

LA VERKIN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

Wednesday, December 10, 2025, 6:00 pm.

City Council Chambers, 111 South Main Street

La Verkin, Utah 84745

Present: Chair: Allen Bice, Commissioners: Kyson Spendlove, Sherman Howard, and John Valenti; Staff: Derek Imlay, Fay Reber, and Nancy Cline.

A. Call to Order: Allen Bice called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

The invocation and Pledge of Allegiance were given by Allen Bice

B. Approval of Agenda:

The motion was made by Commissioner John Valenti to approve the agenda, second by Commissioner Sherman Howard. Spendlove-yes, Sherman Howard-yes, Valenti-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Approval of Minutes: November 12, 2025, regular meetings.

The motion was made by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove to approve the Minutes for November 12, 2025, second by Commissioner John Valenti. Spendlove-yes, Valenti-yes, Sherman Howard-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Reports:

1. Commissioner Bice suggested that La Verkin city could adopt a city motto or city model. Such as "We can agree to disagree without being disagreeable". Orem City motto was "In God we trust". He suggested a city motto could encourage people to be civil while getting their ideas out there.

2. City Council and Director of Operations

Councilwoman Wise reported on the December 3, 2025, city council meeting.

Derek Imlay reported on what the January meetings would involve. The first one would be different types of signages, it could be off-premises signs. Signage like the RV resort and the Hot Springs. Where the business is tucked away enough that they wanted to get a little bit more visual advertising. At least directions to the Hot Springs. They came up with a list of potential signs that could be posted and give directions. Second is setbacks. The new studies coming out show that front yards are no longer applicable as far as where kids want to play because they can be deemed unsafe. The backyard is where kids play. We've talked in the past about potentially bringing the front edges forward. He suggested two different ways. There's potential to bring the living portion of the house forward to 15-foot setbacks. The garage would stay 25 feet because we don't want the cars to get out onto the sidewalk. Our code, which desperately needs a lot of work, has three ways to apply setbacks. One from the back of the curb, one's from the back of the sidewalk. He tried to put it to where if it went from the back curb and set back to the ground, it'd have to be 30 feet. They can't use that first four to five feet of sidewalk, or a parkable area. If we go from back to sidewalk, then it'd be 25 feet. So basically, that's just showing the examples of what we have, and that would be applicable to all the residential areas that we've got. The second paper is what Brad puts together. We found we were in pretty bad shape as far as our commercial zones. Particular attention was brought forth when The Fields did what they did, which was according to code, but the number of buildings that we were able to put on that land was a big deal for everybody. We have put proposing language that we can add to our zones that would restrict the number of buildings, setbacks, separation between buildings, open space,

which would be completely different than parking. He only applied it to the general commercial and the retail commercial. He excluded tourist, resort, or luxury resorts. There's some language to look through and start to include so that we can somewhat regulate the number of buildings that there are on a piece of property. There are codes that need to be addressed probably sooner rather than later and then just update on upcoming projects which are going to affect the entire city. Over the next year we won't have a single road that's not tore up. Between the pond project that will be running water from the treatment plant over to a pond site on interstate rocks property phase one. He thought that there would be seven million gallons in the pond. It will run from the reuse plant down 370 which is in Riverwood phases one and two. Then up to about where the four plexuses are underneath the road over to the Interstate rocks property. Then down 740 and straight up and then we'll have two lines that will go down almost to the pit area. Then it'll come all the way up to 500. We're separating the line that we share with the conservancy district. Once it is at 500 north our lines combine into one line. We're doing that so we can separate the lines out.

Commissioner Bice asked if it would be pumped by the city or the district.

