

**Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting  
County Administrative Offices, Duchesne, Utah  
February 6, 2008 - 5:00 p.m.**

**In Attendance were:**

Chris Peatross, Planning Commission Chairman  
Leon Sweat, Planning Commission  
John Jorgensen, Planning Commission  
Dean Burton, Planning Commission  
Shelly Fabrizio, Planning Commission  
Kent Olsen, Planning Commission  
Randy Mair, Planning Commission  
Mike Hyde, Community Development Administrator  
Laraine Dickinson, Planning Secretary

**Visitors:**

Roger Brockbank  
Ryan Brockbank  
Lanny W. Ross  
Gregg Harmston  
Craig Zimmerman  
Kellee Grant  
Carolyn Moon  
Jerry Allred  
Ryan Allred  
Roger & Belinda Mitchell  
John Swasey

**Agenda Item**

Titan Development C.U.P.  
  
Rezone  
  
Amendment Subdivision Text

Chairman Peatross opened the meeting at 5:00 PM.

Chairman Peatross welcomed John Jorgensen to the Planning Commission replacing Dean Brough.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. Request by Titan Development, for a Conditional Use Permit to construct an office building at 2813 W 2600 South (Lot 88) and an office building with warehouse at 2793 W 2600 South (Lots 86 and 87) within**

**the Vonsville Subdivision, Section 31, Township 2 South, Range 1 West  
in the Roosevelt area.**

Mr. Hyde stated that the proposed site is one block south of Highway 40 west of Roosevelt. Lands immediately to the northwest (near Highway 40) are used for business purposes (National Oilwell, Stanco Insulation, J&R Construction, old Pepsi Warehouse, etc...) while lands immediately to the northeast, east and south are residential.

Mr. Hyde stated that the proposal is for Lots 86-88 of the Vonsville Subdivision for a commercial development consisting of two office buildings and one warehouse.

Mr. Hyde stated that the commercial zone in this area runs parallel to Highway 40 and the subject three lots are bisected by a zoning district boundary with roughly the southern 2/3rds of the lots being with the R-1 residential zone and the northerly 1/3 being within the Commercial zone. Since the majority of the property is in the R-1 zone, a Conditional Use Permit is required for the proposed commercial development.

Mr. Hyde stated that the criteria for a Conditional Use Permit are:

A. The proposed use and location are not detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare.

Mr. Hyde stated that the proposed location is one block south of Highway 40 on the edge of a heavy commercial/light industrial strip west of Roosevelt. Lands immediately to the northwest are used for business purposes, while lands immediately to the northeast, east and south are residential. The Tri-County Health Department wastewater permit process would ensure that public health is protected. Also if sight-obscuring fencing is required around the west, south and east sides of the property, that would help buffer the facility from view of residential lots.

Mr. Hyde stated that the county has been encouraged by some of the irrigation companies like Moon Lake Water Users Association to make property owners and developers aware that their land is within an area that would be impacted by a sudden breach or a large release of water from an upstream water reservoir. Such is the case here, with the Big Sandwash Reservoir located upstream.

B. The proposed use would be in compliance with the goals and policies of the Duchesne County General Plan.

Mr. Hyde stated that if the applicant meets the Conditional Use permit criteria, the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance would also be met.

The general plan states that future growth and development decision should be made with sensitivity to rural residential/agricultural interests but the plan also wishes to encourage business activity. In light of these plan policies, the Conditional Use request

should be approved to support the creation of new business sites, knowing that conditions of approval would be imposed to protect rural residential interests in the area.

C. The property is not detrimental to adjoining and surrounding properties.

Mr. Hyde stated that the adjoining property to the east is a vacant lot on the corner and the property owners hearing of this proposal were interested in selling that lot to the developers. The property to the southeast has an existing home on the property and there are residential properties to the northeast, which are close to this proposed site.

Mr. Hyde stated that the three lots under consideration total 2.49 acres of land which is large enough to support the office and warehouse buildings, parking, loading/unloading and storage yard/drain field areas needed for potential businesses to function in a manner causing minimal impact to surrounding properties.

Other specific standards in obtaining a Conditional Use Permit may include these conditions:

A. That the site be suitably landscaped and maintained and that the design, setbacks, fences, walls and buffers are adequate.

Mr. Hyde stated that the developer is proposing xeriscape landscaping along the frontage on 2600 South and along a portion of the building perimeters. Xeriscape is a desired landscaping type in that it relies on non-water consumptive materials to provide beautification.

