

**Town of Hideout
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
10860 North Hideout Trail
Hideout, Utah
May 16, 2019**

Present: Jerry Dwinell, Chair
Sara Goldkind
Kurt Shadle, Alternate
Vytas Rupinkas
Ralph Severini (via telephone)
Bruce Woelfle

Others: Dan Dansie, Town Attorney (via telephone)
Jan McCosh, Town Administrator

BUSINESS MEETING

1. OPENING:

a. Call to Order.

Chair Jerry Dwinell called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

b. Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Dwinell led the Pledge.

c. Roll Call.

There was a roll call of those present.

2. PUBLIC HEARING: Zoning Change Petition for Van Dan Acker Property (Lake View Resort) from Mountain to Single-Family Residential.

The applicant, Nate Brockbank, reported that the subject property is located between the two Deer Water phases, and would include 112 townhome units. The property is owned by the Van Dan Acker's who were present. An open house was held early in May to which 15 people were in attendance. The invitation included the plat map. They are planning to develop two or three lots together that are 5,000 to 6,000 square feet in size. They will have 25 feet of front yard, 20 feet of backyard, and two 10-foot side yards. Every third lot will have at least 30 feet of open space between the lots.

Chair Dwinell identified Deer Water Phases 1 and 2 on a map displayed. It was confirmed that 34.25% open space is proposed. He reminded the Commission that there are two reasons the Code allows for what is proposed. The first is that it furthers the goals of the General Plan. The second

1 is that substantial changes have been made to the property or the surrounding property that make
2 it reasonable to rezone. Chair Dwinell did not think the second applies but the first would. With
3 a rezone, they should look for ways to advance the goals of the General Plan.
4

5 Chair Dwinell reported that the second item on the agenda is zone definition changes that will be
6 forthcoming. He expected a few to impact this property. Nate is asking for single-family
7 residential, which would not fit under the new definition. It would, however, fit under Residential
8 Medium-Density. Nate was asked to incorporate other aspects of the zone as well such as a 25-
9 foot offset rather than 20 feet and minimum driveway lengths of 25 feet. There are offset
10 requirements as well. As drawn, all of the buildings are lined up parallel to the road. What they
11 are asking for in the new zoning and for Nate to incorporate into the plan was either a five-foot
12 offset difference from the neighboring home or at least a 15 degree tilt off of the road.
13

14 Chair Dwinell explained that the zone is not yet re-defined, but they want to do something similar
15 to what was done with the Plumb property where they put a deed restriction in place that specified
16 what was desired as a condition of the rezoning. Nate mentioned earlier that he had lost some
17 density, which was likely due to the changes. The proposed changes were described, which would
18 include a water feature and an open space area. Nate stated that the intent was to create a park-
19 like feel. He noted that most of the lots will have lake views. The possibility was mentioned of
20 joining Deer Water to Lake View to provide another egress point. Nate stated that he met with the
21 builder in Deer Water who wanted to keep them separate. If it is required, however, it can be done.
22

23 Chair Dwinell stated that currently in the SFR zone the density can be up to six units per acre. The
24 Commission is looking to change that to three ERUs (Equivalent Residential Unit per acre). The
25 Residential Medium-Density zone would be six ERUs. The building height in RMD would be
26 reduced as well. With regard to egress, it will be up to the Fire District as to whether it is required.
27

28 In response to a question by Chair Dwinell, Nate stated that a playground, park area, and trails are
29 planned. They will make trail connections where they are able. Chair Dwinell reported that Nate
30 would be asked to work with the Parks and Trails Committee to design something that helps further
31 those goals. Nate reiterated their commitment to trails.
32

33 Chair Dwinell remarked that Nate has requested that both Deer Water, and potentially the proposed
34 development, be included in the MIDA project. Nate described the process and stated that they
35 are seeking to be added into what is essentially a taxing district. MIDA typically receives 70%
36 and the developer gets 30%. In this case, the Town would receive 35%, MIDA would get 35%,
37 and the developer would get 30% of the tax revenues. The proposed project equates to \$3 million
38 to the Town with funds not being received until the homes are built. Over a 25-year period, the
39 Town will receive the tax revenues. Chair Dwinell explained that if the property were rezoned
40 and development were to occur, there would be a financial benefit to the Town.
41

42 Renderings of the proposed homes were displayed. Nate reported that three years ago they had
43 the property under contract and planned to develop townhomes. The project did not come to
44 fruition and they decided not to pursue more townhomes in the Town. They are now proposing
45 single-family homes in the \$600,000 to \$700,000 price range. The Council expressed a desire for
46 mountain modern contemporary style homes rather than traditional. The homes will be 2,200 to

1 2,600 square feet in size. If they have basements, the homes will be around 3,800 square feet in
2 size. He noted that they are significantly larger than the townhomes. There will be three separate
3 renderings of each building so they will not all look the same.

