

The meeting of the Meeker Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Gary Hindman, Monday, January 12, 2009, at Town Hall at 5:35 p.m.

Members Present: Chairman Gary Hindman
Keith Rholl
Joy Thayer
Martha Griffin

Members Absent: Leslie Sorensen

Others Present: Anna Smith, Town Planner
Attorney Jerry Viscardi
Becky Niemi, Administrative Assistant

Citizens present: John Arrington, Pastor of Meeker Methodist Church
Kent Borchard
Gus Halandras ó representing Regas and Pegge Halandras

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Hindman asked if there were any changes to the agenda, with Town Planner Anna Smith stating she would like to move Item #8 ó Variance Extension Request for Meeker United Methodist Church before the Escondido Subdivision agenda item.

A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by Commissioner Thayer, seconded by Commissioner Griffin. All ayes, motion carried.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Chairman Hindman inquired if there were any changes, corrections or additions to the November 10, 2008 Planning Commission minutes with none noted.

A motion to approve the minutes of November 10, 2008 as presented was made by Commissioner Thayer, seconded by Commissioner Rholl. All ayes, motion carried.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

Variance Extension Request – Meeker United Methodist Church, 809 Park Avenue. Extension of granted variance allowing a reduced number of required parking spaces and granting access to the parking lot from the alley.

Planner Anna Smith provided the following report: On April 23, 2007, the Meeker United Methodist Church obtained a variance approval for a reduction of the required number of parking spaces (72 spaces) to provide 25 spaces. The variance also included granting access to the parking lot from the alley. However, the variance expired on April 23, 2008. The Church, via a letter request from Mr. Kent Borchard, dated December 19, 2008, is now requesting an extension of the variance approval. If granted, the variance extension would only be valid through April 23, 2009. In the event the Church does not commence construction by that time, the Church will need to reapply for a new variance for these issues. Per M.M.C. 18.1.147(N), the Commission shall grant only one such extension for a period not to exceed

Regular Planning Commission Meeting . January 12, 2009

twelve (12) calendar months. Staff recommends approval of the variance extension request for the Meeker United Methodist Church.

Chairman Hindman asked for questions or comments with none noted.

A motion was made by Commissioner Griffin and seconded by Commissioner Thayer to grant the variance extension request of the Meeker United Methodist Church. The extension will last through April 23, 2009 and will allow a reduced number of parking spaces and access to the parking lot from the alley. All ayes, motion carried.

Escondido Subdivision Final Plat – Regas Halandras

Planner Anna Smith provided the following report: On August 19, 2008, the Board of Trustees granted Preliminary Plan approval of the Escondido Subdivision with conditions, as stipulated in Resolution No 11, Series 2008. The proposed Escondido Subdivision includes 7 residential lots to be accessed from Escondido Drive, a private street, intersecting with the existing Mountain View Road, and will be serviced with Town water and sanitary lines from Meeker Sanitation District. Also included are two additional lots, Parcel A and Parcel B, of which Parcel B will be dedicated to the Town of Meeker. After Final Plat approval, it is intended for Parcel A to be sold to an adjacent private property owner (Thompsonø), who will then request rezoning and lot consolidation of Parcel A with their platted Sage Hill lots.

REQUEST: The Applicants are requesting the Planning Commission and the Town Board approve the subdivision Final Plat as submitted.

Itemized below are the Final Plat submittals addressing conditions that were approved, amended or denied by the Board, as outlined in Resolution No 11, Series 2008:

1. The Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts Escondido Drive as a private street.
2. The Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the location of the private street sign and Plat Note #15 identifies the sign shall be maintained in perpetuity. Item #43 in the Declaration of Covenants, dated December 30, 2008, addresses the private street sign.
3. The Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the variances that were approved, as follows: a) lots 2, 3, and 4 less than the minimum 2-acre requirement for RR zoned lots; b) lots 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 less than the 150-foot minimum lot width requirement for RR zoned lots; c) existing Mountain View Road not maintaining a right angle for a distance of 75 feet, and d) building envelopes for lots 2, 3, 4, and 7 with the following approved setbacks: Lot 2 Front 25 feet, Rear 10 feet, Side (abutting proposed lot 1) 50 feet, and Side (abutting proposed lot 3) 15 feet, Lot 3 Front 25 feet, Side 15 feet, Rear 10 feet, Lot 4 Front 25 feet, Side 15 feet, Rear 10 feet, Lot 7 Front 25 feet, Corner street 25 feet, Side 50 feet, Rear 50 feet.
4. The trails and common open space requirements were met through the Applicants' dedication of 3.72 acres (Parcel B) to the Town to protect the Town's two existing water tanks. Common open space and trails were not proposed in the subdivision due to public opposition to public trails in the area; the Eastern Rio Blanco Metropolitan Recreation and Park District's statement they could not accept maintenance responsibility; and the proposed large lots providing sufficient open space in the proposed subdivision.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting . January 12, 2009