Derek replied that it would be Ash creek or the conservancy district that will pump to the pond by Ash creek. And then the pond and all the maintenance will be the conservancy district. Until it goes into our pump station where we'll pump it and send it back into the city. The other one we're hoping to run right after or during is the \$13 million irrigation project. Basically, replace the majority of all the backyard lines in the street. Taking care of a lot of the main lines, especially the one on 100 east where it's still shallow. Liability is alleviated from the city and gets it out to where it needs to be. We have to shut off large sections as we use it, because of the way it's set up. We also have the lead and copper. The federal government gave us until 2030 to take care of all the lead and copper issues that we had, at least on the city side. And then in 2035, the homeowner's side would assume that most homeowners would replace the main line. We received a \$2.2 million grant loan, 70-30% loan, low interest over 20 years. The majority is located in the Stoll's area, and there are some other scattered areas, that will be coming up as we release a lot of these other projects. Then we have the storm drain project that we'll be doing at 300 South. It's part of the study that was done, and this is the first phase. We'll take drainage basically from filtering underneath the highway, it will go down through South, and to Main Street. It will branch off and go down 100 South, that will be the first phase of it. Eventually, it will go up above Kerry Gubler's and Micah's house, run along 100 East. We're trying to get less drainage coming towards the South. The city will be torn up in that time and people need to be patient.

Councilman Sherman Howard asked if they will be asphaltting the road after or just patching them.

Derek replied they would be patching them. He predicted there might be road failure after all that digging. He feels overall the roads are kept up well in the city.

E. Business:

1. 1. Presentation, discussion and possible action to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026 regarding Ordinance No 2025-07. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAVERKIN CITY CODE FOR ALLOWANCE OF SHORT-TERM RENTAL IN DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS ("DADUs"); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Commissioner Bice expressed he has not been a real fan of doing that, of having that ordinance, but perhaps the Planning Commission is the right place to have a public hearing about it. The City Council can get that information before it comes before them for a vote. I'm just a little conflicted on, the "where as" in an ordinance. He asked if anyone read it.

Fay counseled that the substance of the Ordinance is the crucial part. If you agree on the amendment to the ordinance and set it for public hearing, we'll go back between now and then and clean up the "whereas". Those are wrong so he counseled not worry too much about that right now.

Derek added that he doesn't usually put in the "where as" to an Ordinance for planning commission. They will change according to what happens in the planning commission. He apologized that it said they approved it when they do not. It would state what the vote is.

Commissioner Bice was glad it would change because he is against it. The ordinance is fairly simple. It just adds short-term rental as an approval for anything 10,000 square feet or larger.

Derek added that he got some phone calls about the square footage limit that have 8,000 square foot piece of property that a DADU would fit. There is a minimum of 250 and up to third of the size of actual layout of the property coincides with the eight percent of accessory buildings on your property. He constructed a diagram with an 8,000 square foot lot with a DADU, and parking. It met the requirements.

Commissioner Bice commented he attended the League of Cities and Towns. He went to one of the presentations and Heber City has a subordinate dwelling unit clause where they can have postage stamp size lots with narrow access to the street with a minimum of 800 square foot apartments, trying to solve the affordable housing problem. They also approve mission-style apartments, so that it looks like a big house, has just one front door, but are apartments inside. It's not looking like a bunch of tiny apartments, although it is. Ephraim has a transition zone. The smallest lot can be 3,000 square feet with setback adjustments and rear entry, so they have an alleyway in the back, trying to solve their affordable housing problem. Mill Creek allows affordable housing in all zones. And all of those have them specified that they can't be vacation rentals in perpetuity, so forever, trying to solve their affordable housing problem. And it seems like this is the opposite. So, every one of these that becomes a vacation rental no longer will be affordable housing. It'll be a little patch of commercial in our residential. He read his statement. He had a serious concern about allowing short-term rentals, 29 days or less, in detached Accessory dwelling units in La Verkin City. One of the most serious challenges right now is a lack of affordable housing. There's a financial disincentive for builders to make smaller houses, La Verkin is attempting to create a R-1-6 zone hoping that smaller lots will result in smaller and more affordable houses. A better solution would be to encourage residents to offer attached accessory dwelling units as long-term rentals or mother-in-law housing for family or others who are struggling with affordability. Allowing those detached ADUs to be vacation rentals financially disincentivizes homeowners from making them affordable long-term rentals and will exacerbate not alleviate our affordable housing crisis. Having backyards and residential zones become commercial spaces will adversely affect the nature of the neighborhood. No matter how careful homeowners are about screening and policing their guests, there's a difference between how we treat property and neighbors in a short-term hotel room and how we treat them where we live. Having vacation units in backyards will increase the resale value of that property, which will increase the assessed value of the property around it. And neighbors, many of whom are on fixed incomes, will pay more in property taxes. Vacation properties cause dramatically more infrastructure impact. In commercial zones, the business owners pay for that increased impact through higher taxes and fees. In residential zones, other citizens who get no financial benefit will have to pay for the increased impact on utilities and services. If La Verkin proceeds to allow vacation rentals in residential zones, we will create a situation from which we cannot go back. Profiting a few affluent enough to invest in them at the expense of the rest of the residents. He thought it most unwise and urge the City Council to carefully consider the unforeseen ramifications of opening this particular Pandora's box.

