



**TOWN OF SILVERTHORNE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 6, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m., on October 6, 2015, in the Council Chambers of the Silverthorne Town Hall, 601 Center Circle, Silverthorne, Colorado.

2. ROLL CALL – Commissioners present and answering Roll Call were: Susan Byers, Jenny Gloudemans, Stan Katz, Robert Kieber and Donna Pacetti. Brian Wray and Tanya Shattuck were absent. Staff attending tonight's meeting included: Matt Gennett, Planning Manager, Susan Miller Lee, Planner I, Dan Gietzen, Town Engineer and Melody Hillis, Planning Commission Secretary.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR – Stan Katz made a motion to approve the September 15, 2015, Planning Commission minutes. Donna Pacetti seconded. The motion was approved by a vote of five to zero (5-0). Brian Wray and Tanya Shattuck were absent.

4. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS:

None.

Matt Gennett, Planning Manager, requested that the Planning Commission Agenda be amended to move Public Hearing, Item 5A, to Item 5, and that the Public Hearing be number Items 6A and 6B, Item 6 becomes Item 7, Item 7 becomes Item 8. Planning Commission agreed by a vote of five to zero (5-0) to amend the agenda. Brian Wray and Tanya Shattuck were absent.

5A. Site Visit to Angler Mountain Open Space by the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission adjourned at 6:05 p.m. for the Angler Mountain Open Space site visit. Planning Commission reconvened at 6:46 p.m.

6. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Resolution 2015-3; A Resolution to Adopt a Master Plan for Angler Mountain Open Space.

Susan Miller Lee, Planner II, presented Resolution 2015-3. The Town of Silverthorne is requesting approval of Planning Commission Resolution 2015-3, A Resolution to Adopt a Master Plan for Angler Mountain Open Space.

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

Susan Miller Lee - Introduced Mark Wilcox, DHM, the consultant hired to do the Three Parks Plans.

Mark Wilcox - Explained the plan, the research, process, public meetings and input, etc. Looked at the Comprehensive Plan and the Town's goals for Angler Mountain Open Space. Trying to find a way to balance all the needs and goals. Categorized as a Tier 3 Open Space.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS:

- Stan Katz - If the next step is to try to figure out how to use Township funds, a cost benefit analysis should probably precede an approval. Stated that not looking at costs until approval is received should be considered.
- Mark Wilcox - Have begun to look at costs for the improvements to the Angler Ranch Open Space, not finalized.
- Stan Katz - Estimate?
- Susan Miller Lee - An estimate is provided in the Planning Commission packet.
- Stan Katz - Can you give that to us publicly?
- Susan Miller Lee - The POST estimate, with boardwalks is in the \$60,000 dollar range, and this is within that number.
- Robert Kieber - The number would be nice to know, but the Planning Commission cannot use that.
- Stan Katz - Going to interrupt Commission Kieber and say that yes, we can. The reason that we can, if you recall when the Town Attorney spoke with us, he said there a vast difference between an ordinance, which this is, and an application. When an application comes in we can't discuss money. When an ordinance comes in, it is a political issue and as a political issue, the Planning Commission can discuss anything that involves the politics. So, in fact, yes, a cost benefit analysis is a legitimate function of the Planning Commission when we are dealing with an ordinance.
- Susan Miller Lee - Remind everyone that this is a resolution. As the Planning Commission you are entrusted with Master Planning the community. This is a planning document; it is a master plan for this park and in order for the Town to move forward with any kind of cost estimating, or any kind of management strategies for this park. Staff is requesting approval from the Planning Commission. Would enable Staff to create some structure and framework in order to plan for and manage this property.
- Stan Katz - So Planning Commission has to vote for it to find out what's in it?
- Susan Miller Lee - The plan before you this evening is the Master Plan.
- Donna Pacetti - On page 9 of the packet, Exhibit A, there is a cost range that says \$155,000 to \$210,000 for the Angler Mountain Open Space.
- Susan Miller Lee - With the boardwalks and the decking, it is well under the previous projected costs. The original POST Plan vision was quite a bit more extensive, envisioned items such as a bridge, an outdoor classroom, a wild playground.
- Mark Wilcox - Estimating that it will be less than \$100,000.
- Susan Miller Lee - The project has been scaled way back in costs, probably about half of what is in the POST Plan estimate.
- Susan Byers - Quite a number of e-mails with public comment, mostly in July. Has Staff received any public e-mails to the revised conceptual plan?
- Susan Miller Lee - The date on the majority of those e-mails is prior to the July 21st meeting. Staff had huge public input and participation at that meeting. After that Staff took a hard look at the plans, consulted with the wildlife biologists, and the plans were revised. Didn't get a lot of public feedback about the revised plans, but Staff did have a number of people attend the SPORT Committee meetings and Angler Mountain Open Space committee representative Roger Kendall come to the final public meeting at the August SPORT committee meeting and endorsed the plan, felt that the project was moving in the right direction. Roger Kendall was not solicited to come to that meeting.
- Jenny Gloudemans - The presentation stated that it appears that there will be a very limited use for the area, as far as time that it will be closed down when the wildlife are migrating, or whatever wildlife does. There is not going to be a lot of time that it is actually open to a lot of people, and it was stated that it was not being designed to be used by a lot of people. There wasn't going to be more parking provided, etc. My question is why do we have to focus on this property? Wouldn't the Town's dollars be better spent utilizing an area that

