

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT
December 2, 2025

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call: The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Alan Macdonald. The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Chair: Alan Macdonald

Commission Members: Troy Slade, Michelle Schirmer, John MacKay, Greg Butterfield, Susan Whittenburg, Jeff Davis

Excused:

Staff: Ryan Robinson, Jason Judd, Marla Fox

Others: Sarah Blackwell, Andrew Young, Ezra Lee

B. Prayer/Opening Comments: Jeff Davis

C. Pledge of Allegiance: John MacKay

II. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

None

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Public Hearing: Adoption of the Water Conservation Plan

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson introduced the item, explaining that cities in Utah are required to update their water conservation plans every five years, with the current deadline being the end of 2025. He noted that Horrocks Engineering had been contracted to assist with this update. City Engineer Judd clarified that while Horrocks Engineering helped with the Water Element of the General Plan, the Water Conservation Plan itself was produced in-house by himself and City Administrator Sorenson; the previous plan from five years ago has been updated and some conservation goals had been met while others are still in progress.

Commissioner MacKay expressed satisfaction that the Plan did not include onerous limitations on residents.

Commissioner Schirmer inquired about incentives versus fines for conservation. She specifically mentioned leaving portions of her property undeveloped with natural vegetation but still being charged water rates based on lot size rather than developed area. Staff noted this was a good suggestion to consider for future implementation.

Commissioner Whittenburg mentioned the Eyes on Water app, noting its effectiveness in monitoring water usage and detecting leaks. She suggested broader promotion of this tool.

Chair Macdonald then opened the public hearing.

Steve Burrows, resident, advocated for both conservation measures and infrastructure improvements to ensure water security. He suggested implementing regular accountability reports on conservation progress and better citizen education.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Davis highlighted Alpine's leadership in water conservation, noting the City was one of the first in Utah to meter both culinary and secondary water. He commended the City's efforts on leak detection and other conservation measures.

Chair MacDonald expressed concerns about future water availability, noting the decrease in snowfall over his 25 years in Alpine compared to previous decades.

The Commission discussed the water supply projections included in the Plan, which showed adequate supply through 2065 when Alpine is expected to reach buildout. City Engineer Judd emphasized that conservation remains important despite adequate supply projections, as it saves pumping costs and helps preserve aquifers.

MOTION: Planning Commission member Jeff Davis moved to recommend approval of the Alpine City Water Conservation Plan as presented.

Susan Whittenburg seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u>Ayes:</u>	<u>Nays:</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Alan Macdonald		
Michelle Schirmer		
Troy Slade		
Susan Whittenburg		
John MacKay		
Greg Butterfield		
Jeff Davis		

B. Public Hearing: Amendment to the Alpine city General Plan to add a Water Conservation Chapter

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson explained that state code now requires cities to include a water element in their general plans by the end of 2025. This requirement was added to match other mandatory elements like land use, traffic circulation, and housing. To assist with this requirement, Alpine City received a grant from the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water Resources, and hired Horrocks Engineering to develop the Water Conservation Plan.

Craig Nebeker from Horrocks Engineering, joining via Zoom, commended the City on its conservation efforts. He stated that, by looking at the numbers, the City was doing a great job already at conserving water. However, he highlighted that landscape irrigation and secondary water systems presented the greatest opportunities for additional conservation. Mr. Nebeker noted that, compared to culinary uses, the secondary systems seemed to have more potential for improvement in terms of water conservation. His analysis suggested that efforts focused on outdoor water use could yield significant results in achieving conservation goals.

Commissioner Davis referenced Mr. Nebeker's recommendation to increase storage capacity; he asked which of the City's seven tanks that recommendation would include. Mr. Nebeker clarified that there he had not identified a specific tank in terms of increased storage capacity; he emphasized that added storage primarily provides more resilience in supply but is challenging to accomplish. City Engineer Judd noted that the City's Master Plan does reference the water tanks and needed storage capacity.

Chair MacDonald opened the public hearing.