Mr. Hyde stated that the setbacks of proposed buildings are acceptable; however, since the proposed office and warehouse on Lots 86 and 87 straddle the property line, the applicant would need to record a deed restriction that would ensure that lots 86 and 87 couldn't be sold separately. Also the applicants have proposed a six-foot tall chain link fence around the west, south and east sides of the property. This fencing would need to have sight-obscuring inserts to provide the buffering necessary between the proposed commercial and existing residential uses.

B. Provisions of parking facilities, including ingress and egress and unloading/ loading areas.

Mr. Hyde stated that the site plan shows parking areas on the north side of the proposed buildings and loading/unloading areas on the south side. Ingress and egress are available at three locations along 2600 South however, if the applicant should ever sell the westerly lot separate from the easterly two lots, it would be necessary to provide easements so the center access drive would be used by both ownerships.

Mr. Hyde stated that the applicants indicated that the parking lot would be gravel over road base. This is acceptable for most of the lot; however, the building code requires

handicapped parking spaces shown would need to be on a hard surface such as asphalt or concrete. It is not mandatory that the parking lot be paved by the county code but the county recommends that the entire parking lot area be paved; leaving the areas behind the buildings graveled.

C. Adequate streets, water supply, sewage disposal and fire protection.

Mr. Hyde stated that there is adequate access from 2800 West off of Highway 40 however, 2600 South would need to be improved to a standard approved by the County Public Works Director from the edge of the existing road surface to the north property line/landscaping strip.

Mr. Hyde stated that Johnson Water District has verified culinary water but the nearest fire hydrant is located at the intersection of 2500 South and Highway 40 by WE Machine where Johnson Water has a 12-inch line. Mr. Hyde stated that the fire hydrant is 820 feet away and does not comply with the Fire Code, which is 500 feet away. Mr. Hyde stated that the existing water line is a 4-inch line and that is not large enough to handle a fire hydrant and so the water line would need to be upgraded to an 8-inch line or a fire sprinkler system would need to be installed and approved by the Duchesne County Fire and Emergency Management Director.

Sewage disposal would need to be approved by Tri-County Health Department prior to the issuance of a building permit. Roosevelt city sewer is not available.

D. Regulation of signs.

Mr. Hyde stated that the buildings have not been spoken for and so it is unknown what types of businesses would be using the buildings at this time. If the businesses wish to place a sign along Highway 40 they would need a permit from UDOT Region 3 office. If the businesses wish to install pole signs on site they would need a permit from the Duchesne County Building Department. Wall signs would be limited to the north-facing walls and no roof signs would be permitted due to the residential nature of the surrounding area.

E. Nuisance factors.

Mr. Hyde stated that without knowing what kinds of businesses would be using the facilities it is hard to predict what types of nuisances would be generated. So, it would be up to the residents to inform the Planning Commission of any problems that may occur and the county nuisance ordinance would then be enforced.

F. Operating hours

Mr. Hyde stated that without knowing what type of business it is hard to specify what the operating hours will be but the nuisance ordinance prohibits noise loud enough to disturb neighboring residents between 9:30 PM and 7:00 AM.

Mr. Hyde stated those were the findings for approval but that I also prepared findings for denial in the case that there are a number of surrounding property owners that are opposed to this.

Chairman Peatross asked if the applicant had anything to add or comment on.

Roger Brockbank (applicant) stated that one problem that there seems to be is the paved area between the buildings and right now blacktop is \$250 a square foot and we are assuming there would be a lot of heavy equipment, which would come with some type of oil field business. In this case there would be no need to pave the entire parking area. Mr. Brockbank stated that they would put in paving for the handicap parking.

Mr. Brockbank stated that with the approval of the Conditional Use permit that they are willing to put in the fire hydrant with the extended 8-inch line.

Chairman Peatross asked if the Planning Commission had any questions then we will turn the time over to any visitors that had any comments.

Commissioner Burton asked what types of buildings these would be and if there was going to be any type of outside lighting. Mr. Brockbank stated that they have built other buildings of this type in other parts of the county and that there would be lighting in the rear yard and there could be some affect to the residents to the south but with the type of fencing that would be installed there should not be a big impact to surrounding neighbors. Mr. Hyde suggested that the developer use a cut off fixture to make the lighting go downward and not outwards as much.