5. The school land dedication requirement was addressed by the School Board's January 9, 2008 letter indicating they would not be able to accept any dedicated land or land fees.
6. The engineering plans, as prepared by SJCE with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the 50-foot long concrete area, including the 6-foot valley pan, at the intersection of Escondido Drive and Mountain View Road.
7. The Applicants have submitted a revised Declaration of Covenants, dated December 30, 2008, addressing the following; 1) the perpetual existence of the HOA, 2) the perpetual maintenance and repair of the private graveled street, the drainage ponds and the erosion/sediment control structures, and their easements, 3) no future subdivision, resubdivision, and/or lot line adjustment of platted lots as established by the signed and dated Final Plat (specify date) by individual owners, heirs, successors, assigns, and/or legal representatives, and 4) lots will only be accessed from the private street, Escondido Drive. Plat Notes #6, #8, #14, and #15 on the Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, addresses some of these issues as well.
8. The Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the location of the private street sign and Plat Note #15 identifies the sign shall be maintained in perpetuity. Item #43 in the Declaration of Covenants, dated December 30, 2008, addresses the private street sign.
9. Plat Note #6 on the Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, addresses that all lots will only be accessed from the private street Escondido Drive. The note also includes prohibiting other private driveways or access for vehicles, off-highway vehicles, or snowmobiles from the platted lots onto already developed streets in Sage Hills or C.R. 11/Sulphur Creek Road. Also item #43 in the Declaration of Covenants, dated December 30, 2008, addresses the matter.
10. The attached SJCE response, dated August 27, 2008, identifies "a high point at the edge of road at the property line of lots 4 and 5 that will prevent stormwater runoff from the road to this area".
11. The Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the easement between lots 4 and 5 as a utility easement.
12. Concerning the disposition of Parcel A, the Thompsons have initiated the necessary steps to commence the rezoning and lot consolidation, pending Escondido's Final Plat approval.
13. The C5 Plan, as prepared by SJCE with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the correct location of the proposed utilities.
14. The Board approved 50-foot side yard setbacks adjacent to the lot line between Lots 1 and 2 to protect the natural drainage way.
15. The Board did not grant the Applicants' request to commence road work activities prior to Final Plat approval. No road work activities were initiated and the Applicants intend to wait until after Final Plat approval to commence such activities.

16. The submitted SJCE response, dated August 27, 2008, addresses the Town Engineer's comments in his July 15, 2008 letter. Subsequent comments submitted by the Town Engineer have also been satisfactorily addressed, per the Town Engineer's December 19, 2008 letter.
17. The C5 Plan, as prepared by SJCE with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts a street light at the intersection of Escondido Drive and Mountain View Road, in accordance with WREA's approval.
18. Annexation of the proposed Escondido Subdivision into the Meeker Sanitation District has been completed, per the attached District Court Order.
19. The Final Plat, as prepared by JSC, Inc. with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts all the notes previously shown on the Geologic Features plan during Preliminary Plan review.
20. The C5 Plan, as prepared by SJCE with the stamped "Received November 4, 2008" date, depicts the correct location of the Town's water mainline on Mountain View Road.

17.1.110 – FINAL PLAT SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

NOTE: Town Code is typed in bold.

A through E code requirements in Section 17.1.110 have been addressed in the design of the Final Plat plans.

F) The final plat submission shall conform in all respects to the preliminary plan, as previously reviewed and approved by the Board, and shall incorporate all modifications required as a result of the Board's review. Two (2) copies of all documents submitted and approved as part of the preliminary plan shall be submitted in fulfillment of the final plat requirements. The Board may approve a final plat which has been modified to reflect improvements in design or changes which have occurred in the natural surroundings and environment subsequent to the preliminary plan review and approval.

The design of the Escondido Subdivision with its private street layout and lot boundaries has remained the same. Other changes, as required in Resolution No 11, Series 2008, have been complied with as outlined in the above comments 1-20.