can have a greater use? Seems to me that maybe there is tunnel vision that something has to be created on this parcel, whatever that may be, when maybe that isn't the best action. Maybe the best action with this, is no action at all.

Mark Wilcox - It's a fine balance when trying to program a space like this. It has been identified by the community as a park that people want to access and use. Have seen historically, that if a management plan is not in place that shows some kind of limited access or limited management of the property it will get used in ways that the Town doesn't want to see it used. Unfortunately beginning to see that happen already with some of the pump tracks that are being formed, and some of the other activities that are occurring. By promoting the goals of the project by improving wildlife viewing, limiting access, improved access to the natural resources by the entire community goes a long ways towards managing this property. If left unmanaged it will be in a state that will see a lot of disrepair, and perhaps unauthorized use.

Jenny Gloudemans - Unauthorized use, would have to go back to how the unauthorized use going to be managed? I live at the pond at the end of Rainbow Drive, walk my dog down the street and cross to the Willow Grove Open Space, with that cool gazebo that is now flooded with cigarette butts, beer cans, etc. Understand the idea of monitoring stuff, but people are going to do what people want to do regardless of whether an improved are or not. Feels there needs to be a balance of those improvements, wonders if it is worth the improvement?

Mark Wilcox - Can sort of understand what is being said. Spending a little bit of money here to provide access, you are questioning whether or not the wrong type of access is being provided. Is this going to allow for people to hide and do things that shouldn't be done? Would say that is happening now. This would provide more visibility that isn't there now. The more eyes that are on a space like this, then the activities that you don't want to see there would be less likely to occur.

Susan Miller Lee - The comments and feelings of limiting access are not that we don't want anyone to go do there, the wildlife biologists emphasis was on limiting large groups. The wildlife biologists recommendations that she was trying to make to the Town were to break up large school groups, to keep large groups of people that were traveling along the Blue River Trail from being able to access it right across the river. By limiting access we're controlling the quantity of people that might come together in a group. Still creating a space that people can use, trying to create it in a sustainable way.

Susan Byers - Would this park be excluded from the Town's website, and other Town promotions?

Susan Miller Lee - Already on the Town's website, because it is a Town owned property it is public so people are allowed to access it and they are using it.

Susan Byers - How would the Town contemplate closing the park, how would the public be notified or would there be signs, what would restrict someone from going there during times they shouldn't be there.

Mark Wilcox - Normally done through signage and through education. If a sign is put there that there is a seasonal closure because of moose calving for example or osprey breeding, etc., at least people are aware that their intrusion will be impacting animal habitat. Obviously can't keep people out that really want to go down there anyway, by controlling access to where it is only off the boardwalk, you could secure a gate at the end of the boardwalk that isn't open during seasonal closures, someone would have to try really hard to get down there. And lastly, just education.