Mr. Hyde asked what the height of the buildings would be. Mr. Brockbank stated that the warehouse would be 16 to 18 foot with a pitched roof and the office would be 10 to 12 foot with a pitched roof.

Greg Harmston stated that he owns property on two sides of this proposed site. This area has not built up as quick as other parts of the county but the residential lots are starting to go now in this area. Also isn't there enough commercial land in the county so, that they do not have to build in a residential area and if this proposed site is going to be oil field related the working hours are 24/7 and it is noisy and dirty.

Mr. Harmston stated that with lighting they say they would install lighting that would not show in neighboring windows but when trucks need to be repaired, then lights would be shining in your window.

Mr. Harmston stated that he is opposed to this going in as his son lives in the existing home to the southeast and he said that in the future he is planning on developing the other residential property near this site.

Mr. Hyde stated that he could summarize the findings for denial on this proposed

application. Commissioner Sweat stated that where this is an application for a Conditional Use permit all of the criteria would need to be met and if they were not then the Conditional Use permit could be revoked.

Commissioner Jorgensen stated that he could see Mr. Harmston's concerns about the open area where there could be parking of trucks or equipment and a chain link fence probably would not be sufficient. Maybe a solid fence 7 feet high needs to be considered. Chairman Peatross stated that if it is related to the oil field then there are idling semi-trucks at all times of the day and night and there is this type of business adjacent to this but this would be pushing this type of business further into the residential area.

Commissioner Mair stated that this would have an impact with the existing home even if it is only going to be used as a storage yard.

Commissioner Olsen asked if the findings for denial could be summarized for us. Mr. Hyde stated that the only difference in the findings as to public health, safety or general welfare, it states "public health, safety and general welfare of neighborhood residents would be better served if 2600 South serves as the boundary between Commercial and Residential development".

Mr. Hyde stated in regards to the General Plan, the general plan states that future growth and development decisions should be made with sensitivity to rural residential/agricultural interests. Added to this it states that "in light of these plan policies, the Conditional Use request should be denied to protect rural residential interests in the area".

Mr. Hyde stated in regards to property size. The findings state that, "due to uncertain nature of the uses that would occupy the property, this proposal could be materially detrimental to surrounding residential property owners".

Mr. Hyde stated that in regards to fencing it states that "even if this fencing has sight-obscuring inserts, it would not provide the buffering necessary between the proposed commercial and existing residential uses".

Mr. Hyde stated in regards to noise, even though there is a nuisance ordinance prohibiting noise between 9:30 PM and 7:00 AM, "due to the proximity of this site to existing residents, approval of the permit would likely result in nuisance problems in the future".

Mr. Hyde stated that whatever decision is made by the Planning Commission it could be appealed to the County Commission within ten days.

Commissioner Sweat asked Mr. Hyde what the potential growth rate in this area was? Mr. Hyde indicated that there has been an increase in manufactured homes in this area within the last couple of years. Custom Homes of Ballard purchased several of the lots

and put in homes on those lots.

Commissioner Mair stated that there are pros and cons to this as having the water line brought in and a fire hydrant but it would also make Mr. Harmston's property a buffer zone.

Commissioner Fabrizio stated that it would bring more benefits to the area rather than distract from the area. The harm that could be created to the Harmston's would be minimal and if there were problems complaints could be presented and the Conditional Use permit could be revoked. Commissioner Fabrizio stated that the benefits would outweigh what would be the downside.

Commissioner Jorgensen stated that if we knew exactly what type of business would be coming in it would be easier to make a better judgment but the unknowing makes me lean toward denial of the application for a Conditional Use permit. Some discussion was made and it was in agreement that lower impact commercial use would be fine but that higher impact industrial use would be encroaching on the residential area.

Commissioner Jorgensen motioned to adopt the findings to deny this request for the reasons discussed.

Commissioner Mair seconded that motion with a vote of 5-2. Commissioners Sweat and Fabrizio voting against.

