.

Commissioner Flint stated that the zone change is not in compliance with the SCP. Commissioner Jaeger stated that the zone change is not in compliance with Zoning Regulation 8.2.1.C.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Ms. Winser reviewed the upcoming agendas. She said that Planning Commission would probably resume in-person meetings in July, depending on how the transition goes with the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Winser noted that she had sent the proposals submitted by potential consultants to assist with the Master Plan update to Planning Commission. She said that she would like to receive feedback on the proposals in advance of the selection committee meeting next Thursday. She said that she would like recommendations regarding the top two or three firms that should be invited for interviews. Ms. Winser discussed her impressions of the proposals and said that staff would also be weighing in with their recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.