

**MINUTES-REGULAR SESSION  
CITY OF GODDARD  
118 NORTH MAIN, GODDARD, KS  
June 14, 2021**

The Goddard Planning Commission met in regular session at Goddard City Hall on Monday June 14, 2021. Chair VanAmburg called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Chair VanAmburg led in the Pledge of Allegiance and Commissioner Cline led the Invocation.

**Commission members present were:**

Jamie Coyne, Doug VanAmburg, Doug Hall, Shane Grafing, Darrin Cline, Jody Crow

**Commissioners absent were:**

Justin Parks

Also present were: Micah Scoggan City Planner; Thatcher Moddie Assistant to the City Administrator; Don Folger of Folger & Associates

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Grafing* moved to approve the agenda. Commissioner *Cline* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**6-0**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Commissioner *Grafing* moved to approve the minutes from May 10, 2021. Commissioner *Hall* seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**6-0**

**CITIZEN COMMENTS**

None

*Chair VanAmburg* [closed the portion of citizens comments]

**BOARD OF ZONING**

None

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **G.1 Sign Regulation Amendment**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated that the sign regulations of the City of Goddard help to regulate the types and number of signs existing in the City limits. These regulations can be changed with the approval of the Planning Commission and of the Governing Body. On March 21, 2016, the Governing Body approved changing the sign regulations to include a stipulation that mandates all signs be brought up to the code by December 31, 2021 (Ordinance #783). This new code does not classify pole signs and it would require all commercial signs to be converted to monument signs by the end of the 2021 year. He further stated on May 10, 2021, the Planning Commission and the Governing Body discussed the sign regulations in detail. The City Planner created a draft amendment reflecting these comments which is being presented today.

He presented the changes to the regulations stating the green lettering would be the added text and the red lettering would be the text removed.

*Scoggan* mentioned some text that the City attorney wished to be added so it was made clear the city would not deny a permit based on freedom of speech rights.

*Scoggan* spoke on the portions of the sign regulations that would be changed per the conversation had on May 10<sup>th</sup> and asked if there were any questions.

*Chair VanAmburg* said he did not remember the added language for sign repair, but he liked it.

*Commissioner Crow* asked what did it mean sign repair?

*Scoggan* replied the existing sign being removed and another pole sign being erected. Minor repairs would be allowed. *Scoggan* said he could add more text to make it black and white for clarity.

*Commissioner Crow* if she saw that as a business it would seem she wouldn't be able to do minor repairs without having to tear down the pole sign and replace it.

*Scoggan* said it could be added.

*Scoggan* showed the text that qualified a monument sign and asked if it should be amended, and he showed an image of how a sign could not be a monument sign but would not be defined by the current regulations.

He asked would another sign definition be more acceptable to allow for that type of sign.

**Commissioner Cline** said he would be open to adding a new type of sign.

**Commissioner Coyne** said he would agree to keep them separate.

**Chair VanAmburg** said he felt like that it was just opening up a door. Even though that particular sign can be specifically spelled out it might allow for other types.

**Scoggan** replied that was true and mentioned that besides display width and base material width it had another qualifier with open space being little to none beneath the sign.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked what direction they want to go? The sign on display could easily conform to be a monument sign. If they leave the text the way it is any non-conforming signs would be grandfathered in and they would have to convert in time.

**Commissioner Crow** said the space requirement would be met by the sign on the display.

**Commissioner Coyne** said that is true but the fifty percent requirement for base material would not be met.

**Scoggan** said the options could be to leave the text as is and require those types of signs like the one on display to convert to the monument sign standard.

**Chair VanAmburg** said if that is the direction, they want to go in why should they deviate from that direction?

**Commissioner Grafing** asked do they want to strike the 50% or keep it?

**Commissioner Coyne** said it should be kept. Force people to move towards a monument looking sign.

**Commissioner Crow** said someone could ask for a variance.

**Scoggan** said yes article 7 which governs the sign regulations is open to variances.

**Chair VanAmburg** said since sign variances has come up, he believes the Planning Commission has approved to many variances on signs. He believed the businesses that were coming to Goddard would have showed up anyway regardless of the variance.

**Chair VanAmburg** said he did not think the outdoor power store would have lost some of their sponsors if they had not given them the variance.