Steve Burrows, resident, stated it appears residents did not know about this meeting because conserving water is important and no-one is here. He advocated for a dual approach in the Water Conservation Element of the General Plan, emphasizing the importance of both conservation measures and infrastructure improvements to secure long-term water availability. He stressed the necessity of creating a safety net through developing infrastructure like pipelines and wells to ensure reliable water sources. Mr. Burrows suggested the implementation of routine accountability reports on conservation progress and enhanced citizen education to encourage civic participation in water-saving initiatives.

Andrew Young, resident, asked if there would be another Public Hearing on this matter. Mr. Robinson answered no, with Mr. Judd adding that residents are welcome to talk to the City about this matter at any time they want to. Mr. Young stated he has spoken with City staff, and they have all indicated a need for water storage.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Davis stated that in 2022 the Legislature passed the law requiring a water conservation element in the General Plan and according to that law, the Planning Commission is responsible for this matter. He has expressed frustration over the fact that the Commission received the draft version of the document 'at the 11th hour', and he feels these things and other elements of the General Plan are important. He noted that some of the steps in the water conservation chapter checklist have been skipped and he suggested that going forward, the Planning Commission should have regular work sessions on water issues as required by State code, including inviting agencies like Central Utah Water and the Division of Water Resources to participate. By law, it is the Commission's responsibility to ensure compliance with State law and these checklists for developing these elements must be followed. He then emphasized the importance of watershed protection, noting Alpine's fortunate position adjacent to mountain watersheds including Dry Creek, Wadsworth Creek, Box Elder Creek, and Fort Canyon Creek. He advocated for strong protective measures for these resources and for Dry Creek as it runs through town.

Chair MacDonald agreed that the Planning Commission should have more involvement in water conservation planning, suggesting that staff schedule regular agenda items on this topic when meetings are less busy. He acknowledged historic agreements and claims on water that flows through the City and on to other points further downstream. He also offered input on the scheduling of pertinent agenda items and the possible creation of break-out groups to handle things like this in the future.

Commissioner Whittenburg asked where the natural springs in the area are located. Mr. Judd stated the only natural springs he is aware of are Grove Spring, which provides the bulk of the City's water, and Schoolhouse Spring.

Commissioner Slade asked if it would be appropriate to include some language regarding incentives for water conservation in this section of the General Plan as suggested by Commissioner Schirmer during the previous public hearing. Mr. Robinson indicated that would be a good suggestion for future amendments to this section of the General Plan.

In conclusion, there was brief discussion regarding the idea of a field trip to understand water sources; this was seen as beneficial for Commissioners. Commissioner Schirmer expressed interest in visiting water infrastructure locations, while Commissioner Davis and Chair MacDonald acknowledged past use of field trips for zoning issues, suggesting they could expand understanding of local water use and conservation efforts. The thought was that it would help Commissioners grasp where and how the City's water resources

originate and might improve their effectiveness in planning discussions related to water usage and conservation.

MOTION: Planning Commission member John MacKay recommended approval of the proposed Water Element to the General Plan.

Jeff Davis seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u>Ayes:</u>	<u>Nays:</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Michelle Schirmer		
Susan Whittenburg		
John MacKay		
Troy Slade		
Greg Butterfield		
Alan Macdonald		
Jeff Davis		

C. Public Hearing: Proposed amendments to Alpine Development Code 3.01.110 (Definitions), 3.04.030 CR-40,000, and 3.23 Conditional Uses to create and allow a “Farm Stand” use within the CR-40,000 Zone.

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson introduced the proposed amendment to create and allow a farm stand use within the CR-40,000 zone. He explained that this would amend three sections of the code: the definitions section, the conditional use section for the CR-40,000 zone, and the conditional uses standards section. This code amendment would establish a formal definition for “Farm Stand,” identify the land use authority for future applications, and set forth required development standards for the use. At this stage, the request is only to create the land-use category, definition, and accompanying standards. If the Planning Commission recommends approval and the City Council adopts the amendment, the applicant must then submit a separate Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application for their specific farm stand proposal. Because this use would be added to the CR-40,000 Zone as a conditional use, any property meeting the minimum requirements in this zone would be eligible to apply for a CUP for a farm stand. To implement the proposed land use, amendments are required in the following sections of the Alpine Development Code:

- **ADC 3.01.110 – Definitions:** Add a definition for “Farm Stand.”
- **ADC 3.04.030 – Conditional Uses in the CR-40,000 Zone:** Add “Farm Stand” as a conditional use.
- **ADC Chapter 3.23 – Conditional Use Permits:** Establish specific standards for the use and designate the land use authority.