G)

I) Drawings prepared by an engineer and/or land surveyor licensed in the state of Colorado showing layout, profile, and detailed design of the following:

(a) All utilities and easements, plus statements from utility providers, such as: water, sewer, electric, gas, cable television, and telephone, as may be applicable, that service shall be provided to the development in accordance with applicable state and local regulations.

The submitted Final Plat and the C5 plan depicts the locations of utilities and easements. All statements from applicable utility providers have been received.

(b) Detailed stormwater drainage plan showing profiles, and typical cross-section drawings of all streets, bridges, culverts, and other drainage structures, in accordance with the Town Construction Standards.

The attached engineering plans from SJCE depicts the required information and complies with the Town Construction Standards.

(c) Detailed grading plan, which shall be indicated by solid line contours superimposed on dashed line contours of existing topography for the area of the final plat. Such contours shall be at two-foot intervals for predominant ground slopes within the tract between level and five-percent grade, and at five-foot (5) intervals for predominant slopes exceeding a five-percent (5%) grade.

The submitted C1 and C3 plans from SJCE depicts the topography and grading for the area of the final plat.

(d) Detailed erosion and sedimentation control plan, when required for preliminary plan review, as provided in this Title or when required as a result of such review.

On behalf of the Applicants, SJCE submitted the Escondido Subdivision Stormwater, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, dated July 15, 2008. This Plan has been reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer.

(e) Detailed plan of the layout of sidewalks, pedestrian and cycling paths, and street lighting.

The Code does not require sidewalks, pedestrian or cycling paths in RR zoning district, therefore none are proposed. The C5 plan depicts the location of a street light at the intersection of Escondido Drive and Mountain View Road.

(f) A plan showing the proposed addresses, as determined by the Town, of the subdivided lots.

An attached address plan depicts the addresses for the lots.

(g) Final vegetation plan (not required for subdivisions in the RR and RR-A zone districts).

The submitted C3 plan depicts re-vegetation areas to address stabilization of land proposed to be re-graded (cut and fill) for the installation of infrastructure.

(h) Final subdivision improvements agreement, pursuant to section 17.1.115 of this Title.

A draft copy of the SIA is attached. This draft is still being revised to suit the project.

II) Where an existing easement or right-of-way is contiguous to a proposed easement or right-of-way within the proposed subdivision, proof of dedication of the existing easement or right-of-way acceptable to the Board shall be submitted.

There are no existing easements or right-of-ways within the proposed subdivision.

III) When the applicant is to dedicate land for the use of schools, streets, parks, pedestrian and cycling paths, or other public purposes, a letter of intent shall be required from the Board having administrative responsibility over the dedicated land, stating that said Board shall accept the lands to be dedicated.

The Applicants intend to dedicate Parcel B to the Town of Meeker. Attached is a copy of the Board's letter of intent to accept the dedication of Parcel B.

IV) Where required by the Colorado Department of Transportation, a copy of the Colorado Department of Transportation access permit and any other relevant documents from Colorado Department of Transportation shall be submitted.

Not applicable.

V) Copies of all covenants and deed restrictions, including but not limited to those required by the Board, to govern the future use of each lot and any common land with regard to the future construction of water or sewer systems or other improvements, minor subdivision and other potential changes, which might significantly alter the subdivision, as approved by the Board, with regard to the criteria and standards of this Title.

The Applicants have submitted the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions of Escondido Subdivision, dated December 30, 2008, to address this requirement.

VI) The names, mailing addresses, email addresses, and telephone and fax numbers of all owners and applicants of the subject property, the principal engineer and/or surveyor responsible for the preparation of the plat, and all persons possessing a security interest in the property, as evidenced by any deed of trust, mortgage, lien, or other recorded or unrecorded instruments and a duly executed agreement indicating the consent to the proposed subdivision by all such persons.

The contact information for the owners, applicants, engineer and surveyor has been provided.

VII) A water right agreement pursuant to the Water Rights Dedication Ordinance of 1981.

Town staff recommends the Town consider the additional land value of Parcel B and its dedication to the Town as compliance with the Town's Water Rights Dedication Ordinance, per Mr. Viscardi's December 11, 2008 letter. Mr. Regas Halandras, on December 16, 2008, provided in writing via email, the Applicants' acceptance of staff's proposal.