Donna Pacetti - Would the anglers be limited to access during that time also? The parking lot is there, but they have to walk down and enter the same as everyone

- else did tonight. Will they be ousted from being able to fish where they want to?
- Mark Wilcox - Imagine all access would be limited during the seasonal closures, including the anglers.
- Donna Pacetti - As far as the parking lot, if someone chose not to go fishing and someone wanted to use it just to observe this area, there would be nothing from preventing that, right?
- Mark Wilcox - Right now there is nothing from preventing people from going down there and using the space. The whole area in green is delineated wetlands; it is wet pretty much year round and is very difficult to access, without any kind of a decking system to keep people above the wetland and water.
- Donna Pacetti - Hard to imagine, seems like just a neighborhood park, and not for the public in Silverthorne to use, but it would be funded by public money to build the infrastructure that would be in there, having a stumbling block, and not having access to it except with Angler Mountain Ranch parking lot. I reside across the highway, but it is dangerous to cross the highway to get over there. The last time this was reviewed, it was stated that there would be bicycle parking.
- Susan Miller Lee - Arctic Placer Park, is a very well used park and there are no parking spaces.
Robert Kieber - There's two.
Susan Miller Lee - The new plan the Planning Commission approved has four. Currently no parking at Arctic Placer Park. That was a park that was well loved enough by the community to get over 50 residents to that park on the night of the open house to speak for it. Angler Mountain Open Space is a fairly new residential area that isn't built out yet, there isn't a park or open space area on that side of the highway or in that general area. Staff feels that there is going to be more pressure on that property as more homes are built and more people move into that area, and that is one of the management concerns for this property.
- Stan Katz - Basically going to discourage school groups from being able to use this area?
- Susan Miller Lee - This is leading to a bigger discussion for what would be the specific rules and regulations for this park. That is perhaps a deeper layer than Staff has gotten to at this time. This is programming. Feel we would have to limit large groups based on feedback that Staff received from CPW and would have to define what exactly that means, and that includes the seasonal closures, what specific dates, etc. Don't have all of those answers right now, but will have to dig deeper into that as the project develops.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mark Bartell - 305 Bald Eagle Road. Wants to commend the SPORT Committee and the Town for trying to make our community a better place and enhance it. Heard comments about who is using it, who's not using it, who might use it. Have a bird's eye view of that property. The only activity that I've seen in the seven years that I've lived there is migration; there is a lot of wildlife, deer, moose, elk, etc. See people from the Ponds or people from Bald Eagle walking their dogs, kids, etc., use the sidewalk a lot. To my knowledge, have never seen anyone go in there. I've been in there a couple of times just to see what's in there. Seen the committees going in there, but haven't really seen people go in. Honestly don't know how much use it would get. Do know that the wildlife uses it from my observations.
- Janice Ferringer - 419 Bald Eagle Road. On the Angler Mountain Ranch Open Space committee with Roger. Overlook all of it. It is extremely important that we

stick to something that protects the wildlife. In the last two springs a moose cow has calved, and has returned again with a young bull, and a new female calf. The three of them are in there all the time; spend a lot of time around the lake at Blue River Ranch Lake Estates. If you hike the Angler Mountain Ranch Trail and watch from about 100 to 150 feet up, between October 1st and June 15th, any day two or three hours before sunset you'll see the moose, so we know that they live there and we know that she has calved there the last two years, know it's important. Not just the protection of the moose, but the protection of the children and the people. There is one reason to develop a trail, if a trail isn't developed, a lot of trails will be developed, and there are already some down there. My family frequents this area, is a favorite, but there is no path to stay on, so we are carving new paths as well. Have a master's degree in this, it is important to me that we all leave the area undamaged, and that is the advantage of a path. That way there isn't an affect from seven or eight self-made paths that destroy a larger area. The advantage of having at least an educational area, people should know that there are moose and wildlife in the area, and that it can be dangerous, as well as wonderful, something that explains that there are moose that have calves would mean a lot to people. I think people would be excited to know that and should be excited about it. The two observation areas off of the road would be great. See people walk along the sidewalk and they'll step off and try to look though the willows and see what's in them because they can here the animals, and are trying to see what's back there. If you leave it like it is, okay with that too. Didn't like the original plan, glad that it was realized that this wasn't the best use for it. We get to see it all from our second floor, and would like for other people to be able to do so as well.