Commissioner Valenti agreed with commissioner Bice. This has been an ongoing issue with the City. We've closed out people on waiting lists that have wanted vacation rentals. We're hunting down people that have done them illegally. And it just seemed to him to be under this plan that better than half the city could have a DADU vacation rental if they really wanted one. He felt it would be going in the wrong direction.

Commissioner Sherman Howard added this could overpopulate the vacation rentals in the city. Then what will happen to the empty rentals. However, he doesn't like the idea of taking away too many of the property owners' rights and managing everything that they do. He likes the idea of some vacation rentals if they're ownership isn't a business/corporation but La Verkin citizens that profit from them. He would like to consider size too, if it's big enough where it needs to have a sprinkler system then it's definitely too big. It would be a place where it becomes a big party place, the smaller ones are pretty quiet and could benefit the property owners

Commissioner Spendlove added that he sees both sides. He sees a benefit for the people that live there that may need extra money, because you can make more money with short-term rentals. He has a couple that are in his neighborhood that whether they're legal or not they come and go and you don't know who is there. You start adding a lot more vehicles to the area. It's hard because we went so in-depth on this last time that it's really hard to try to bring it back up and say that he still doesn't agree that we should be pushing back through this. Residential should stay residential. There are spots where we can do short-term rentals that make more sense and allow us to do residential. He asked if in the past they required space between short term rentals.

Commissioner Bice replied that Hurricane city does that.

Commissioner Spendlove continued to say that he sees a benefit to allow it occasionally, or it's a first-come, first-served, because then it doesn't allow every person to have it. When we originally discussed this, his whole concern was, let's say we do allow short-term rentals again, and we have, in our previous discussions, discussed if the homeowner lives on site, that we would consider that to be more short-term rental not for the commercial companies to buy. The hard part is when they're not home. My sister has a short-term rental, and she's not home. They can party, do whatever they want, and the neighbors can complain, but that person's not home. So, if we were to go back down this route, he thought they needed to look at that side of things and consider some sort of fee if the property owner isn't managing and taking care of these people.

Commissioner Sherman Howard asked if it encourages citizens to run an illegal rental if they can't have one. If they can have one there will be more competition and it might fix itself.

Commissioner Valenti added that before we did this fifteen percent or seven percent or ten percent and what it was meant to do is balance out the influence of those in neighborhoods under the new plan we could end up with pockets of R-1-10 pockets R-1-14 we could end up with 20, 30, or 40 in one area which would be like a mini vacation village. It's not going to work we keep trying to put artificial pieces in place to control it but at the same time we're stripping other people of rights to have one. If we're going to open that up everybody should be able to do with their property what they want to do with their property. If we pare it down in the way we're doing it just picks winners and losers, and he didn't think it's an effective way to zone the city.

Commissioner Spendlove commented that houses in Hurricane, that he builds, 99 % of the homes have some sort of live in. They want to call them mother-in-law suites or whatever. It was concerning to him.

Commissioner Sherman Howard added that the city has already increased the business license fees for short term rentals to cover the problems. It was \$45 now, it's \$200.