4
5 Zoning issues were discussed. Ralph Severini asked about the proposed zone change that would
6 result in an additional five-foot setback. It was noted that the front setback in the zone is defined
7 as 20 feet. The minimum driveway length is also 20 feet. The desire was to increase the length to
8 25 feet to accommodate a full-size extended cab pickup. The potential of extending the side yards
9 by five feet was also mentioned. Commissioner Severini considered that important to the Town.

10
11 With regard to revenue generation of \$3 million, it was noted that there would be a ramp up period.
12 There would be very little generated the first five years but would increase over time as
13 development occurs and more tax money comes in. Nate described the benefits of being part of
14 MIDA and stated that provides a windfall for everyone. Utopia is currently putting lines around
15 Jordanelle Reservoir but will run the lines from Highway 40 to Hideout. In Deer Water Phase 1,
16 they recently opened the power trench and Utopia was coming up on Monday to put in the conduit.

17
18 It was confirmed that the building heights will be approximately 28 feet. Currently the height
19 restriction is 35 feet to maintain viewsheds. For Residential Single-Family it is 35 feet or 2 ½
20 stories, whichever is greater. Nate reported that the homes that have been built are 28 feet tall.
21 Currently, there was no proposal to lower the building heights. As part of the next agenda item,
22 there was discussion of a new Protected Viewshed zone that would include additional
23 requirements.

24
25 In response to a question of slope, it was noted that it will be presented with the next phase. The
26 General Plan addresses providing a balance of types of homes. Commissioner Rupinkas was of
27 the opinion that the town had gone too far in allowing so many townhomes. The General Plan
28 stipulates that a balance of home types is required. He was of the opinion that Nate and the Van
29 Dan Ackers are making the appropriate action by going with detached single-family. From a
30 General Plan standpoint, he believed it provides balance. It was noted that there is nothing
31 currently in Hideout that is even remotely similar to what is proposed in this price range.

32
33 Chair Dwinell proposed that the request be amended slightly to be a rezone to Residential Medium-
34 Density with the following deed restrictions: A 25-foot minimum front setback, 25-foot minimum
35 driveway length, and a five-foot or 15-degree offset from any neighboring building or road. It was
36 clarified that the zone exists, but the definitions were to be amended.

37
38 Commission Severini commented that there would be value to the Town and to these single-family
39 homeowners if there was greater side setback, which would provide 10 additional feet and result
40 in a better view. Another metric could be entertained that addresses the minimum distance between
41 buildings. That would not impact the side setback or affect the open space. It does, however,
42 specify that a building cannot be placed directly on the setback line. The developer designed the
43 project with the open space between the lots.

44
45 Ralph Severini suggested the side setback remain in its current location and add another metric
46 that would apply to the zone and specify the minimum distance from any neighboring building. It

1 was noted that the way the homes are being built, the second home creates a huge space between
2 two lots and the other two homes have almost no space because the intent is to get as high up on
3 the lot as possible to get the best view. The only way to protect the first lot owner on the higher
4 end is to have a larger setback or a minimum distance or angle showing how the second home
5 would be built.

6
7 The question was raised as to whether any part of the discussion should pertain to a deed restriction
8 separate from the zone discussion. Sara Goldkind's understanding was that the zoning can only
9 be changed based on what already exists. Residential Medium-Density zoning exists currently. In
10 order to modify it for this project, it would be in the form of a deed restriction. There was previous
11 mention of what might be the New Residential Medium-Density zoning requirement, but they were
12 not yet known. It seemed to Commissioner Goldkind that the only way to do them properly was
13 to specify that it would be approved under the current existing Residential Medium Density with
14 appropriate deed restrictions. It could be zoned as Single-Family Residential with deed
15 restrictions, but that if we rezoned to Residential Medium-Density there would be no need to
16 rezone the property in the future.

17
18 Commissioner Rupinkas was concerned about operating in that manner. Chair Dwinell explained
19 that we are trying to clean up the zoning and have a few exceptions as possible. In the long term,
20 we don't want to have to reference an exception list to determine what's permissible in an area.
21 Another option would be to rezone the property after the zone definitions are final; and grandfather
22 in anything that doesn't match the new zone. The developers, however, would have to agree. The
23 point was made that the rezone is essentially an MDA and both parties would have to agree to it.
24 Some will, but the intent is to clean up the zoning.