The draft ordinance language reflecting these changes is included in the meeting packet.

Chair Macdonald clarified the proposed text change is not for one particular site, but for all properties that fit the language of the ordinance. He stated he and Commissioner MacKay met with the owners of Burgess Orchards to try and come up with an understanding of their plans for their fruit stand; the Burgess's could not accomplish their goal under the existing land use ordinance and that is why a new definition is being proposed. Mr. Robinson stated that is correct and displayed a zoning map showing the CR-40,000 zone (in light yellow), noting that the amendment would affect parcels in this zone. He explained that the farm stand would need to be on an arterial road, which includes Alpine Highway, Canyon Crest, and Grove Drive.

Commissioner Whittenburg inquired about the origin of the proposed definition for farm stands. Mr. Robinson explained that the definition was brought forward by the applicants, Paul Gu and Derek Rowley, the owners and operators of Burgess Orchards. The staff and some Commissioners, including Alan MacDonald and John McKay, had been involved in reviewing and making recommendations before it was presented to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Whittenburg asked what percentage of items sold at the stand will be grown on the property. Mr. Robinson stated the applicant wants to change that language as well to indicate that the property will be used for agriculture purposes instead of a percentage of what is sold at the stand to be grown there. Commissioner Whittenburg stated she has concerns about meat being sold at the farm stand.

Chair Macdonald opened the Public Hearing.

Sarah Blackwell, resident, questioned the definition of "agricultural land," asking whether backyard chickens would qualify as a product to be sold from a farm stand.

Mr. Robinson explained that the farm stand definition included baked goods, meats, preserving supplies, branded apparel, and other agricultural products. He noted that past efforts to fit into the produce stand definition had failed due to the inclusion of smoked meats and baked goods, which were priorities for the applicants.

Andrew Young, resident, said he appreciates the diligence of the applicants to work with the residents to make their proposal work, but he wondered how often the applicants would need to have their business license or permit renewed and how many properties could potentially be impacted by the proposed code amendment. He also questioned whether the change could be limited to arterial roads or if the change must apply broadly to the City. Mr. Robinson clarified the situation, stating that just because a change would apply in one zone does not automatically extend it to another property. Different zones in the City have various permitted uses, and simply because a proposal is considered for one area does not necessitate a City-wide application. He mentioned that extensions to other zones would require those areas to come forward with their proposal if they wished to pursue such changes. Each zone has its specific conditions and permissible modifications, ensuring suitability for the zone's intended purpose. Chair McDonald added that his understanding is that the conditional use permit (CUP) will not be reviewed on a regular basis; however, if there are complaints about the operation or any concerns about violations of the terms of the CUP, the City Council can review the matter and consider revoking the permit.

Ezra Lee, resident, spoke in favor of the Burgess Orchard stand, highlighting its value as a distinctive element of the community. He described it as "quintessential of the small town, farm town vibe" and emphasized its uniqueness in the area. Ezra also discussed the agricultural and cultural importance of such farm stands, noting that they create a charming rural atmosphere that is increasingly rare in the surrounding regions. In emphasizing the aesthetic and experiential contributions of the roadside stand to Alpine, he acknowledged that traffic could be a concern but suggested that the benefits, including fostering community spirit, outweigh such issues. His comments reflected an appreciation for the orchard's character and its role in preserving a sense of rural identity and local tradition within Alpine.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

The Commission discussed at length the definition of a farm stand versus a produce stand. Chair MacDonald explained that previous attempts to modify the produce stand definition had stalled because the petitioners wanted to include baked goods and meats, which couldn't fit within the produce stand definition.

Commissioner Schirmer expressed concern about the broadness of the definition, noting it seemed to be "more like a grocery store with a small amount of land." She pointed out that under current rules, the majority of products sold need to be grown on the property, but the new definition would only require the majority of the land to be used for agricultural purposes.

Commissioner McKay disagreed with characterizing the proposal as a grocery store, arguing it was simply creating flexibility for farm stands to sell a wider range of agricultural products.