Commissioner Valenti added that councilwoman Wise said the look at the people that have them and are making extra money. But people that live right next door are going to suffer because it's going to drive up the property value, their taxes. It's going to limit resources that the city is already short on.

Commissioner Bice replied they are being charged like a commercial entity and in these backyards that won't be the case and they'll impact the infrastructure use. Short term rentals are charged commercial rates for electric and water but that won't be the case for the DADU.

Derek added that he realized they were trying to pass the DADU onto the commercial side and city council threw that out. All these have to be ran on the same utilities and the owner does have to live on site

Commissioner Valenti commented that he has a bed and breakfast in back of his property. And the owners live there and it doesn't affect the crowds from coming.

Derek added that he isn't for or against it he is getting pressure to get it to the next level. They are required to have a business license. City Council didn't really take the planning commissions advice on vacation rentals the first time and this has been a sore spot ever since.

Commissioner Bice commented that the decision tonight is to set a public hearing for the way it is currently written. If we refuse to and then the City Council have the right to their own public hearing. The concern is if we have the public hearing, they'll have an opportunity to review it if they choose and hear what the public has to say about it. Oft times we have had our public hearing and then proceeded with the motion five minutes later which is human nature to do.

Commissioner Valenti replied that it would be his preference to send it to city council without a public hearing.

Derek advised that they have to have a public hearing in planning commission not city council.

Fay added that typically the planning commission wants to discuss something they'll hold a public hearing but if you reach a point where you don't want to discuss this anymore and we just want the council to take care of it. Then the city council can in fact hold a public hearing on something anytime.

Commissioner Spendlove suggested they have a public hearing and hear the public's comment, and if we don't agree with the public or with city council, we can still recommend it for denial from planning commission. They're still going to make their choice. But at least we've got the residents and the citizens coming and we can hear their ideas, and ultimately still make that decision. It sounds like from what's going on, it doesn't always get heard.

Commissioner Sherman Howard asked if they could delay their decision until the next meeting.

Commissioner Bice asked if he meant to delay the decision until the meeting after the public hearing.

Commissioner Spendlove explained they would hold a public hearing, but then possibly if we're concerned, then we can table the action.

Commissioner Bice explained at the League of Cities and Towns they discussed public meetings. One of the mayors said after their public hearing, it's written into their agenda, that they'll discuss it but take no action that meeting. Which looks better, except for when they're required by a deadline to do that.

Fay asked if in January there would be new appointments to the planning commission.

Derek replied they would reappoint Allen Bice and replace John Valenti.

Fay thought because this is a matter of some importance to the city and the Planning Commission has strong feelings. His suggestion would be that they continue this to the next meeting until we can have all of our planning commission members here to share the discussion. Including anybody who's appointed and that way you can then at that point, if you decide you want to, you can then set up for a public hearing for the next

meeting. Then you'll have the benefit of the comments from all planning commission members making that decision.

Commissioner Sherman Howard liked the idea of not taking action right after the public hearing but making the decisions the meeting after.

Commissioner Bice agreed and said at his meeting the mayors had a lot of positive feedback in proceeding that way. Like the commission took time to think about what the public had to say, and it was more polite.

Fay commented that there is nothing making them take action right after a public hearing. You can, again, continue it to the next meeting for further deliberation, further consideration, based on what you've heard. It may change a few minds, or it may strengthen your feelings.

Commissioner Bice added that as it turns out, any member of this commission can recommend we table things and then we vote on tabling it anytime we're discussing anything. Staff can say it appears to us that you don't have as much information as you should and recommend that we table. He thought it was a good idea to table this until a bigger quorum was present.

The motion was made by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove to table Ordinance No. 2025-07 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAVERKIN CITY CODE FOR ALLOWANCE OF SHORT-TERM RENTAL IN DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS ("DADUs"); AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE until next planning commission meeting, second by Commissioner John Valenti. Spendlove-yes, Valenti-yes, Sherman Howard-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Presentation, discussion, and possible action to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026 regarding the Ordinance No. 2025-08. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LaVERKIN CITY CODE, BY REMOVING, ADDING / INSERTING THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND DEFINITIONS TO SECTION 10-1-6: AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Derek explained that on the accessory dwelling unit, the accessory building and the accessory structure, there were some questions on the water and sewer. He would take that one out.