25
26 Commissioner Rupinkas commented that the zoning as it exists does not make sense. Nate's
27 project, however, is coming in in the midst of this change. He did not think that issues like the
28 ones identified by Commissioner Severini, which are valid, can be imposed on Nate unless he
29 agrees to it. Chair Dwinell commented that once the deed restrictions are voted on, they are
30 permanent. If the zoning is changed on Nate's property, he will be grandfathered in. For that
31 reason, it is important to agree on the major issues and include them in the deed restriction.

32
33 Nate explained that their plan is not going to change, and they can work with either option. In
34 looking toward, the future, Chair Dwinell commented that when the zone map is distributed, he
35 would want to eliminate as many aberrates as possible. He wanted to zone it today to fit future
36 needs.

37
38 The vision for the project was acknowledged with the understanding that a rezone is discretionary.
39 Possible options were discussed. It was noted that an MDA could be done in conjunction with a
40 rezone. The possibility of entering into a development agreement was discussed. Height issues
41 were discussed with the current maximum being 35 feet. Chair Dwinell commented that he and
42 the Mayor discussed how heights are measured. The desire was to standardize it and require it be
43 from the lowest point where the building meets the finished grade, to the highest roof line of the
44 building. Further, the measurement would be subject to review by the Planning Commission.

1 Commissioner Goldkind conducted research on the issue at the direction of the Mayor and stated
2 that it is very complicated. In different counties there are different ways of measuring building
3 height. In this case, it would be measured from finished grade. In speaking with the Town
4 Engineer and the Mayor the desire was to make sure that building height is always subject to
5 review.

6
7 In Deer Springs, two Town Representatives will be serving on the Design Review Committee.
8 The Commission likes to see something similar for this development. Chair Dwinell summarized
9 the rezoning request to Residential Medium Density with the following restrictions:

- 10
- 11 1. 25-foot minimum front setback.
- 12 2. 25-foot minimum driveway length.
- 13 3. Five-foot or 15-degree offset from the neighboring building or road.
- 14 4. Single-Family Detached only
- 15 5. Max ERU of six.
- 16 6. 35-foot maximum building height, subject to review.
- 17 7. DRC will consist of two Town officials.

18
19 It was suggested that the property be rezoned Residential Medium Density since it would most
20 match that zone after the zoning definitions are updated.

21
22 Chair Dwinell opened the public hearing.

23
24 Joel Van Dan Acker reported that his family owns the subject property and they like the concept
25 of single-family homes over townhomes or other options. He confirmed that the reason behind
26 increasing the length of the driveway from 20 feet to 25 feet was to accommodate a pickup truck.
27 It was noted that the truck measured was a Ford F-150 extended cab full bed length, which is ~23
28 feet. It is the longest production non-commercial vehicle. The increased setback and driveway
29 length is to support longer vehicles.

30
31 Mr. Van Dan Acker asked if there are other municipalities with similar requirements. Nate replied
32 that this was common in other developments. Mr. Van Dan Acker next inquired about the five-
33 foot offset difference or the 15-degree angle and was of the understanding that it decreases the
34 overall open space. He was informed that that is not the case but that a side setback change would.
35 The intent was to orient the building and improve the visual appeal. As part of Rustler Phase 1,
36 the homes are aligned with the street and in Phase 2 they are tilted, which creates a completely
37 different feel. Mr. Van Dan Acker expressed his support for the project to go forward with Nate.
38 If it doesn't go forward with Nate, they want to be able to attract other potential buyers. For that
39 reason, he was curious about the numbers and the proposed changes.

40
41 Dennis Van Dan Acker echoed the comments of his brother, Joel with regard to Nate and what
42 they are proposing. He was pleased with the vision of the Town and how they plan to accomplish
43 that vision. In the past it has been difficult, and this group has been very open and professional.
44 He and his siblings were confident working with the Town and Nate. Regardless of what is decided
45 on the issues, it will not limit their ability to sell the property. Mr. Van Dan Acker was informed
46 that if the Town agrees to the zone change, whatever the zone is today with the restrictions

1 overlaid, will be what they get. If any other changes are made to the zone definitions, they would
2 be grandfathered in.

3
4 It was suggested that if the Town agrees to the zone change, they want to make sure that the
5 restriction mechanism is tied to the zone change. The Town does not yet have its own design
6 review standards. It was stated that an MDA would be tied to the subdivision.

