

**TOWN OF YUCCA VALLEY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
February 6, 2007**

Chair Huntington called the regular meeting of the Yucca Valley Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners present: Chair George Huntington, Commissioners David Cooper, Dennis McKoy, Steve Willman and Shannon Goodpaster

Chairman Huntington led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Cooper moved to approve the Agenda which motion was seconded by Mr. Willman and passed unanimously by voice vote.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**1. PARCEL MAP 18009 – Smith**

A request to subdivide an existing parcel into two parcels along the line which currently delineates a zoning between them located on the southwest corner of Yucca Trail and Valley Vista and identified as APN 587-281-21

With reference to the complete printed staff report preserved in the meeting and project files, Contract Planner Nicole Criste presented the staff discussion to the meeting. Printed copies of the PowerPoint presentation used by Ms. Criste are preserved in the meeting and project files.

Mr. Cooper requested that Condition of Approval #8 be amended to include the words “is required” between the words “period” and “before” in the last sentence. He requested and received confirmation that the alleyway easement mentioned in COA #15 is required when the map is recorded.

Mr. Willman asked if there is enough room for the alleyway to go through to Valley Vista. Ms. Criste responded she does not believe there is but the intent is for the alley to go through.

Mr. Goodpaster requested and received confirmation that there will be no access to the project site from Yucca Trail.

Mr. Huntington commented the map shows a 40 foot right-of-way but the requirement is for 50 feet. He questioned a previously approved apartment complex adjacent on the southwest to the project.

Mr. Huntington opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bill Warner of Warner Engineering stated the applicant concurs with most of staff’s recommendations. He stated it is likely that the approval of the adjacent apartment complex has expired

but the status of the alley was not proposed to change at that time. The alley terminates at the west property line. The applicant asks that the Commission not require the alley be dedicated at this time. Until the site is planned they won't know how to configure the alley. There is insufficient space between existing buildings to extend the alley to Valley Vista. He received confirmation that the utility lines can be placed underground at the time of development. The split zoning on the property is a problem for the owner and he requests the Commission to adopt staff's recommendations.

Mark Cain of Yucca Valley stated he is a tenant in the medical building on the property in questions. There is a safety issue in that two cars cannot pass each other through the current alley. He requests that the proposed alleyway be made part of the Parcel Map to guarantee access from Joshua Lane. That would provide two points of access. Currently there is only one for the existing buildings and businesses.

Mr. Warner stated he understands Mr. Cain's concerns but believes the concerns can be integrated into the design of a project. It is premature to plan routing before a project is designed.

Terry Elam of Yucca Valley commented Valley Vista floods every year and he would like to see something built on the site.

Ms. Criste stated staff believes the alleyway easement is of value at this time. If a project develops that does not need the alleyway, the easement can be vacated at that time.

Mr. Huntington closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cooper commented the alley can either be created now or at time of development and sees no reason not to allow the applicants request to deal with the issue at the time a CUP or SPR comes forward. He suggested COA #15 be amended to allow the issue of the alley easement be determined when a project is brought forward. Mr. Huntington agreed with Mr. Cooper. They will have to find access from somewhere but not from Yucca Trail.

Mr. Willman moved that the Planning Commission approve Variance V 09-06 based on the findings contained within the staff report. Mr. Goodpaster seconded the motion which carried unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Cooper moved that the Planning Commission approve Tentative Parcel Map 18009 based on the findings contained within the staff report and the recommended Conditions of Approval as amended above. Mr. McKoy seconded the motion which carried unanimously by voice vote.

**2. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT GPA 01-06, REZONE RZ 01-06, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP TM 17862, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT EA 05-06 – COPPER HILLS**

A request to change the zoning designation of 63.4 acres located at the southeast corner of Golden Bee and Sage Ave. from Rural Living – 5 acre minimum to Residential, Single Family – 3.5 units per acre; and to subdivide the 63.4 acres into 107 Single Family lots, as well as lots for street and a retention basin. APN 585-071-16, 17, 25 & 26

Mr. Cooper stated he had a conflict of interests because applicant representative Bill Warner is a client and this project will have a significant economic affect on Mr. Warner's company. Mr. Huntington excused Mr. Cooper from the hearing and Mr. Cooper left the room.