H) Non-contiguous parcels of land shall not be included in one plat, nor shall more than one plat be made on the same sheet. Contiguous parcels of land owned by different people may be embraced in one plat, provided that all owners join in the dedications and acknowledgements.

Not applicable.

I) No final plat shall be approved unless remedial actions to mitigate the geologic hazards identified as required in Section 17.1.108C have been approved by the Town Engineer.

Chris Hale, the Town Engineer, has identified in his December 19, 2008 letter, that all questions, comments and concerns have been addressed to his satisfaction.

J) No final plat shall be approved prior to the execution of the required improvements agreement pursuant to Section 17.1.115.

The Final Plat will not be scheduled for Board approval until the SIA has been executed.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting . January 12, 2009

The Planning Commission recommend the Board of Trustees approve the Escondido Subdivision Final Plat, with the following conditions:

1. The Final Plat date shall be updated to a current date as well as have the surveyor's stamp and signature, and received by Town staff prior to the Board's adoption of a motion approving the Final Plat.
2. Remove the "Preliminary" stamp from the Escondido Subdivision constructions plans and the engineer's stamp and signature should be placed on the drawings. Resubmit these signed and sealed drawings prior to the Town Board's adoption of a motion approving the Final Plat.
3. Approval of the Water Rights Dedication proposal by staff, as set forth in the attached letters.

Chairman Hindman asked the applicant's representative, Gus Halandras, if there was anything he would like to add, with Mr. Halandras inquiring about an easement between two lots read earlier by Planner Smith, who then read there were no easements for the record. Planner Smith clarified by stating the easements she referred to were proposed as part of the subdivision, to establish a utility easement between lots 4 and 5. She stated the other section Mr. Halandras inquired about was pertaining to any existing easements within the 27 acres, prior to the subdivision and there were none.

Chairman Hindman asked the Planning Commission for questions or comments with none noted. Chairman Hindman inquired if the Planning Commission needed to make a motion to recommend the Final Plat to the Board of Trustees with Planner Smith stating "if the Planning Commission felt comfortable with what had been presented and there were no outstanding questions or additional information that would need to be provided, thus delaying the Final Plat to another meeting, the Planning Commission could make a motion to recommend to the Board of Trustees that they approve the Final Plat with the 3 noted conditions or any additional conditions the Planning Commission would like to add." She stated Staff then had the responsibility of providing the information to the Board of Trustees no later than thirty days from the Planning Commissions final recommendation.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hindman that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that they approve the Escondido Subdivision Final Plat with the 3 conditions that were read previously into record, seconded by Commissioner Thayer.

Attorney Viscardi stated before the Planning Commission voted on the motion, he had a few items to mention for the record. He stated the subdivision improvements agreement the Planning Commission had was a draft agreement done in May 2008. Mr. Viscardi stated he and Planner Smith had a meeting with Regas Halandras on January 9, 2009 and had gone over some items with him. Attorney Viscardi stated he wanted the Planning Commission to be aware there had been some significant changes to the document since it had been drafted. He stated during the meeting with Mr. Halandras, the applicant had indicated he would like some latitude from the Town regarding payment for the engineering inspection and the materials testing fees, which were part of the subdivision improvements agreement (SIA). Attorney Viscardi stated the agreement required a deposit fee to be held through the completion of construction. Attorney Viscardi stated they obtained an estimate from the engineer and the testing firm to cover the cost of inspection. The SIA also provided for collection of fees for legal but such had been deleted as the Town had a fee for legal review. He stated the review had been conducted with Mr. Halandras the previous year and the payments had been made already. Attorney Viscardi stated the paragraph would only deal with payment of inspection fees and given the uncertainty about when construction would start, Mr. Halandras had requested the fees be paid at a later date, rather than within the thirty to forty-five days, for the execution of the SIA. Commissioner Griffin inquired if Mr. Viscardi was referring to

Regular Planning Commission Meeting . January 12, 2009

paragraph 24, and if Mr. Halandras had covered the engineering. Attorney Viscardi stated Mr. Halandras had already deposited funds that covered the engineering and legal during the review. He stated the reason those had been included was the document was all the Town had with a subdivider which required having them pay a deposit to cover subdivision reviews. He stated since the new code was in place, and titled "the review fee agreement" Mr. Halandras had made a deposit for review fees a year ago which included legal and engineering. He stated the changes to paragraph 24 will only address the construction phase of engineering and inspection as well as materials testing. He stated it will also allow for the deposit not to be made until the time of the pre-construction conference.