7
8 In response to a question raised, it was clarified that the currently defined maximum density for
9 Residential Medium Density is six to 20 units. In the new definition, there would no longer be a
10 range but simply a maximum. Currently, a home in Silver Sky that is zoned Single-Family
11 Residential has the zone's ERU, but also has an RSPA overlay, which alters the ERUs. The hope
12 was that the new zone definitions will make the process much less complicated.

13
14 Chair Dwinell reminded the Commissioners that the rezoning needs to further the goals of the
15 General Plan.

16
17 There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

18
19 **MOTION:** Commissioner Dwinell moved to accept the zone change subject to the following
20 stipulations:

21
22 Residential Medium-Density:

- 23
- 24 1. 25-foot minimum front setback.
 - 25 2. 25-foot minimum driveway length.
 - 26 3. Five-foot or 15-degree offset from any neighboring buildings or the road.
 - 27 4. Single-Family Detached Only
 - 28 5. Maximum ERUs of six.
 - 29 6. Maximum building height of 35 feet (subject to review).
 - 30 7. Establishment of a Design Review Committee with at least two Town Council or Planning
31 Commission members represented.

32
33 Commissioner Woelfle seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Bruce Woelfle-Aye, Ralph
34 Severini-Aye, Sara Goldkind-Aye, Vytas Rupinskas-Aye, Chair Jerry Dwinell-Aye. The motion
35 passed unanimously. Alternate Planning Commission Member Kurt Shadle did not participate in
36 the vote.

37
38 **3. PUBLIC HEARING: Review and Recommend Draft Ordinance Concerning**
39 **Development Restrictions based upon Delinquent Taxes, Fees or Other Monies Owed**
40 **to the Town; to be Recommended to the Town Council.**

41
42 Kurt Shadle reported that after conducting an analysis, it was discovered that there are
43 approximately 32,000 residents in Wasatch County. Hideout represents 1/32 of the population of
44 Wasatch County yet they comprise 25% of the tax delinquencies. A mechanism was proposed to
45 address property owners with tax delinquencies or outstanding water charges.

1 Sara Goldkind asked how situations will be addressed if a developer or individual partners with
2 someone else to submit an application. She wanted to avoid granting an approval to the partner
3 entity if they know that the developer is delinquent. Commissioner Shadle commented that if a
4 principal from a company that is delinquent in tax goes to or forms another company, they are still
5 a principal; the moratorium would apply. The thought was that the applicant would have to present
6 an affidavit stating that no property taxes are owed to the Town.

7
8 Chair Dwinell explained that if an ordinance is in place, it would only apply to properties that are
9 not covered under an MDA going forward. As a result, it needs to be a two-pronged approach.
10 The ordinance can specify any and all property that is owned within Hideout. The second prong
11 is a procedural approach in the form of a resolution that staff can implement. The scope, however,
12 can only be for the parcel under consideration. In addition, no business will be allowed to operate
13 within the Town if they are delinquent in property taxes, fees, etc. Procedurally, a business license
14 can be revoked without concern for the MDA. Within the ordinance, they want to make it law as
15 well that a business cannot be run within the Town of Hideout if the owner is delinquent in taxes,
16 fees, etc. While the focus is on property taxes, the scope would involve any monies going to
17 Hideout.

18
19 Sara Goldkind asked if a developer, entity, or individual was applying for a new permit in the
20 Town and is delinquent if they can go beyond the scope of the single site for which the building
21 permit is being requested for and require all delinquent taxes be paid in full. She asked if it would
22 be possible to have taxes for all parcels paid before a permit will be issued. Mr. Dansie stated that
23 such an approach may go beyond what can be done in terms of a procedural implementation. He
24 was not, however, aware of anything in State Code that would prevent them from doing that. He
25 explained that the lien for property taxes is called a supervening lien. It was noted that interest
26 and penalties accrue for unpaid fees, but it is very small.

27
28 Mr. Dansie reported that he had spoken to David Church, who previously provided legal advice to
29 the Town, and he was not aware of a prohibition. With regard to the application of a business
30 license, it was suggested that in addition to providing an affidavit, if at any point a property owner
31 becomes delinquent, the business license can be revoked. It was suggested that the Town draft an
32 ordinance and include language to amend Sections 3.2.105 and 3.2.111. A resolution should also
33 be drafted that includes the same restrictions.