**B. Recommendation to the County Commissioners regarding a proposed rezoning of lands immediately north of the Duchesne City limits, between the Duchesne County Jail and Highway 87 from Industrial to R-1, located in the NE ¼ of Section 36, Township 3 South, Range 5 West.**

Mr. Hyde stated that Kirk and Kellee Grant are wanting to build a home on this property however dwelling units are not allowed in an Industrial zone (with the exception of a caretaker dwelling associated with a permitted commercial or industrial use). But rather than consider the rezoning of just one property, letters were sent to surrounding property owners, which asked what their preference was. The results of that survey indicated that Jerry Allred, Roger Mitchell, UDOT, Duchesne County Jail, Calvin Carmen and Randy Tomaiko stay Industrial with the property owned by Moon Livestock, Kirk Grant, Matt Mitchell and the Catholic Church be changed to residential. Mr. Hyde stated that there would be several different ways to handle this and that would be to go with property owner preference or use the road as a buffer and those properties to the north stay with industrial zoning and those properties to the south change to residential. Jerry Allred requested that his property stay industrial because one day he would like to move his business and Roger Mitchell did not want to have problems with his farm animals. Mr. Hyde stated that there was also a third alternative and that would be to rezone as commercial and that way the Grant's would still be able to build their home.

Mr. Hyde stated that two staff reports have been prepared to show the findings for a residential zone and the findings for a commercial zone.

Commissioner Mair asked if Matt Mitchell's property was residential? Mr. Hyde stated that Matt Mitchell's property is in the Industrial zone but has received a permit to have a home there because it has been interpreted as a caretaker/manager dwelling but in the survey that was taken he indicated that he would prefer it to be residential/agricultural.

Mr. Hyde stated that the laws have changed and so now there is no minimum lot size for a zone change where in the past spot zoning was an issue.

Chairman Peatross asked those that wanted to comment to do so one at a time.

Kellee Grant stated that their preference would be to have it changed to residential land, as it is easier to get a mortgage as compared to commercial land. Mrs. Grant stated the she would like all options made available so that it would make the path a little easier for them to build a home there.

Jerry Allred stated that if the property that he owns stays industrial or even if it were to change to commercial that would be fine but does not want his changed to residential.

Roger Mitchell stated that he does not have a problem with the Grant's building a home in the area but would prefer to have his property left in the industrial zone.

Chairman Peatross stated that in reference to the maps that the proposed residential zone would not an island by itself because it borders Duchesne City limits to the south and so it would all tie in. Mr. Hyde stated that in the beginning rather than do a rezone the Grant's asked about annexing into Duchesne City but at this time there is currently a moratorium until they update their General Plan.

Chairman Peatross stated to do the residential zone but to leave Mr. Allred and Mr. Mitchell's properties in the industrial zone as they have requested. There was some discussion in regards to Matt Mitchell's property and whether to leave it in an industrial zone or to change it residential now that he has built a home on it. Belinda Mitchell stated that on behalf of Matt Mitchell (son) he now has a new business and does on occasion park water trucks on his property and with him being unable to attend tonight his thoughts may have changed and would like to remain in an industrial zone.

Commissioner Mair motioned that the Planning Commission adopt the findings and conclusions herein and recommend approval of this rezone by the County from Industrial to Residential, as depicted on Exhibit A of the rezone ordinance, leaving Matt Mitchell, Roger Mitchell and Jerry Allred properties in the Industrial zone.

Commissioner Sweat seconded that motion and it passed unanimously.

### **C. Recommendation to the County Commissioners regarding proposed**



**amendments to the Subdivision Ordinance regarding Minor Subdivisions, Flood Hazards, Lot Width to Depth Ratio and Subdivision Improvement Guarantees.**

Mr. Hyde stated that these are some changes that are being recommended based on some issues that have risen over the last year or so.

A. Minor Subdivision.

Mr. Hyde stated that State Law allows 10 or fewer parcels, right now the county ordinance states 9 or fewer parcels.

Mr. Hyde stated that on line 5 of the minor subdivision it states that there needs to be a proposed water source. There was an instance where the water district stated there was a proposed water source within a quarter mile but that the applicant had no intention of extended that water line to his property. So there in the wording the words "both" and "proposed" would be taken out. Also on that line it calls for an electrical power source and we are recommending taking that out as some people use generators..

Mr. Hyde stated that on line 6 it stated one division could be made per year and the wording states the division is not part of a phased development, which is misleading.

In the past there have been a couple of instances where someone has wanted to do one commercial lot and one industrial lot and right now the way it is worded you cannot do that and so it does not seem necessary to run through the complete subdivision process for one lot.

And in line 8 the County Recorder's Office is requiring an electronic copy of the map at or before the time of recording.