**Commissioner Grafing** said he did not think the outdoor power store variance for them was bad. That one didn't bother him but he felt the ice cream store sign was off.

**Commissioner Coyne** said does anyone see anything wrong with leaving it as it is?

**Commissioner Grafing** said he did not.

**Scoggan** showed the Planning Commission the text for the general standards and stated they all stay the same except for subsection L. This section spoke on portable signs.

**Scoggan** mentioned this was administrative cleanup since the amortization period of portable signs was for 2005 but portable signs would still be considered not acceptable and prohibited.

**Commissioner Cline** asked about small help wanted signs.

**Scoggan** stated those were considered temporary signs and allowed as long as they did not stay in existence for longer than a couple of days at a time.

**Scoggan** also mentioned the marketing signs for residential developments would be exempt from the sign regulations since the Planning Commission had approved several variances for them as well.

**Commissioner Grafing** said he didn't have a problem with it but he would want to see a time period.

**Chair VanAmburg** said there would be one, once the last lot sold but what about commercial developments?

**Commissioner Grafing** said someone had to spray paint something on the sign to get the developer to remove the sign.

**Scoggan** said he had spoke with the developer about that sign. He mentioned it never stipulated when a sign would come down. The developer was using the sign to market another development in Goddard.

**Commissioner Crow** asked if that would be a phase or the whole development?

**Scoggan** replied once a sign was put up and the phase changes usually the face of the sign comes down and a new face goes up on the same sign. The sign usually markets the whole development from start to finish.

**Commissioner Cline** asked about the commercial building, shouldn't there be a time limit on that.

**Scoggan** replied the way the text reads it would be the CFO or certificate of occupancy. Once a building gets a CFO which means people can enter and occupy the building a temporary marketing sign must come down.

**Commissioner Hall** asked if that would apply to multi-tenant buildings.

**Scoggan** replied it would. Once a CFO is signed it applies to the whole building. He added perhaps the change should say the certificate of occupancy for the building instead of just the occupancy of the building.

**Commissioner Crow** agreed.

Commissioner Coyne asked if there should be a date or timeline?

**Scoggan** replied usually he would give them so time to set their own schedule because the developer would use a sub-contractor to do the work. He did not want to beat them over the head if the weather was unfavorable, but he did say the process has started to get it removed.

**Scoggan** further stated that if they do not comply, they begin to turn up the heat a little bit by restricting building permits. He stated they have ways of encouraging them to comply.

**Scoggan** stated that with the new zoning classifications being considered, it would make sense to add the sign regulations that work within those zoning districts now, so it does not have to be added later.

**Chair VanAmburg** asked about annexation and if a property would have to be annexed in between the properties desiring to be annexed and those that were not.

**Scoggan** replied that it was called an island annexation and it was possible technically but the county frowns on it and it becomes easier if the land in between the city and property desiring to be annexed was annexed at the same time.

**Commissioner Grafing** said he thinks it looks good. RUI should be loose since once it becomes denser they would come out of RUI anyway.

**Scoggan** said yes that was probably true.

*Commissioner Crow* said it is out in the county anyway.

*Scoggan* said that was true there is not a lot of reason to market out there unless they had a large distribution warehouse or something like that.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Hall* motioned to approve the changes to the sign regulations outlined in exhibit G.1a. with the added text as discussed during the meeting.

*Commissioner Grafing* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

## **G.2 Building Design Standards**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated that as the City grows more businesses are being attracted to the residential boom that is being experienced as they see new potential clients in a burgeoning market. All new commercial buildings typically require a site plan which outlines what the architectural style of the building is as well as the building material. As construction costs increase some property owners are desiring to build rolled metal buildings on commercial lots for the principal building or for an accessory building. Design restrictions do not restrict these types of structures and some new buildings have been allowed to be built with rolled metal. They do however require metal facing to be clad with something else like stucco, stone, brick but the building frame is allowed to be rolled metal.

On May 10, 2021, the Planning Commission and the Governing Body discussed the design standards in detail. The City Planner created a draft amendment reflecting these comments which is being presented today.

*Scoggan* further stated that the current regulations are found in Article 11 108.4.C which dictate that metal structures either for storage use or business usage of a square footage greater than 200 square feet shall not have sides faced with metal cladding. Facing materials for these structures shall be stone, brick, stucco or other approved materials.