With reference to the complete printed staff report preserved in the meeting and project files, Contract Planner Nicole Criste presented the staff discussion to the meeting. Printed copies of the PowerPoint presentation used by Ms. Criste are preserved in the meeting and project files. Ms. Criste stated, as currently proposed, the Tract Map can not proceed without the General Plan Amendment and Rezone. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Environmental Assessment 05-06, which is a change from the recommendations on the Agenda and in the Staff Report. CEQA requires that action be taken on the Environmental Assessment prior to making a determination on the project itself.

Mr. McKoy requested and received confirmation that the current zoning on the project site has not been changed since the General Plan was adopted.

Mr. Goodpaster requested and received confirmation of the surrounding zoning. The proposed Tract Map is not in compliance with the RS-2 zoning.

Mr. Huntington opened the Public Hearing

Mr. William Warner of Warner Engineering stated the minimum lot size is 12,500 sq. ft. Relocating the power poles on Sage Ave would be a major expense. The water tank just off the SW corner of the property does not serve the project site. Hi-Desert Water District has issued a water availability letter.

The GPA to 3.5 units per acre was requested to design a project that meets the goals of the developer and to render it economically feasible. The density is important. The maximum number of lots that can be developed on the site is right around the number of lots on the Tract Map. Unfortunately to get to the lot size shown on the Tract Map the RS-3.5 zoning must be requested.

Mr. Warner passed out copies of his Power Point presentation to the Commissioners, copies of which are preserved in the meeting and project files. He disagrees with staff that the site is hilly. Only the SW portion of the site is hilly. The topography does not mandate the current RL-5 zoning. This is an island of RL-5 between RS-3.5 zoning. The Master Plan of Drainage designation of the Long Canyon wash is a managed flood plain, to be left untouched as open space. Applicant contends this is an in-fill project and the use should be more compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods.

The project site is constantly being used by off-road vehicles and for the illegal dumping of trash. Developing the project will eliminate both of those uses. The project will preserve 24% of the land as open space.

The applicant requests the Planning Commission recommend approval to the Town Council.

Mr. McKoy asked if Mr. Warner is saying there was no logic to the zoning designation in the General Plan. Mr. Warner replied yes, it is inappropriate to the terrain.

Mr. Goodpaster agreed that the RL-5 zoning is inappropriate but questioned the request for the RL-3.5 zoning which could allow 222 homes to be built. He does not have a problem with the Tract Map as designed other than there is no sewer system, but does have a problem with the requested GPA. Mr. Warner stated there is a lettered lot at the north end of the project intended to be the location of the on-site sewage treatment plant. The developer expects to have to install sewer lines that will eventually connect to the larger system.

Mr. Willman questioned the location of retention/detention basins. Mr. Warner stated storm water will flow down Golden Bee to Aster Ave. and then into an existing detention basin. We're held to pretty high standard for hydrology.

Mr. Willman questioned impacts on Sage Ave. Ms. Criste stated cars could park on Sage but the parkway would be eliminated. The sidewalk would be adjacent to the curb. Mr. Warner stated Sage is currently approximately 25 feet wide. The applicant would have to develop the east side of Sage to add an additional 40 feet of paving. They propose the travel-way be shifted to the west so the new curb on the east does not interfere with the power poles. When traveling north, the road will narrow through a converging lane.

Mr. Huntington asked how the project meets the Goals, Policies and Programs identified in the staff report. Mr. Warner stated the surrounding densities are a preservation of the rural character and those densities are approximately 2 per acre. The scenic characteristics of the site are already degraded. Much of the site burned in the 70's and there are few Joshua Trees. The ridgelines are preserved by placement of building pads.