Mr. Hyde stated that in the next section a minor subdivision required a public hearing and I would schedule those meetings and in most cases no one would show up. Now, we send a notice to property owners within 300 feet of the land being subdivided at least three days in advance of the administrative decision date and if anyone wants to request a public hearing they may do so. Then if they want to appeal my decision, they may do so and then it would go before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hyde referred to page 3 of the ordinance the new wording under item "V" stems from the Moon Lake Water Users Association concerns from a study they had received regarding what would happen in the event the enlarged Big Sand Wash Reservoir were to fail. Mr. Hyde stated that MLWUA requested that the county make property owners, subdividers and purchasers aware of this potential hazard by placing notations on the subdivision plat. This would not only affect the Big Sand Wash but also the Upper Stillwater, Starvation and Soldier Creek in the case of a breach or a major release of water. Chairman Peatross asked Mr. Hyde wasn't the State requiring that these areas

maps supposedly by a certain date? Mr. Hyde stated that he wasn't sure but that the Bureau of Reclamation prepared the maps he had. The purpose of this is to put subdividers or people buying in these areas on notice that there could be a possibility of flooding in these areas. Chairman Peatross stated that if this were to show up on a title report showing that this was in a flood plain then the lender would probably require that you get flood insurance. Mr. Hyde stated that FEMA maps do affect a mortgage and the only FEMA maps are of Myton City and Duchesne City, the rest of Duchesne County has not yet been mapped. This is associated with an unlikely event rather than a 100-year event.

Mr. Hyde stated that in regards to the lot depth to length ratio. Now, if a new lot is created the depth of the lot cannot be more than 5 times the width. So, if the width is 200 feet the depth cannot be more than 1000 feet. What we are proposing here is to waive that, if the lot frontage is 200 feet or greater because if you go any smaller in the width it looks real long and narrow. Mr. Hyde stated that with narrower frontage there would be a tendency to have more driveways along a road and appear to have more density along that road.

Mr. Hyde stated that the next change would be to the "Subdivision Improvement Guarantee". With a recent subdivision application, it was discovered that the language for different types of guarantees are not the same. If someone submitted an escrow account versus an irrevocable letter of credit or surety bond there is different language on how those are treated. So what we are proposing is that all of them would submit their bonding to cover uncompleted subdivision improvements at a rate of 125% of the engineer's cost estimate and that after improvements are done the county would release 90% of that bonding and would hold 10% of that bonding for a one year guarantee period.

Chairman Peatross asked if there were any questions on the report? There was none from the Planning Commission so the time was turned over to public.

John Swasey stated that his concerns are with surveyors having to put more and more on plat maps. Concerned property owners should know that if you are living on the flat there is the possibility of living in a flood plain and especially if you are living below a reservoir. I feel that there needs to be other types of notification other than having Jerry Allred putting more on the plat maps.

Mr. Swasey stated that when doing a subdivision the developer need to show a proposed electrical source, I am glad that that is being omitted because who else would the electrical come from other than Moon Lake Electric unless of course you generate your own.

Mr. Swasey stated that he thought a three-day notice is a little short for someone to come in and request a hearing. I don't know about anyone else but I have been on vacation for more than three-days and then to come back and find out something has already been done and I am unable to have a hearing on it. Mr. Hyde stated that it is

consistent with state law. Mr. Hyde stated that if someone wants a minor subdivision approval and notices go out on a Monday then approval would be granted the following Monday. If no one has called in stating that they would prefer a hearing. Mr. Swasey stated that he did not feel this was enough notice so either don't give any notice as in the past, or give more than a three-day notice.

Mr. Swasey stated that on the guarantee of improvement I have some problems there because in my case what if I had put in the road with paving and got approval from the road department prior to getting approval of my subdivision why would I need to get any type of bonding. Mr. Swasey stated that he feels that something should be worked out between contractor and the one-year guarantee because I am just the developer and why should I have to have my money tied up for one year just to make sure that the contractor's work is guaranteed. So I feel that contractors should guarantee their work for up to a year if approved by the road supervisor. Mr. Swasey stated that \$1,500.00 was what I had to put out for a bond and when the road was accepted by the road supervisor I thought that I was done and asked for a release of the bond and was told no, that I had to go for another year. Mr. Swasey stated that he thought this was inconsistent and you need to do something more than just changing the language. Mr. Swasey stated "I want to say it like this, I don't want to make any threats, but if I have \$1,500.00 to put out for a bond, I have another \$1,500.00 to get rid of people who put that kind of ordinance in to position in a campaign, so that's all I have to say."