He further stated that the applicability of these regulations seems to be for just principal buildings. All private and public principal land uses shall submit site plans and other required drawings for approval by the Planning Commission except single-family and duplexes, unless the latter are arranged in courtyard or grouped settings.

He stated that the building design standards have been amended in the form of a draft that is attached below in Exhibit G.2a. with green lettering showing the text to be included and the red lettering with a strike through shows the text to be removed.

*Scoggan* showed some slides illustrating the ideas that were expressed in the previous meeting of

the Planning Commission and the City Council on May 10<sup>th</sup>.

*Scoggan* elaborated on the idea behind significantly exposed and what qualified.

*Scoggan* went on to explain how empty lots were considered future development and would be required to face the rolled metal when they are built.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Grafing* motioned to approve the changes to the design guideline regulations outlined in exhibit G.2a. with the added text as discussed during the meeting.

*Commissioner Coyne* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

### **G.3 Zoning amendment C-2 “General Business District”**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated that a commercial zoning with a residential component is typically referred to as mixed use. It is a structure that hosts both commercial and residential uses and is often seen as commercial on the first floor and residential above. This type of land use is becoming more prominent across the nation for development. It is a positive trend for development as it introduces more density for potential commercial customers in a smaller area as well as increasing commercial property value.

Currently the only zoning that will allow for this is the Central Business District (C-1) which is only a couple of blocks from Santa Fe to 3rd St. Amending the General Business District (C-2) to allow for residential and mixed-use types would open this zoning classification up to host more residential rental properties on commercial lots.

On May 10, 2021, the Planning Commission and the Governing Body discussed the idea of Commercial mixed use in detail. The City Planner created a draft amendment reflecting these comments which is being presented today.

*Scoggan* stated that the current regulations are found in Article 4: Zoning Districts For the C-1 Central Business District He mentioned that in the regulations under article 104.A.3 dwelling units which were constructed in conjunction with and above the first floor of business establishments were allowed. He went on to say in the C-2 General Business District under article 105.F.1 1 it stated that no building shall be used for residential purposes except an existing residence which is a legal, nonconforming use.

*Scoggan* went on to say that the C-2 “General Business District” regulations have been amended in the form of a draft that is attached below in Exhibit G.3a. He mentioned that Green lettering shows the text included and Red lettering with a strike through shows the text to be removed.

*Scoggan* explained why he added childcare facilities as it had come up several times and even

though he considered personal services to include child care facilities he felt this would help remove any doubt.

He further stated they had removed the no residential requirement and outlined what types of residential should be prohibited.

**Commissioner Crow** asked where duplexes and triplexes fell into the uses, if it was allowable or prohibited.

**Scoggan** replied it could be written to say no at grade duplexes or triplexes.

**Commissioner Crow** said that would be more acceptable said it says no single family detached units. She wanted to make sure it was accounted for somewhere.

**Commissioner Coyne** said if there were no detached housing it would be done.

**Scoggan** replied it could be written to say no units at grade. He asked if it was built in tandem with a commercial structure would that be considered acceptable?

**Commissioner Coyne** said he did not think it would be a problem because it was commercial zoned and it would require a site plan and anything that did not conform could be denied.

**Chair VanAmburg** said he did not think so because it was like the Chiropractors office with the house next to it that was suppose to be torn down upon completion of the Chiropractors office.

**Commissioner Crow** asked what was the meaning of use limitation?

**Scoggan** explained it was like additional parameters for that zoning classification.

**Commissioner Coyne** said he believes the whole point was not to create confusion.

**Scoggan** agreed and said if someone wanted to deviate from a commercial lot to dramatically by only building duplexes, they would have to take it to the Planning Commission for a rezoning.

**Chair VanAmburg** said if it is not too confusing than it should be added.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked if it was necessary? Would there be confusion? Would someone want to build duplexes in a commercial zoned lot?

**Scoggan** replied he didn't think it would be confusing but market forces do push on cities and if

duplexes were the best land use in terms of return for developers you could see some asking for that.