Chair MacDonald noted that a key sticking point was the potential for food preparation and sandwich sales, which would increase visitor stay time and potentially exacerbate traffic conditions that had previously been addressed.

Commissioner Davis expressed conflict between wanting to support a popular local business and adhering to residential zoning guidelines and safety concerns.

MOTION: Planning Commission member Jeff Davis moved to recommend Denial of the proposed amendments to the Alpine Development Code 3.01.110, 3.04.030, and Chapter 3.23 to create a "Farm Stand" use in the CR-40,000 Zone as proposed, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed expansion of the farm stand is too much like a commercial grocery store.
2. It expands too much on a residential zone.
3. It carries with it increased safety concerns which have not been mitigated or studied.
4. The language of products including baked goods and meats; and the handling and preparation of fresh food could lead to the possibility of restaurant food being prepared and sold.

Troy Slade seconded the motion.

Chair McDonald expressed discomfort with reason number one, explaining it is too hyperbolic. Commissioner McKay agreed.

Commissioner Davis amended his motion to remove reason number one, but to expand on reason number four to reference the handling, preparing, and sale of food items. The list of reasons for denial was amended as follows:

1. It expands too much on a residential zone.
2. It carries with it increased safety concerns which have not been mitigated or studied.
3. The language of products including baked goods and meats; and the handling and preparation of fresh food could lead to the possibility of restaurant food being prepared and sold.

Troy Slade stated his second of the amended motion stands.

There were 6 Ayes and 1 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes:

Michelle Schirmer
Susan Whittenburg
Troy Slade
Greg Butterfield
Alan Macdonald
Jeff Davis

Nays:

John Mackay

Excused

D. Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.23.060 to reduce the minimum lot size from five (5) acres to two (2) acres and add additional compliance standards for Guest Houses.

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson explained the petitioner, Ezra Lee, has submitted a request for a text amendment to Alpine Development Code (ADC) 3.23.060 – Guest Houses, specifically regarding the minimum lot size on which a Guest House may be constructed. The current standard requires a minimum lot size of five (5) acres for a Guest House. The proposed amendment would allow Guest Houses on lots as small as two (2) acres within the CE-5 Zone (see attached zoning map), subject to additional standards intended to address potential impacts associated with smaller lots:

1. A Guest House may not be subdivided from the primary residence.
2. The Guest House must share the same address as the primary residence.

After reviewing the proposal, staff recommend adding the following additional requirement:

3. For any Guest House located on a lot smaller than five (5) acres, the Guest House shall not exceed forty percent (40%) of the square footage of the primary dwelling or 1,500 square feet, whichever is smaller.

These standards are intended to maintain neighborhood compatibility, preserve the low-density character of the CE-5 Zone, and ensure accessory units remain subordinate to the primary residence. Mr. Robinson noted he has received feedback from Will Jones, the Three Falls Development Review Committee and Homeowners Association (HOA) President, who has indicated he is not in favor of changing to smaller lot size for guest houses. He has stated this would affect people who bought property without knowing this could happen and the HOA guidelines only allow guest houses on five-acre lots and the HOA did not plan to change these guidelines.

Chair MacDonald questioned the purpose of moving forward with the amendment if the HOA's Covenants, Conditions, and Regulations (CC&Rs) would prevent its implementation in the Three Falls subdivision. Mr. Robinson stated the City is not bound by HOA CC&R's, and the homeowner would have to work that out with their HOA. If this ordinance were changed, it would apply to other parts in the City as well.

Chair Macdonald opened the Public Hearing.