Commissioner Griffin inquired "the rest of the sentence would carry out construction observation and inspection and other technical assistance for the review, all the way to construction." Attorney Viscardi stated yes and had been changed since the meeting with Mr. Halandras. He stated another change was the requirement from the State of Colorado in issuing a stormwater permit for all construction and given the question of when construction would begin, Attorney Viscardi stated St. Joseph's Engineering had indicated they would not apply for the permit until construction began. Attorney Viscardi stated he had tied getting the stormwater discharge permit to the time of the pre-construction conference.

Attorney Viscardi stated another change had been made regarding the difference between private improvements and public improvements. He stated public improvements were the only ones the Town would be taking the security deposit in the form of a letter of credit to ensure construction of those improvements. Attorney Viscardi outlined the exclusions of the security deposit, with discussion focusing on what the Town takes security deposits for, the uncertainty of beginning construction, and letters of credit. Commissioner Griffin inquired how letters of credit worked with Attorney Viscardi outlining the process, how long they are issued for and what happens if it wasn't used within a year. Attorney Viscardi stated a letter of credit is a letter of assurance from the bank that they will stand behind for a specific amount of money and if not completed, the Town has the ability to draw on it to do the work itself or to get a third party contractor to do the work.

Attorney Viscardi stated Planner Smith had mentioned in her report, the sanitation district annexation process had been completed, stating the agreement had an elaborate process the Town had used in the past. He stated once the copy of the court order from the sanitation district was received the previous week, he re-wrote that just to acknowledge the property is annexed. Commissioner Griffin inquired if the Planning Commission had a copy of all the changes with Attorney Viscardi stating no, as he was in the process of re-writing it the past weekend, and if they wanted a copy, he would get it to them. He also stated the information would be in the Board packet. Commissioner Griffin inquired if it would be anything that would stop a vote with Attorney Viscardi stating no. He reiterated again changes were made based on Mr. Halandras's request at their last meeting. Attorney Viscardi also stated that Planner Smith's report be incorporated into the minutes for the record.

A motion was made by Chairman Hindman that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that they approve the Escondido Subdivision Final Plat with the following 3 conditions:

- The Final Plat date shall be updated to a current date as well as have the surveyor's stamp and signature, and received by Town staff prior to the Board's adoption of a motion approving the Final Plat.
2. Remove the "Preliminary" stamp from the Escondido Subdivision constructions plans and the engineer's stamp and signature should be placed on the drawings. Resubmit these signed and sealed drawings prior to the Town Board's adoption of a motion approving the Final Plat.

3. Approval of the Water Rights Dedication proposal by staff, as set forth in the attached letters.

Seconded by Commissioner Thayer. Ayes ó Commissioner Thayer, Rholl and Chairman Hindman. Nay ó Commissioner Griffin, motion carried.

Discussion regarding proposed changes to the Meeker Municipal Code Title 18 Chapter 7 – Signs and Outdoor Advertising Devices Ordinance to allow digital signs along Highway 13 in the Highway Commercial Zoning District and schedule a Public Hearing.

Chairman Hindman asked for questions or comments regarding the digital sign draft ordinance with Commissioner Griffin stating she had a correction on paragraph F under Section 18.7.11. Sign Standards by Zone District. She stated the last sentence of the paragraph stated “shall not exceed a combined sign area of one hundred and sixty square feet” and showed 150 sq/ft in parenthesis and wondered if that was correct. Attorney Viscardi stated it should read 150 sq/ft as that was the maximum allowed.

Chairman Hindman asked Attorney Viscardi to begin the discussion, with Attorney Viscardi stating the document was what the Planning Commission had seen at the November meeting with a few changes based on CDOT’s review. He stated CDOT liked the document and the only change he had made was some additions of things in their current proposal. Attorney Viscardi stated they were not drastic changes and CDOT’s main proposal was the creation of a definition of what the signs were as they never had them defined in previous regulations.