**Commissioner Grafing** said it should be no duplexes at grade without rezoning.

**Commissioner Crow** asked why would the duplexes or single-family housing need to be singled out for exclusion?

**Scoggan** explained sometimes certain markets have more prominence for example residential housing and there is a legal opinion circulating about a right to build. It essentially says if as a developer you make it through the subdivision regulations shouldn't you be able to build what you want? What would be the reasoning to be denied if something conforms or it doesn't not explicitly say you cannot. This removes that argument.

**Chair VanAmburg** said that it shuts the door.

**Commissioner Coyne** said and wouldn't the City Council have to approve the amended regulation as well?

**Scoggan** said yes.

**Commissioner Coyne** said it should be added.

**Commissioner Crow** asked about other mutli-family units.

**Scoggan** replied it could say no multi-family at grade with the exception of condos and apartments.

**Commissioner Cline** asked about parking requirements.

**Scoggan** replied the C-2 general business district requires onsite parking which would be covered in the site plan.

**Commissioner Crow** asked about the difference between condos and apartment complex versus duplexes, tri-plex and the like.

**Scoggan** replied it has to do with ownership or renting and horizontal development and vertical development.

**MOTION: Commissioner Coyne** motioned to approve the changes to the zoning classification

C-2 outlined in exhibit G.3a. with the added text as discussed during the meeting.

**Commissioner Grafing** seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

#### **G.4 Zoning addition R-4 “High Density Residential”**

**Scoggan** introduced the subject. He stated that zoning classifications were adopted as a regulatory control over land development. As market trends change zoning classifications should change as well to maximize land value and property taxes without compromising health, safety and welfare. With residential housing considered a national issue and demand for rental properties increasing within the City limits of Goddard, this new zoning classification allows for a streamlined entitlement process with revised bulk regulations for creativity in design and density. These new zoning classifications need to be approved first by the Planning Commission and finally by the Governing Body. Once approved by the Governing Body they will become official 30 days after publication in the City newspaper.

He stated that on May 10, 2021, the Planning Commission and the Governing Body discussed the idea of R-4 “High Density Residential” in detail. The City Planner created a draft ordinance reflecting these comments which is being presented today.

**Scoggan** further stated that the current regulations are found in Article 4: Zoning Districts And that this new zoning classification allowed for higher density. He stated that it allowed for land uses of single family and all types of residential structures. It also increase potential higher valuation properties to capture greater property taxes as well as streamlined the entitlement process for multi-family developments while maintaining oversight over the new developments. Increase marketable land value for individual property owners. He stated that the R-4 “High Density Residential” zoning classification has been included in the form of a draft that is attached below in Exhibit G.4a.

**Commissioner Crow** asked about uses and restriction in the R-4 versus a commercial district. Why was childcare not included?

**Scoggan** replied it was more of a commercial use than a residential use.

**Commissioner Crow** replied that there were other commercial uses included in the R-4 why couldn't childcare be included?

**Scoggan** replied he could include it if they wanted to see it. Typically, the other uses had a smaller footprint but there was a catch all if someone wanted to introduce something that was not specifically mentioned.

**Commissioner Crow** said other zoning classifications had allowable and not allowable uses.

**Scoggan** said that was correct, but they had found out that over time market forces keep pushing on the city and these uses were either too restrictive or they could be more fluid to allow those changes to occur more naturally over time.

**Scoggan** said he could add “such as” to the text for conditional uses to make it more open to other low intensity uses.

**Chair VanAmburg** said he thought it would be helpful and there is still a catch all at the bottom.

**Scoggan** mentioned he left the lot size unrestricted to help with non-conforming lots in the event of a natural disaster. Some of the older lots and non-conforming due to their size and if there was a natural disaster those houses that were destroyed could not be rebuilt. It would also help mitigate existing non-conforming lots if there were any additions being proposed.

**Commissioner Crow** said that was certainly hypothetical but not improbable.

**Scoggan** also added that there was no lot coverage so that buildings could occupy more of the lot and it had the potential to reduce the amount of code compliance issues visible to the public.

**Commissioner Crow** asked about the height for that zoning classification. She asked what would happen if someone wanted to build something that was three stories next to a single family detached house.

**Scoggan** said that was a good question. It would be allowed and the real question would be is the city going to go vertical to maximize the land or will the city keep going horizontal. For the City it is more economical to go vertical because the cost is borne by the developer more than by the city. He did say it creates an awkward question for the neighbor.