34
35 Commissioner Goldkind wanted to prevent a developer who is delinquent from skirting the
36 requirements. It was noted that both development applications and property taxes are specific to
37 a property. For that reason, a property tax lien is filed against the property. Possible options were
38 discussed.

39
40 Chair Dwinell explained that the intent is to address a developer who owes a large sum of money
41 who comes in for an application or permit. The application would be accepted but not processed
42 until the taxes and fees are paid and current. The matter was not ready for a vote since additional
43 language needed to be added. Procedural issues were discussed. The decision was made to form
44 a small sub-committee consisting of Chair Dwinell and Commissioner Shadle to refine the
45 language. The matter would then be ready for inclusion on the agenda on next Town Council
46 meeting with no further action from the Planning Commission.

1
2 Chair Dwinell opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing
3 was closed.

4
5 **MOTION:** Commissioner [REDACTED] moved that the ordinance and resolution presented about the
6 delinquent tax be recommended for a vote at the next Town Council Meeting but with
7 modifications to be made by Chair Dwinell and Kurt Shadle between now and then, as discussed.
8 Commissioner Goldkind seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Bruce Woelfle-Aye, Ralph
9 Severini-Aye, Sara Goldkind-Aye, Vytas Rupinskas-Aye, Chair Jerry Dwinell-Aye. The motion
10 passed unanimously. Alternate Planning Commission Member Kurt Shadle did not participate in
11 the vote.

12
13 **4. ADMINISTRATION: Discussion of Proposed Zone Definition Changes.**

14
15 Chair Dwinell reported that this is the beginning of the discussion on this topic. The Commission
16 can address as much as desired; and it can be further discussed at the next meeting. He explained
17 that there are serious problems with the current zoning. There is an overly complex zoning
18 structure with the intent being to simplify it. Some zones mention a particular characteristic such
19 as a front offset or driveway materials, for example, and others that don't address it at all. The
20 goal is to standardize the characteristics and what each zone says about those characteristics. The
21 result will be to have uniformity across all of the zones and eliminate the complexity.

22
23 Chair Dwinell proposed the addition of a couple of new zones and the retirement of a few as well.
24 The following existing, proposed new, and to be retired zones were identified:

- 25
26
- Residential Single-Family (existing – will remain);
 - Residential Medium Density (existing – will remain);
 - Residential Protected Viewshed (new);
 - Residential High-Density (new);
 - Resort Village Medium-Density (to be retired);
 - Resort Village High-Density (to be retired);
 - Neighborhood Commercial (existing – will remain);
 - Commercial (new);
 - Community Site (existing – will remain);
 - Open Space (existing – will remain);
 - RSPA (to be retired);
 - Planned Performance Development (to be retired); and
 - Hospitality Casita (to be retired).
- 39

40 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Goldkind, Chair Dwinell stated that if a hotel
41 were annexed in it would be under Commercial.

42
43 The notion of conditional use was discussed. Chair Dwinell reported that while the Utah League
44 of Cities and Towns advises against Conditional Use, there are, however, times when a conditional
45 use is desirable such as in Commercial areas. While a big box use may be desired, the Town would
46 want to apply restrictions to it.

1
2 Chair Dwinell stated that with respect to Short-Term Rentals, they are understood as allowing a
3 residential unit to be rented for less than 90 days. There is, however, no definition of “short-term”
4 or “rental”. For some uses, definitions will need to be provided if they are to remain. It was noted
5 that some definitions exist on the MDAs. One option was to determine whether there is a definition
6 on the MDA and then decide if it is one, they would like to accept.
7

8 Chair Dwinell commented that the land uses are separated into residential, community,
9 commercial, and infrastructure. At the bottom are the more specific characteristics such as density,
10 frontage, setbacks, building, driveway, garage, etc. They are also characterized as new and
11 existing.
12

13 The Commission Members were asked to review the document using the process described. They
14 can then give input and refine the document. With regard to infrastructure, it was assumed that
15 aspects of infrastructure will exist in every zone. Town Engineer Taylor commented that there
16 should be some definition of what types of Infrastructure were restricted to specific zones (like a
17 water storage facility).
18

19 Chair Dwinell next addressed the residential protected viewshed, which was an idea that came up
20 earlier in the week. The Mayor recently visited Deer Vista, which is a master planned community
21 where the designer has oriented every home to have minimal impact on the view of the surrounding
22 residences. The lot prices in Deer Vista are very high as a result. With regard to dining, Chair
23 Dwinell asked if they want to narrow their focus and allow certain types of eating establishments
24 in the Town. The three categories were identified as casual sit-down, counter service or fast food,
25 and fine dining. The Commission Members were encouraged to give feedback.
26