Commissioner Valenti asked about there being a provision for detached accessory units. They just tabled that, but will it be allowed in this one?

Derek replied that unless we take that provision out there's one section in there on internal dwellings. We need to fix it right now just for the fact that there is no definition of what attached is. If someone has a 40 foot two by four shed in the back without attaching it. We're starting to get those people that are thinking outside the box. We could potentially take out this definition and then we can do it at the same time as when we go down that other road with the rest of the definitions.

Fay asked if they would take paragraph C out to accommodate that.

Derek replied yes. The structure for units physically. The building has shared wall, roof, and floors. It includes the door providing interior access for the standalone building. The problem that we have is that people are trying to make that connection on a detached unit.

Commissioner Bice is familiar with the case in Hurricane that they attached the unit with an angle iron, not two-by-four. Maybe the definition doesn't require us to say what it is. Maybe it doesn't require us to say what it's authorized to do. He asked if they wanted to make that motion with paragraph C out.

Derek replied yes because it clears up one issue we have had for a long time. So, we can take that out and pass the rest.

Commissioner Bice explained that it seems it still can be a definition without saying what it authorizes them to do, a definition of what the unit is.

The motion was made by Commissioner Sherman Howard to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026 conditioned on removing paragraph C, for Ordinance No. 2025-08. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LaVERKIN CITY CODE, BY REMOVING, ADDING / INSERTING THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND DEFINITIONS TO SECTION 10-1-6: AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE. second by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove. Spendlove-yes, Valenti-yes, Sherman Howard-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Presentation, discussion, and possible action to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026 regarding the Ordinance No. 2025-09. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LaVERKIN CITY CODE BY ADDING / INSERTING THE FOLLOWING PROVISION AND DEFINITIONS TO SECTION 10-7-21:
INTERNAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (IADU'S)

Derek explained that paragraph C must be attached to the C definition. Does the definition comply? We're doing the initial section of "whereas" definitions that are only for a singular purpose. The detached definition should go into the definition with the detached. This is basically moving that definition that we're going to have a public hearing on.

Commissioner Bice commented that at his business he has a groomer next door and she has a power meter, but it's just for me to look at how much power she's using. Does this, on page 3B, prohibit the installation of a separate utility meter for an ADU. Would it prohibit that so that the city never reads it? He had one put in so he could see how much power part of my business was using. Could somebody put that there to see how much their vacation rental was used or does this prohibit that.

Derek replied that it brings up another grey area. If the metering at the end is going to be off of the primary meter, and your kind of acting as your own sub-utility.

Commissioner Bice replied he shares the power bill with them depending on how much they use.

Derek replied that he didn't think that our code, the way it sits now, is not allowed for water. You can't put a separate meter after a meter, and you can't act as your own utility. He said it is a loophole. You could say you're still running off of one meter, but you're subtracting how much they're using. Citizens aren't supposed to act as their own utilities. It's kind of the way the code reads now. I don't know, there's so much gray in all these areas. He personally wouldn't have any issues going through that because you're still having one primary unit being read by the utility. You're just tracking it for yourself.

Commissioner Bice asked if this required them to share a floor and a wall.

Derek explained that it can be a room, it can be upstairs, it can be downstairs, but it has to literally be part of the house. Interstate Rock has done a beautiful job. If you look down there in Cottonwood Hollow, they've incorporated this into the house to where there's an exterior door that goes into it, but there's an interior door that still makes it connect with the inside of the house, which meets the definition of the internal. It has to be part of the house. You can't add something on. It's a problem when people are trying to get around the code. He brought a map up last time on how they were finding ways to work around that. That's why we have to be a little bit more deliberate by the definition of attached.