Mr. Huntington stated the Tract Map shows Long Canyon Wash untouched in the grading process and as several hundred feet wide. Mr. Warner stated it varies in width. The lots will run to the center line of the easement but the rear parts in the drainage easement will be bounded by a fence. The land will be privately owned but unusable by the owner. Mr. Huntington voiced a concern that the increase in density will cause more off-road vehicles to use the wash. Mr. Warner stated that is a valid concern but the proposed walls and fences will make access less likely. Mr. Huntington asked if a Planned Development was considered by the applicant. Mr. Warner said it was discussed early on but the applicant's goals and business plan are not met by a Planned Development. His product is single detached residences on larger lots.

Applicant Bill Shack, Jr. stated recorded lots existed on the property when he bought it, but the approved zoning was changed during the General Plan adoption process. It is economically unfeasible to develop the parcel with the current zoning. He intends to completely fence the Tract. There will be limited access to the green open space areas from Golden Bee and San Andreas only. There will not be access for the homeowners from the individual lots. He has no intention to build more than 107 houses in the project. The average lot size is 21,500 square feet, the smallest lot is 12,400 square feet and there are lots as large as 2.5 acres. Sage Ave. narrows to less than 30 feet. They will construct a full road on San Andreas and develop Sage to a full road. They are only asking to move Sage Ave. over 10 feet. They will be constructing a wastewater treatment facility to be connected to the sewer lines, installing sidewalks, walls and street lights. 107 lots is the minimum number to make the economics and infrastructure work. The project has 24% open space. He begs approval of the GPA.

Mr. Willman questioned the installation of sidewalks and lights and received confirmation that the adjacent property does not have sidewalks or lights.

Frank Delzompo of Murrieta who is a real estate broker in Yucca Valley stated he has sold a dozen or so houses in Copper Hills. People want to buy and live there and he supports the GPA.

Sabrina Peukert of Yucca Valley supports the project. The other tracts developed by Mr. Shack have raised property values and created good jobs in Yucca Valley. He needs the density to make the project economically feasible.

Mark Vikdal of Yucca Valley supports the amendment. He is concerned that the current condition of the vacant land with the off road activity and trash dumping affects the quality of life in Yucca Valley. The project will control access and create green open space.

Mike Reynolds spoke as the president of the Morongo Basin BIA in favor of the GPA. With housing tracts to the east and west of the project, the project is an in-fill project which only makes sense in the neighborhood. The 21,000 square foot average lot and 24% open space are enhancements. The addition of the sewers is a plus.

Alvin Trotter, Jr. of Yucca Valley representing CHH Constriction and Copper Hill Homes supports the project. It will be good for the tax base and infrastructure. CHH creates jobs for local residents and is an economic boost to the Town. He asked the local employees of CHH present in the room to stand. Approximately a dozen people stood up.

John Wright who lives on Golden Bee stated they are building the nicest home in the valley.

Sarann Graham of Yucca Valley supports the GPA. A General Plan is a blueprint of the community and is amended based on the issues. The project will complete the consistency of the area.

David North of Yucca Valley who was a contractor for Copper Hills supports the GPA. It seems like a slam dunk and matches the density to the east and west.

The following people support the GPA but did not wish to speak: Dennis Morgan, John Melendez, Raymand Shirey, Ronald De Maio, Pete Tompkins, Ernie Zapanta, Norma Zapanta, Steven Dillon and William Shack, III.

Mr. Harry Bowkley of Yucca Valley spoke in opposition to the GPA which would increase density on the site by 1700% (Seventeen hundred percent) and will not preserve the rural character of the neighborhood. This is the opposite of rural. It is urban. The mass grading of the site will eliminate scenic hillsides, increase sedimentation and natural vegetation will not remain. To approve the GPA will deny our rural heritage. This is an outrage against the General Plan.

Terry Elam of Yucca Valley worked for Copper Hills for 2 years along Long Canyon. Copper Hills does not match the Town and is an eyesore. There were a number of homeowner complaints about drainage problems in the first Copper Hills. It was mass graded and it would be a mistake to pass the GPA.