JoAnne Nadalin -

2922 Osprey Lane, speaking as a resident, but also sit on the SPORT Committee as a Town Council representative. This plan is really an outgrowth of the POST Master Plan that was approved by the Planning Commission and the Town Council a year ago, the fact that the SPORT Committee and the people involved have the insight to take it to the next step and figure out whether the POST Master Plan that was approved at a much higher level of development for this area really met the needs of the community on further inspection, and they found it didn't. To me the important thing about this plan is that number one: it provides controlled access, as was said previously, by establishing a trail you're going to have control of people trampling through the wetlands, control people building the little pump tracks. I don't think it is going to result in more people going down there, but it will be a better experience for the people in the community who are able to use this and for people who are walking past to be able to use this. To me the issue really is about can it be managed better or is it going to be left unmanaged in which case it will be whatever it is going to be. There is not a scenario which says that it is not going to be used. It's just how does it get used?

Joel High -

329 Bald Eagle Road. Had a lot of concerns about the original plan because it was built into the wetlands, unless a disturbance permit is obtained, you don't build in a wetland, don't know whether the Town of Silverthorne would have to do that or not, but certainly everyone else has to. Such a small area that can be used, the whole green area is all wetlands and can't be used. Have been down there during different parts of the year, pretty wet and not usable. Seems to me that what Silverthorne needs and trying to get with this a little bit is riverfront access. There really isn't much, certainly along the northern stretch that is on public property. The place to get that access would be Lot 5 of the Ponds. Silverthorne has had an opportunity, have

brought up the issue of open space and acquiring Lot 5 of the Ponds as open space, it has a lot more usable land, both parcels are about 12 acres, there is more than 7 acres of usable land on Lot 5, not sure how much is on the Angler Mountain Open Space that is usable. Lot 5 has excellent access to the waterfront; the Angler Mountain Open Space parcel is much more limited. If Lot 5 does get built, as being proposed, there will be no wildlife on the Angler parcel, because most of that wildlife comes through from the east side of the lake, comes down from elementary school, always wildlife in that area to the right. If Lot 5 gets built, then the path of wildlife into this area will be gone, feels that's a strong consideration. Does the Town want to do this and have no one there because Lot 5 gets built or does the Town need to address Lot 5 and try to look at that as open space? Much bigger piece of property, better access, more parking space, level access to the river.

Polly Cook -

361 Bald Eagle Road. Seems to me that if there is going to be limited access, that we could better use the money that will be spent on this for another park that we could get more access and more use.

John Taylor -

1712 Red Hawk Road. Live to the west of the river, to the west of Highway 9, up the hill, am a 21 year resident. Have learned that people like to get out to an open space. SPORT Committee is working on projects that have been around for about 25 years and are looking at this. There are social trails, after social trails, after social trails; there are eight of them in a certain stretch. Involved in another program that is new, they have an internal trail system, people want to head to the wilderness, they want to head for the national forest and it's important. If we don't get up in front of this sort of thing, what is going to happen is people will create their own trails, and the residents won't necessarily like it because the trails will be all over the place. I think, if you do it up front and give a person something that they can follow and hopefully stay on the trail and come back out. The other thing I think everyone saw today is that access to that parcel of land is not the easiest to get to, and not the safest to get to. Secondly, the little hillside on the south side of the guardrail is going to start eroding and then there are problems. I give my kudos to DHM, they've done a tremendous job. We've gone from an amusement park to a park that makes sense. Telling people that when they go in there "here's a route, now follow it, and come back out".

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Stan Katz -

This is a Township issue, as a Township issue with Township funds, like to start looking at costs and benefits. On the cost side, we have costs estimated at \$60,000, \$155,000, there's \$210,000, the \$210,000 and \$155,000 are probably prior ones, and will probably come down. Have a little bit on the cost side. As far as benefits, the first and most important thing is that it has been stated that they don't want to have a lot of people. But once you don't have a lot of people, you don't have a lot of benefits. As a couple of people have mentioned, the only people that are going to benefit from this park are people that can walk to it and that means that this is really a neighborhood benefit and not a Township benefit. The comment that was made about comparing the parking to the Arctic Placer Park, it has a playground, there is a very big difference what people want to do there and what people will want to do here. Without a parking lot, my big issue personally, how would this allow people from other parts of the Township to use this; this is not a Township park that has Township benefits. This is a benefit to basically to the Angler Mountain Ranch HOA. Made a big point that the HOA supports this. Well, if I lived there, I would probably support