Attorney Viscardi stated the prohibited signs section at the bottom of page 1 incorporated some new language from CDOT’s proposal. He stated it prohibited a great deal and was more detailed. He stated the time for changing of the signs and the length of the display had not been changed. He also stated in Section B, he added the last sentence to make it clear “that unless it is prohibited in the limited section of Highway Commercial, these types of signs are otherwise excluded from any other part of Town,” even though it states it many other ways, it just comes out to say “message center displays are prohibited in any other part of Town other than this limited portion of Highway Commercial.” Attorney Viscardi discussed the size of signs stating it was based on the assumption there would be one sign that had everything incorporated in the sign, which was proposed and depicted in the drawing the Town had. He stated if the Planning Commission looked at what Blue Spruce had now, which was one sign that was internally lit, and underneath it a message display sign which was a separate sign. Commissioner Griffin stated she thought that was required in the code and remembered a discussion regarding it. Attorney Viscardi stated the Town believed, based on the diagram from Mr. Watt, that it would be one large sign with a portion of it being a message center. He stated the current set up now is one separate sign and underneath is two units, one mounted on each side of the pole

Attorney Viscardi stated the Town had to rethink the situation and made it the way it is now; to have the sign and any other display with only one message on either side of the free standing sign. He stated the reason for the increased square footage was that one sign could not be bigger than 60 sq/ft but the total signs (i.e. Go-Fer or CARQUEST) can not be any more than 150 sq/ft and was revamped because of Blue Spruces signs. Discussion focused on last fall’s sign discussion, other town’s regulations and formulas, maximum square footage and how it would apply to Blue Spruces sign. Attorney Viscardi also outlined a couple of other minor changes he had made in the document. Commissioner Griffin inquired about the intensity period with Attorney Viscardi stating it basically meant that a sign could not be brighter in the evening than in the daytime.

Chairman Hindman asked for additional comments or questions, with Commissioner Thayer stating they should set a date for a Public Hearing as she wanted to hear what the citizens had to say. Planner Smith stated the Public Hearing could be set for February 9, 2009, to give time for 3 newspaper articles to be

Regular Planning Commission Meeting . January 12, 2009

written and submitted on the subject. Commissioner Griffin inquired about the newspaper articles, if it would be an article in the paper, or a publication. Planner Smith stated it would be an article in the paper and the proposed public hearing date would provide enough time for the public hearing legal timeframe which is 15 days. She also stated it would give 3 newspaper editions for an actual article to be written that the public could read. Commissioner Thayer inquired if the article could state such things as "you can only have a digital sign every 3 blocks" so that the public would be aware of exactly what happens if the Town decided to move in that direction. Commissioner Griffin stated she didn't feel there should be too many details in the article or they won't come or even read it. Discussion focused on public awareness, limitations of the article, what would happen if the Town approved the ordinance, and who would write the article. Consensus from the Planning Commission and Attorney Viscardi was the Town should write the article(s) for the paper. Chairman Hindman stated he would like to see something in the article stating in other areas/towns it may have been a controversial topic and the Town's purpose was to invite public input.

A motion was made by Commissioner Thayer to set a Public Hearing to solicit public input and provide information regarding the proposed Meeker Municipal Code Title 18 Chapter 7 6 Signs and Outdoor Lighting Device ordinance for February 9, 2009 at 5:30 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Griffin. All ayes, motion carried.

Election of Officers: Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary

Planner Smith stated Commissioner Sorenson had submitted her letter of resignation effective immediately; therefore as the Planning Commission selected officer positions, it would be done between the four remaining members. She stated the Planning Commission's by-laws stated that the first regular meeting in January of each year must have an election of officers.

A motion was made by Commissioner Griffin to nominate Gary Hindman for Planning Commission Chair, with Commissioner Thayer seconding the motion. All ayes, motion carried.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rholl to retain Commissioner Thayer as Planning Commission Secretary, seconded by Commissioner Griffin. All ayes, motion carried.

A motion was made by Commissioner Thayer nominating Commissioner Rholl as Planning Commission Vice-Chair, seconded by Commissioner Griffin. All ayes, motion carried.

Planner Smith reiterated Gary Hindman will continue as Planning Commission Chair, Keith Rholl as new Vice-Chair and Joy Thayer will continue as Planning Commission Secretary.

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Rholl inquired about the future replacement of Leslie Sorensen, with Planner Smith stating a suggestion had been presented to Terry Goedert at the last Board of Trustees meeting. She stated he had indicated interest and would possibly submit a letter. Commissioner Rholl inquired if he was the only one, with Planner Smith stating yes, but the position still needed to be advertised to identify the vacancy and to solicit written requests for participation.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Thayer made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Griffin. All ayes, motion carried. Planning Commission Meeting adjourned 6:40 p.m.

Gary Hindman, Chairman

Joy Thayer, Secretary