The motion was made by Commissioner John Valenti to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026, regarding the Ordinance No. 2025-09. AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LAVERKIN CITY CODE BY ADDING / INSERTING THE FOLLOWING PROVISION AND DEFINITIONS TO SECTION 10-7-21: INTERNAL ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (IADU'S) second by Commissioner Sherman Howard. Spendlove-yes, Valenti-yes, Sherman Howard-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Presentation, discussion, and possible action to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026 regarding the Ordinance No. 2025-10. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAVERKIN, UTAH, AMENDING THE MODIFYING REGULATIONS IN SECTION 10-6A-5 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-1-8), SECTION 10-6B-5 (ONE AND TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-1-10), SECTION 10-6C-5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-3-6), SECTION 10-6D-5 (RESIDENTIAL-AGRICULTURAL R-A-1), AND SECTION 10-6D-5 (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL R-1-14) OF THE LAVERKIN CITY CODE

Commissioner Bice explained that just talks about adjusting the setbacks. Going to five feet if no utilities exist and seven and a half feet if utilities exist in the setback. It's the same thing for all of those zones and cleans it up. Because it ought to have been that way. It keeps people from building right on the property line.

Derek gave a little history. The way the code works now is if you're 10 feet away from the house, you'd be within 2 feet of the property line. If you're on a corner you'd be 2 feet. The problem that we've been having now is when we didn't have as many outsiders moving in, people didn't really have a problem with the eaves extending over and it drops a lot of water onto the neighbors. There were two buildings that caught fire last year. That house was 2 feet off on his side and the other guy was 2 feet off. So his house caught on fire and caused a fire on the other side. It caused a lot of concern with breaking the fire code. We have approved the fire code even though most of the fire code is done by the Hurricane Valley Fire District. There are still requirements we have to do. He felt that moving it five feet back if there's no utilities and in parts of town where we have utilities, which with this irrigation project may take away some setbacks, because we can move houses. There's still power in some backyards. Some backyards make it bad for us because we have to go there and repair something. They have built a really nice shed there and our utilities are underneath it. Then we're going to take out what we need to take out to make the repair and then it's left up the owner to fix it. He didn't like being put in a position that we have to do that and then they get to bear the cost. If we can prohibit it by, pushing them outside the easement that we already have it could alleviate that. He actually pulled five feet off of each corner in the back there in the blue, and 10 feet away from that, it still gave ample room to park a vehicle. We could maybe still allow it to be within three feet if we fire-aided the assembly, which would be no open windows within the first five feet. For somebody that wants to build a shed, or something like that he thought this was the easiest way to do it. He didn't think it was going to hurt anybody. He tried this out on about 10 spots around on the smaller lots and it worked. If we stick with the five to protect ourselves with the code that we're required to enforce and keep them off the utilities. He doesn't want to be the one to come in and tear somebody's stuff up. He felt the biggest battle with citizens is draining. The dynamics have changed so much. When everybody knew everybody, it wasn't so bad. Now almost four or five times a week that we're getting complaints about his sprinklers running too long and coming into their property. We need to start toughening up our ordinance. It's hard on staff because we have to send somebody out every time. Right now he has one guy that's almost a full-time plumber, that's all he does. He felt if they clean it up the city is in a good position to not hurt people later on.

Commissioner Bice added that this is only for new construction. Everyone else is grandfathered in.

The motion was made by Commissioner John Valenti to set a public hearing for January 14, 2026, regarding the Ordinance No. 2025-10. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF LAVERKIN, UTAH, AMENDING THE MODIFYING REGULATIONS IN SECTION 10-6A-5 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-1-8), SECTION 10-6B-5 (ONE AND TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-1-10),

SECTION 10-6C-5 (MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-3-6), SECTION 10-6D-5 (RESIDENTIAL-AGRICULTURAL R-A-1), AND SECTION 10-6D-5 (LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL R-1-14) OF THE LAVERKIN CITY CODE, second by Commissioner Kyson Spendlove. Spendlove-yes, Valenti-yes, Sherman Howard-yes. The motion carried unanimously.

F. Adjourn:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

15 Jan 26

Date Approved

Alber Buel

Planning Commission Chair