this too, why not, you're using Township funds to build a local park. From a total Township point I don't think that benefit is particularly great. In addition, I heard tonight that they want to discourage educational groups from visiting, another area that would have been a benefit, and again it's going to be discouraged, there is one less benefit on the benefit side. Another piece that would've been a benefit for people that did want to walk around would be to walk their dogs, and dogs will not be allowed. That again reduces the number of people than can get any benefit from this. Finally, it's not even going to be a year-round park, because there would be closures for flooding, moose calving, a lot of closures that will simply reduce the benefit that the Town gets for whatever the cost is going to be. The costs are not going to be any lower because of those closures, if the closures resulted in less cost that would be something important. The total cost is the total cost. One other cost, rather than a reduced benefit is the loss of the protection of wildlife, the best way to protect the wildlife is to possibly not develop it as a park. From a cost benefit analysis, I don't think that there is enough benefit here to justify a cost to the Township. Other small issues: wouldn't support without a parking lot and they've been very adamant about not having a parking lot. Without a parking lot, other people in the Township don't benefit from this at all. Can't see doing this. As a personal comment I am very pleased with what I saw tonight, because this was not a dog and pony show, I expected it to be one, after the Town Council's comments, which I read in their minutes. The Town Council was upset because we had a legal quorum at the last meeting, our legal quorum by a vote of four to zero decided not to put this item as a part of what we delivered to Town Council. Town Council didn't like it and said "let's have a do over", and that is simply not the way that a Town Council should work with the Planning Commission, that's not the way politics should work. It does, unfortunately work in the national council. But I'm hoping that we're not going to be asked to repeal Obama Care four or five times. Actually heard people from Angler Mountain Ranch saying that this might be better off not being developed, firmly agree with that, nothing new in the presentation tonight that wasn't there two weeks ago and with nothing new, my opinion at that time was that this wasn't a very valuable use of Township dollars and I still feel the same way.

Donna Pacetti -

Echo what Stan Katz says. Am on the fence with the whole thing, agree with JoAnn Nadalin that the paths need to be defined, but why do people have to be in there at all is what I'm having a hard time with. Concerned with all the migration, the wildlife, the calving that's taking place. Joel High talked about Lot 5 at the Ponds and that it is a wildlife corridor all the way from North Pond through this area. It seems like it needs to be a preserve to me and to try to keep people out with signage at the front with saying that we don't want dogs, we don't want people walking around. Love to fish, if fisherman are coming in there and causing problems, then why are they allowed in there and other people aren't at times, don't understand.

Jenny Gloudemans -

Also on the fence. Love the idea of going in and making a defined trail, because the social trails are everywhere and everybody just runs, and that tramples everything. Keep coming back to the benefit side of it, is it enough of a reason to do that park, and spend that money whatever that budget is on an area that is going to be utilized for so little of a period of time. The dollars could be allocated somewhere where people could drive to it, and utilize it 365 days a year or at least more than 180. On the fence, but this is a hard sale to me.

Susan Byers -

Would say the same thing, very conflicted. What Joel High said resonated well with me because there may be a better place to accomplish what people want. Been here about 20 years, still in awe of the moose, try to stay

out of their way and give them wide berth. If this is an area, where residents have seen wildlife and moose in particular and they come back year after year, that's a concern. People and wildlife don't mix. One of the other comments was the educational aspect, can we not accomplish education without the human aspect in that area? Can we have some signage, can we have some other features to let people know what the Osprey and what the different wildlife experience is without actually being right in that space.

Robert Kieber -

Thanked Mark Wilcox, thanked DHM, as a consultant their job is to come in here and work with the SPORT Committee and design something that hopefully you hope, the Town hopes or somebody hopes will be developed. The SPORT Committee spent a lot of time on it and I know that they are always looking for activities and paths and trails and things like that. Been a resident of the Ponds since 2001, been in the county since 1991, have seen that area develop. Seen the decrease in the wildlife, had three deer in my backyard just the other night, and moose, no bear for a couple of years. When you start adding trails, the initial cost is the minimal cost. The long term cost is the maintenance and when you add a trail, some people stay on it and most people don't, they wander off, that's how the fisherman get access to the river. See it at the Ponds all the time, constantly having new ways to get down to the river off of the path and it is an improved asphalt path. To say that the people are going to stay on the trail, some of them will. Also, can tell you that if you put up a sign that says "no dogs", we have dogs running lose all the time that is not going to stop a dog owner. Responsible people are responsible for their dogs. We are constantly seeing responsible dog owners being half-way responsible by picking up the dog droppings, but leaving it on the side of the trail, so they're half-way responsible. Looking at it from the Comprehensive Plan stand point and agree with some of the aspects of it. What is going to benefit the Town, not just a neighborhood or be so minimally used is it worth the investment, whether the cost is \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$500,000. If it were approved and built, I think it would be a trail that would look nice at the beginning, but the history of the Town, and I'm going to be blunt, is extremely poor in the maintenance of what they have now. Someone mentioned earlier you go up and down the Blue River Trail, and there is junk sitting on the side of the trail, there's trash, there's vandalism, there's beer cans and bottles, cigarette butts. The maintenance is lacking, asked Susan Miller Lee when the Town took ownership of this property.