Ezra Lee, resident in the Three Falls development, addressed the Planning Commission to explain his situation regarding a small outbuilding he constructed on his property. Initially designed as a maker's space studio, the building included a small bathroom, which was permitted and approved under City regulations. As construction progressed, Mr. Lee decided to partition the space and add a bed, creating a private area intended to serve as an office or a guest space. Recognizing the potential for family members like his brother or mother to visit and use the space, Mr. Lee found that Alpine's current ordinance, which restricts guest houses to properties of at least five acres, rendered such use non-compliant for his 2.5-acre lot. Mr. Lee argued that the existing restrictions seemed unreasonable, particularly given that his property's substantial size and location within Three Falls ensured minimal to no impact on neighbors. He pointed out that his property had ample off-street parking and was surrounded by extensive open space, diminishing any potential concerns over density or traffic. Mr. Lee emphasized that the sticking point with his property was not the physical specs of the building but rather its permitted use, highlighting the perceived incongruity between the ordinance's requirements and his property's characteristics. In advocating for the ordinance change, Mr. Lee noted that the current prohibition felt excessive for sizable properties like his and suggested that a reasonable reduction in the minimum lot size requirement for guest houses would better align with the capabilities and existing character of larger properties while still maintaining community standards.

Chair Macdonald stated the Three Falls CC&Rs stated that residents in Three Falls cannot build a guest house on their property unless their property is five acres in size; he wondered if it would be better to table this issue until the HOA changes their rules.

Mr. Lee contended the City needs to change the zoning in order for the HOA to have an opportunity to change their CC&Rs; the City's action is the "first domino to fall" before he has a chance of getting approval from the HOA.

Commissioner MacKay inquired about the criteria that define a structure as a "livable" guest house. Mr. Robinson explained that to be considered livable, a structure must have facilities for cooking, sanitation, and a full bath. Commissioner McKay highlighted that without a kitchen, a guest house would not meet the criteria for being fully livable despite having a bed. Mr. Robinson agreed that constructing a structure without a kitchen would not classify it as livable under the building code's stipulations.

Andrew Young raised concerns that approving the amendment could potentially allow about 46 additional homes in the Three Falls area and additional homes in the CR-40,000 zone if that standard was also changed in the future. While it may be desirable for some to build an ADU for their mother-in-law to eventually live in, most units of this type will be used as short term rental properties, which can be detrimental for a neighborhood. He suggested pursuing an exception for Mr. Lee's specific situation rather than changing the code broadly.

Sarah Blackwell asked about potential strain on the sewer system as a result of allowing additional detached buildings with bathroom facilities.

Chair Macdonald acknowledged the concerns expressed by Mr. Young and Ms. Blackwell but also noted that some property owners have been circumventing guest house restrictions by connecting separate guest structures to the main residence with small architectural features, such as a bridge, thus technically integrating them into the primary home footprint. This strategy allows people to include necessary amenities like kitchens and bathrooms, classifying the space as part of the main dwelling instead of a standalone building.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Schirmer asked if the proposed code amendment would allow any property owner with a two-acre lot size to build an accessory building. Mr. Robinson presented the zoning map again and indicated that any lot between two and five acres in size could be affected by the zone change.

During high level discussion among the Council, Commissioner John McKay suggested that allowing guest houses on two-acre lots would be a proactive measure to align Alpine's ordinances with potential future State mandates concerning accessory dwelling units (ADUs). He indicated that the state legislature has shown interest in enforcing policies to expand housing options, which includes making municipalities accommodate attached and detached ADUs on smaller lot sizes. He implied that by reducing the lot size requirement from five acres to two for guest houses, Alpine could preemptively comply with these anticipated state directives, thereby minimizing conflict and ensuring consistency with evolving housing regulations.

Commissioner Whittenburg raised concerns about traffic and the potential for property owners to build vacation rental properties if the lot size requirement for guest houses is reduced. She highlighted that even with five-acre lots, there might still be traffic issues, suggesting that reducing the requirement to two acres could exacerbate these concerns. Mr. Robinson stated the City has ordinances addressing short term rental

properties, but enforcement of those ordinances is sometimes difficult due to State regulations regarding the land use.

MOTION: Planning Commission member John MacKay moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.23.060 Guest Houses.

Troy Slade seconded the motion. There were 3 Ayes and 4 Nays (recorded below). The motion failed.

<u>Ayes:</u>	<u>Nays:</u>	<u>Excused</u>
John Mackay	Michelle Schirmer	
Troy Slade	Greg Butterfield	
Alan Macdonald	Susan Whittenburg	
	Jeff Davis	

MOTION: Planning Commission member Jeff Davis moved to recommend Denial of the proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.23.060 Guest Houses.