**Scoggan** mentioned that LA required a shadow sight plan and, in the future, maybe the city would require it too.

**Commissioner Crow** said that the three plex on 2<sup>nd</sup> street was originally two stories and it got reduced down to one because of the civilian outcry over it. She asked if there could be anything in there that restricted its height based on the surrounding area.

**Commissioner Coyne** said there will be a site plan so it would be up to the planning Commission to determine. He mentioned it sounds tall but it is almost the height of his chimney chase on his home.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Grafing* motioned to approve the inclusion of the zoning addition R-4 “High Density Residential” outlined in exhibit G.4a with the added text as discussed during the meeting.

*Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

### **G.5 Zoning addition RUI “Rural Urban Intent”**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated as the City grows, it opens an opportunity for the boundaries of the city to be expanded and annexation to occur. When this happens certain properties that have existed as stock yards, horse stables, or other county related uses become non-conforming when they are annexed. These land uses have no definition under our current zoning and would be either non-conforming or would require a Conditional Use Permit for certain properties as they are brought onboard. To prevent this, a less stringent and more county friendly zoning classification would be introduced to alleviate the necessity for wrestling with these land uses and code violations when the property owner agrees to annex.

He went on to say that on May 10, 2021, the Planning Commission and the Governing Body discussed the idea of RUI “Rural Urban Intent” in detail. The City Planner created a draft ordinance reflecting these comments which was being presented today.

He further stated the current regulations are found in Article 4: Zoning Districts

And the new zoning classification would be called RUI “Rural Urban Intent”

He said it recognizes the property is rural and cannot be immediately serviced by the city with water/sewer ect, but the intent is to bring it online with City services in the future.

The new zoning classification would allow properties to exist “as is” with no code compliance or land use issues and it would allow city to define its growth area with annexation and grow efficiently without feeling the need to compete with other municipalities. He further stated that Wichita currently has a Rural Residential zoning classification which could be emulated.

*Scoggan* mentioned the horse stables at 183<sup>rd</sup> and Maple.

*Scoggan* mentioned he tried to include anything in the acceptable use category that would be seen out in the county typically.

He further mentioned he would have to introduce an amendment to article 2 of the subdivision regulations to add new definitions of certain land use types.

**Commissioner Cline** mentioned Boat and RV storage was not on there.

**Scoggan** said it would be included under C-2 General Business District amendment. The question would be do they want it under RUI to remove any Conditional Use Permits in the county.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked about the boat and RV storage on maple in the county. Couldn't they go through rezoning to get it to the acceptable zoning for that land use?

**Scoggan** replied yes, he could if the Planning Commission accepted that rezoning.

**Scoggan** also said he was not sure about the legality of the Wichita Planning Department approving the CUP and how that would work if the city annexed the land. Since it was a legal question **Scoggan** stated he could not answer it. If it was added under RUI it would be allowed and it would be covered under that zoning.

**Commissioner Grafing** said he thought it was a good idea. He stated he felt the guy who asked for the CUP spent enough money already and there was no point reviewing it again in a year.

**Scoggan** said he would add it.

Scoggan mentioned that he added the height as 45 feet but there could be instances of where it would be higher.

**Commissioner Coyne** asked about the metal building in the county on the east side of 167<sup>th</sup>.

**Scoggan** said he was not familiar with that building. He asked if RUI should have a higher limit for buildings.

**Commissioner Crow** said they did not necessarily need a limit.

**Scoggan** agreed and said he was playing it by ear based on the preference of the Planning Commission and the City Council.

**Commissioner Coyne** said would the only purpose of this zoning classification be for annexation? Or would people approach the Planning Commission to ask for a rezoning to RUI to get a more relaxed zoning classification.

*Scoggan* said it would be for the first purpose and not the later though there could always be instances of where someone might want to rezone to RUI and there was a legitimate reason.

*Commissioner Crow* asked if it was spelled out in the zoning classification.

*Scoggan* said no because that was the purpose of the Board of Zoning Adjustment which falls under the Planning Commission.