27 Other categories included Health Care and Hospital. They are specific designating what would be
28 allowed in each category. Procedural issues were discussed. Chair Dwinell asked that the
29 Commission Members review the documents and be prepared at the next meeting to discuss them
30 in detail. A Special Meeting could also be scheduled, if necessary.
31

32 Ralph Severini reported that he spoke to Brent Bateman, lead attorney in the Office of the Property
33 Rights Ombudsman, five or six weeks ago who suggested the Town consider retaining a certified
34 outside planner with experience. If the desire is to utilize the services of a Planning Consultant,
35 that information should be relayed to Town Administrator, Jan McCosh. Chair Dwinell stated that
36 that determination would need to be made by the Mayor.
37

38 Commissioner Severini stated that the City’s Engineering firm may have someone with those
39 qualifications on staff.
40

41 Town Engineer, Ryan Turner commented that the spreadsheets are a great idea and stated that their
42 firm could provide the needed expertise in rewriting the Code. He stressed that it would need to
43 be a joint effort since in the end it will need to reflect the needs and desires of the Town.
44

45 Over the next two weeks, the Commission Members were asked to review the draft and give
46 feedback in Teams when the review is complete.

1
2 **5. ADMINISTRATION: Discussion of Publishing Methods/Process for Meeting**
3 **Video/Audio/Minutes.**
4

5 Chair Dwinell wished to change the context of the discussion and use the Town's site for
6 publication. Ultimately, he wanted to understand what the Town's site is capable of and follow
7 that model. He remarked that no minutes were being approved tonight because the minutes that
8 were received from the March 25 meeting, which was a two-hour meeting, were less than three
9 pages, which seemed out of balance for the content. He began reviewing the April meeting and
10 found that he would have to listen to the recording because there were sections that did not
11 adequately cover what was discussed. He communicated his concerns to Ms. McCosh and had a
12 conversation about what meeting minutes actually need to be. He questioned whether they should
13 be a transcription of the meeting or a summary of what was discussed and the decisions made. His
14 former mindset was that they need to accurately describe the deliberations of the Commission. If
15 they are not doing that, they are deficient.

16
17 Mr. Dansie commented that the purpose of minutes can be to allow people who did not participate
18 to be able to understand what took place. He frequently uses meeting minutes to ensure that they
19 accurately reflect all of the discussion that took place. They should also indicate how each member
20 voted. Minutes can also be helpful when there is a dispute. Sparse meeting minutes are not as
21 helpful in retrospect although they do not need to include every word that was said. If someone
22 makes a comment, he suggested the substance of the comment be relayed.

23
24 Chair Dwinell agreed and wanted the minutes to fairly capture the discussion and the major points
25 that were made. Sara Goldkind suggested the minutes include a detailed summary, which would
26 be more helpful as long as it accurately reflects the important points from the meeting. Chair
27 Dwinell remarked that in his line of work, writing programming code should be done in such a
28 way that when you look back in 6 months, you can easily understand the thought process of why
29 it was written in that manner. He viewed meeting minutes much in the same way.

30
31 The comment was made that often a Scribe is appointed who is part of the group. Chair Dwinell
32 stated that they began that way and Ralph Severini serving in that capacity. The issue was that he
33 was no longer involved in meetings because he was busy trying to take notes. Lynette also used
34 to help take notes. The advantage was that she had a sense of what the issues were. Possible
35 alternatives for having minutes prepared were discussed.

36
37 Chair Dwinell wanted to have a discussion about expectations to ensure that his were in line with
38 the other Commission Members who agreed. With respect to the March meeting minutes, he stated
39 that it would be faster to relisten to the recording and start over than make changes to what they
40 were given. Various options were discussed.

41
42 There was concern expressed about a member acting as scribe since they cannot really be involved
43 in the meeting. The possibility of having the person who transcribes the meeting attend the
44 remotely and take notes was discussed. The effectiveness of that method was questioned since she
45 would not be present in person. Another solution was to turn on the meeting video, so the scribe

1 could see who was talking. Ms. McCosh described her efforts to hire someone locally to produce
2 minutes.

3
4 **6. ADMINISTRATION: Discussion and Review of the Planning Commission Docket.**

5
6 This item was skipped.

7
8 **7. Adjournment.**

9
10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Goldkind moved to adjourn. Commissioner [REDACTED] seconded
11 the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

12
13 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:41 p.m.