Susan Miller Lee -

Not sure, Tim Crane can probably answer that.

Tim Crane -

Around May 2006, when the property was platted.

Robert Kieber -

So in eight to ten years there has been no maintenance, no clean-up or anything down there in all the time that the Town has owned it. The cost of the plan brought something before us, and I feel that if the Town needed something like this, I would be for it. This is not anything that the Town of Silverthorne needs, and I will vote no on the resolution.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION 2015-3 DIES DUE TO A LACK OF A MOTION.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING.

B. Final Plat and Site Plan, Angler Mountain Ranch Lakeside Townhomes, Filing No. 8. Tract 7C, Angler Mountain Ranch Lakeside Townhomes, Filing No. 7.

Matt Gennett, Planning Manager presented the project. The Applicant Tim Crane, is requesting approval of the Final Plat and Site Plan, Angler Mountain Ranch Lakeside Townhomes, Filing No. 8.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS:

Stan Katz - Question regarding packet page 38, Buckskin Lane ends abruptly, and the turnaround is at the second to last house, plans to do anything with the end or the turnaround.

Matt Gennett - Those are as built conditions, not part of tonight's application.

Robert Kieber - Regarding the wall, Dan Gietzen is happy with the engineering and don't end up with a mess?

Dan Gietzen - Yes, typical to everything else they've done to date, with the exception of what was adjusted to accommodate the Fire Department's comments.

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

Robert Kieber - Any modifications since the other 43 or so units we've seen previously?

Tim Crane - Applicant, Compass Homes Development. No, no major changes. Explained the proposed project, requested approval.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING:

OPENED PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT

Matt Gennett - Stated that a certain area of Tract 8, will be a future development area, not the entire area will be open space.

Stan Katz - Time frame for when Angler Mountain Ranch Filings 9 and 10 would be coming in for review?

Tim Crane - Sometime this winter, working on them now.

Joe Maglicic - Early January 2016.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

STAN KATZ MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAT AND FINAL SITE PLAN FOR ANGLER MOUNTAIN RANCH LAKESIDE TOWNHOMES, FILING NO. 8.

DONNA PACETTI SECONDED.

MOTION PASSES BY A VOTE OF FIVE TO ZERO (5-0). BRIAN WRAY AND TANYA SHATTUCK ABSENT.

7. OTHER ITEMS:

Matt Gennett informed the Planning Commission that Silvertrout has resubmitted. Stan Katz asked if anything has changed. Matt Gennett stated that it has not significantly changed because of CLOMAR revisions would be required if the project had changes.

Robert Kieber asked about Fin Doyle's project, and what stage it was at. Neighbors are curious about what is going on, asked for an update at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Stan Katz asked about the Dunkin' Donuts. Matt Gennett stated that the building permit has been issued.

Dan Gietzen explained that the project that Stan Katz is referring to regarding Xcel Energy is for Terry Novak's project Rainbow Run.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

STAN KATZ MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:10 P.M.

JENNY GLOUDEMANS SECONDED.

MOTION PASSES BY A VOTE FIVE TO ZERO (5-0). BRIAN WRAY AND TANYA SHATTUCK WAS ABSENT.

Submitted for approval by:

Approved this of 1st day of December, 2015.



Melody Hillis,
Planning Commission Secretary



Robert Kieber, Chairman

These minutes are only a summary of the proceedings of the meeting. They are not intended to be comprehensive or to include each statement, person speaking or to portray with complete accuracy. The most accurate maintained in the office of the Planning Commission Secretary.