*Commissioner Coyne* said that makes sense and the planning Commission would not want to cut themselves short if there could be a rezoning for an RUI from another zoning classification.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Coyne* motioned to approve the inclusion of the zoning classification RUI “Rural Urban Intent” outlined in exhibit G.5a with any comments as discussed during the meeting.

*Commissioner Hall* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **H.1 Site plan Arbor Creek Club House**

*Scoggan* introduced the subject. He stated that Folger and Associates has submitted a site plan application for the Arbor Creek Club House on behalf of the developer Marvin Schellenberg. A club house is considered a commercial building and each commercial building is required to have a site plan. This club house is part of the Arbor Creek development at the intersection of 183rd and 23rd.

He further stated that there are two buildings on this site and a pool, and they will have to have MABCD review and approve their civil drawings before we will issue a building permit after approval by the Planning Commission.

*Scoggan* showed some concept illustrations.

*Commissioner Crow* said it had a southwest look.

*Commissioner Grafing* said they did something similar in the Talia development.

*Commissioner Coyne* asked if the face needs to be something other than metal because it had the appearance of metal clad.

*Scoggan* said he brought that up himself as well but it turns out it is not metal it is board and batt

siding.

*Don Folger* said the walls are not metal they are board and batt they have not picked exactly how they are going to do that. The roof is metal, and they call it California Style. It is supposed to be fairly upscale with a pickle ball court.

*Don Folger* said there will be rolling glass doors.

*Commissioner Grafing* said it will be a nice addition.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Hall* motioned to approve the site plan for the Arbor Creek Club House.

*Commissioner Grafing* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

## **CITY PLANNER REPORT**

### **I.1 Platting of Tanganvika land**

*Scoggan* stated that Phil Meyer of Baughman has stated that they are in the process of getting the land platted that was swapped with the city for Jim & Matt Fouts. They anticipate having this before the Planning Commission in the next couple of months. It will need to be a preliminary and final plat with the Planning Commission approving the preliminary and the final and the Governing Body approving the final.

### **I.2 Platting of Aaron Snook land**

*Scoggan* stated that Phil Meyer of Baughman has stated that they are in the process of getting the land platted that is owned by Aaron Snook. The land is already platted but it needs to go through re-platting due to the nature of the new developments being proposed. It will need to be a preliminary and final plat with the Planning Commission approving the preliminary and the final and the Governing Body approving the final.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked if Aaron Snook was trying to swap those two pieces of land with the KDOT?

*Scoggan* replied he had not heard anything yet, but they would have to wait and see. It was possible since if the ROW cut through the Northeast portion, it would make sense for it to cut through the Northwest portion as well.

*Chair VanAmburg* asked how far away the 54/400 elevation extension was?

*Scoggan* said it is anyone's guess. It is a half-billion-dollar project. *Scoggan* said the R-Cut is

going through.

*Chair VanAmburg* said when would the frontage road be extended?

*Scoggan* said he was not sure. There has not been any talk on that at the moment and a portion of the frontage road is private.

### **I.3 Administrative clean up**

*Scoggan* stated that some of the new zoning classifications have new terminology used for land use types that will need to be added to Article 2 which is where you would find definitions of those types. This will require an amendment to Article 2 which will need to be published in the City newspaper allowing 20 days to elapse before consideration before the Planning Commission.

### **I.4 CUP Boat and RV storage at 19721 6th St**

Scoggan stated that Chair VanAmburg asked for him to find out the conclusion of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for boat and RV storage that was considered by the Planning Commission on April 12, 2021.

The Board of County Commissioners considered the item on June 2, 2021. It was voted on with 4 in favor of and 1 against. He further stated that Commissioner Jim Howell of District 5 voted no. A super majority was required which would require 4 or more of the Commissioners to approve the CUP. The opposition of the CUP did speak at the June 2 meeting of the BOCC and presented their case. This item passed and will be allowed to operate as a Boat and RV storage in the county for a ten-year period.

**PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

*Chair VanAmburg* said there was a lot of material covered on May 10<sup>th</sup>.

*Scoggan* agreed and said it was important that was presented and what was discussed and finally was being written down and expressed accurately for the subdivision regulations.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Crow* motioned to adjourn the meeting. *Commissioner Cline* seconded the motion.

Motion carried **6-0**

*Meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm.*

*Micah Scoggan, City Planner*