Mr. Hyde stated that when a subdivider divides property there are two different ways to go. First, you can get your preliminary plat approval then a decision needs to be made whether you are going to do your final plat approval at the same time and post bonding for your roads and water system or wait and build the roads and water system and then come back in after they have been approved for final plat approval. Chairman Peatross asked then if you physically build the roads and put in the water system prior to final plat approval then it is unnecessary to post anything to back your guarantee?

Mr. Hyde stated that under the improvement guarantee chapter it states; "in lieu of actual construction and completion by the subdivider and acceptance by the Planning Commission of the improvements required (typically roads and water lines before approval of the final plat by the commissioners), the subdivider shall guarantee the installation and construction of the required improvements within one year from the date of approval of the final plat and guarantee that the improvements shall be free from defective material or workmanship, for a period of 12 months from the date of completion period this is when you bond. Mr. Hyde stated that the question is if you don't bond are you subject to the one-year guarantee period.

There was discussion about getting back 90% of a bond and Mr. Swasey that it is ridiculous to write that in there the way it is because you are unable to get back 90% of a bond. Commissioner Sweat stated that they do it in Utah County and Mr. Hyde stated that it is done here all the time.

Mr. Hyde stated that maybe at this time this should be recessed until a later date to allow staff to develop some wording to be consistent in terms of that 1-year guarantee because right now it appears that subdivision ordinance requires the 1-year guarantee when a bond has been placed, but does not say anything about when the work has been done and accepted. The Planning Commission was in agreement that there is a flaw in the way the ordinance is written and does need to be corrected.

Jerry Allred (County Surveyor) stated that in regards FEMA flooding maps I just wanted to point out that the one for Myton City does not have elevations on it or any survey data for a surveyor to locate the elevations that are described as flood plain and the map for Duchesne City does and so we are able to determine where the flood plain is. Mr. Allred stated the problem with some of the way this is worded is that if the 100-year flood event there is not really a good set of data to determine what those flows are. Mr. Allred stated that in working with Roosevelt City in trying to determine their flood areas the problem is that to determine flows you need to map the entire drainage system from where it comes from which includes all culverts and bridges from there to where the site is. So I think, without more information, I am afraid this particular wording could get to the point that no one could meet the requirements on a subdivision plat unless there is a better source data.

Mr. Allred stated that here we are talking about two things one being a dam failure and the other being areas subject to flooding in the event of a 100-year flood as determined by an adopted flood study and the county does not have one. Mr. Hyde stated that the County Commissioners had approached him after they were approached by MLWUA regarding the enlargement of the Big Sandwash Reservoir to let people know what the possibilities of a flood could be in surrounding areas. Mr. Allred stated that maybe an exhibit of the Emergency Preparedness Brief and Inundation Map could be included in the Subdivision Ordinance so that people developing in that area would be aware of the possibilities.

Mr. Allred stated that if it is put into the ordinance then it needs to be put on the checklist and a study needs to be done of some kind. Mr. Hyde stated that liability issues brought this concern into the county.

Mr. Allred stated that he and Mr. Hyde has spoken in the past about the five to one ratio and he likes what Mr. Hyde has done with the wording but wanted to recommend that it be changed from 200 feet to 165 feet. Reason being if you have 5 acres (330 feet wide) on a quarter section it could still be split in half.

Commissioner Sweat stated that there had been some very valid points and I feel that we need to recess this until a little further study has been done.

Commissioner Sweat motioned to recess this until the March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Commissioner Jorgensen seconded that motion and it passed unanimously.

**Minutes: Approval of the October 3, 2007 minutes**

Commissioner Fabrizio motioned to approve the minutes of October 3, 2007.  
Commissioner Olsen seconded that motion and it passed unanimously.

**Commission comments and Staff Information Items:**

**A. Meeting dates for 2008**

The Planning Commission was presented with the 2008 meeting date schedule.

**B. Elections of a Chair and vice Chair for 2008 (Chris Peatross was Chair and Dean Brough Vice Chair in 2007).**

Commissioner Sweat nominated Shelly Fabrizio for Chair and that nomination passed unanimously.

Commissioner Fabrizio nominated Randy Mair for Vice Chair and that nomination passed unanimously.

**Adjournment:**

Chairman Peatross motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 PM  
Commissioner Jorgensen seconded that motion and it passed unanimously.