Michelle Schirmer seconded the motion. There were 4 Ayes and 3 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u>Ayes:</u>	<u>Nays:</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Michelle Schirmer	John MacKay	
Greg Butterfield	Troy Slade	
Susan Whittenburg	Alan Macdonald	
Jeff Davis		

E. Public Hearing: Proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.18.080 (Senior Housing Overlay Zone) to comply with State requirements regarding the subdivision review process.

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson reviewed the existing language in Alpine Development Code 3.18.080, which outlines the review process after a development is approved within the Senior Housing Overlay Zone. The current local code language does not fully align with the review procedures required under Utah Code 10-20-805, which governs the municipal approval process for development-related petitions. The proposed amendments are intended to bring Alpine Development Code procedures into compliance with State Law while preserving the policy intent of the Senior Housing Overlay Zone.

Chair Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Andrew Young, resident, asked if this proposal is a result is a State requirement. Mr. Robinson stated that the code amendment will bring the City into compliance with State requirements relative to the subdivision review process. Mr. Young asked if the ultimate result of this code amendment is that the Planning Commission and City Council will not determine what takes place in the Senior Housing Overlay Zone. Mr. Robinson answered no and indicated an applicant will still need to follow the rezone process; the proposed amendment would remove the outdated language and simply state that subdivisions must be approved in accordance with Alpine City's subdivision ordinance.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Planning Commission member Susan Whittenburg moved to recommend approval of the Proposed amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.18.080 (Senior Housing Overlay Zone).

Jeff Davis seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u>Ayes:</u>	<u>Nays:</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Michelle Schirmer		
John MacKay		
Troy Slade		
Greg Butterfield		
Alan Macdonald		
Susan Whittenburg		
Jeff Davis		

F. Public Hearing: Potential amendment to Alpine Development Code 3.08.050 to allow the City Council to grant setback exceptions within the Public Facility Zone when justified by circumstances.

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson explained Alpine City recently established the Public-Facility (P-F) Zone to provide development standards for properties owned or operated by public entities, including the City, County, and Schools. The proposed code amendment incorporates language similar to setback provisions in the Business Commercial Zone, allowing a public entity to request reduced setbacks subject to Planning Commission review and City Council approval. This amendment introduces reasonable flexibility where unique site characteristics or operational needs justify a deviation, while ensuring that any reduction is formally reviewed and approved by the governing body.

Chair Macdonald opened the public hearing.

Andrew Young, resident, sought clarification on the limitations of the setback reductions. Mr. Robinson confirmed the code amendment would not allow reductions below 18 feet and would only apply to corner lots. Mr. Young asked for an example of a situation where a setback exception would be granted. Mr. Robinson stated an exception may be considered for the City's Fire Station or a pump house on City property.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Planning Commission member Jeff Davis moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Alpine Development Code 3.08.050 Location Requirements in the Public Facility Zone, based on the findings that the amendment provides necessary flexibility for public facilities and remains consistent with the P-F Zone.

Michelle Schirmer seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

<u>Ayes:</u>	<u>Nays:</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Michelle Schirmer		
John MacKay		
Troy Slade		
Greg Butterfield		
Alan Macdonald		
Susan Whittenburg		
Jeff Davis		

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Assistant City Administrator/Planner Robinson informed the Commission that the Main Street master plan draft had been received and would be distributed to Commission members by Friday, with a public hearing

planned for the first January meeting. He also reminded the Commission of the Christmas dinner scheduled for December 9, 2025. 5

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: November 18, 2025

MOTION: Planning Commissioner Susan Whittenburg moved to approve the minutes for November 18, 2025, as written.

John MacKay seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes: **Nays:** **Excused:**

Michelle Schirmer
Troy Slade
Susan Whittenburg
John MacKay
Greg Butterfield
Alan Macdonald
Jeff Davis

MOTION: Planning Commission member Susan Whittenburg moved to adjourn the meeting.

Troy Slade seconded the motion. There were 7 Ayes and 0 Nays (recorded below). The motion passed.

Ayes: **Nays:** **Excused:**

Michelle Schirmer
Troy Slade
Susan Whittenburg
John MacKay
Greg Butterfield
Alan Macdonald
Jeff Davis

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.