George Hoagland lives in the Alta Loma area adjacent to the project on 1.5 acres and he has 50 Joshua Trees. How many Joshua Trees will remain on the project site after mass grading? It is hard to understand the rationale to change from RL 1 per 5 acres to 3.5 per acre. He has picked up trash from the project site for years. The trash and dirt bike problem got worse after the first Copper Hills was built.

Bill Souder of Yucca Valley is opposed to the GPA and the extreme 1700% increase in density. Approval could set a precedent that will be hard to deal with in the future. Every other builder may want a 1700% increase. This significant of a change should be addressed in a General Plan Review process rather than by amendment.

Lauren Wilson of Yucca Valley stated the run-off from Long Canyon wash does not empty into the retention basin Mr. Warner described. He concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation to deny.

Mr. Bill Warner stated 1700% is a multiple of the existing zoning but that is not the issue. The issue is what is appropriate now based on the terrain and preservation of the vistas. If trash and motorcycles have increased that is a difficult Code Enforcement issue. 3 to 3 ½ miles of trails have been created on the site which create dust, noise and are a hazard. The degradation of property referred to by one of the speakers is less an issue than if the site were an undisturbed site. They would be happy to work with staff to develop legally supportable findings. Long Canyon Channel was not intended to flow into the detention

basin. The basin is intended to take the water from the remaining portion of the property due to development.

Mr. Huntington stated several letters in support of the project have been received, copies of which are preserved in the meeting and project files. There being no others wishing to speak on the project, Mr. Huntington closed the Public Hearing and requested staff response.

Ms. Criste commented state law prohibits conditioning General Plan Amendments which is sometimes referred to as "contract zoning." You can't tie a legislative act to a particular project. The area being discussed as open space will be private property. Staff referred to a chart on the Tract Map which identifies buildable area by lot. The smallest are along the wash because of the restrictions. All open space shown on the Map is private property. The Tract will be mass graded other than the designated open space areas.

Mr. Willman confirmed that some of the lots are have only 9,000 square feet of buildable space and voiced concerns about the ability of the Town to improve Long Canyon wash for flood control purposes when the wash will be on private property. Ms. Criste stated she does not know what legal vehicles would be available to the Town.

Mr. McKoy commented the request is a quantum leap in density from the General Plan. He said he was not saying he agrees with the proposed density. If we don't have change in the density being proposed then we have the same problem on future building. How are we going to gradually change density? It seems like we're exacerbating the situation by keeping the density as it is being proposed.

Mr. Goodpaster commented the 1700% increase in density is based on 222 homes. 107 homes is approximately an 800% increase in density. Still a leap from what it was. He believes the applicant intends to build 107 homes. However, if the 3.5 zoning is approved and a Tract Map for substantially more than 107 homes is submitted the zoning would allow it. He does not believe RL-5 is appropriate for the site. The Tentative Tract Map is absolutely appropriate for the site. But the Commission is stuck in a catch 22 with the requested density.

Director of Community Development Tom Best stated, if the Commission wanted to provide direction to staff, staff would be happy to meet with the applicant and come back with something that coincides with that direction.

Mr. Goodpaster asked if a new zoning designation could be created to fit the proposed Tract Map. Ms. Criste stated it is possible to create a new General Plan designation and new zoning standards. The applicant could make the proposal or, at the direction of the Commission or Town Council, staff can make the proposal.

Mr. Best commented the basis for starting a reconsideration of this Tract Map may be by looking at the goals and policies in the staff report.

Mr. Willman discussed the buildable area of lots in the Tract Map when the wash area is excluded and noted there are 14 lots under 11,000 square feet, and 14 lots under 12,000 square feet. He's having a hard time with 107 homes. Ms. Criste commented surrounding areas have densities of 1.76 to 2.03 units per acre. The undeveloped areas north of the project are zoned RL-1 and Residential Hillside Reserve, both have Specific Plan requirements. Mr. Willman stated he is concerned that if the Tract Map is allowed there could be a problem if the owners of the property to the north request the same density. He would like to break up the high density area. Everybody could want to do a 3.5 zoning across the whole area.

Mr. Best commented that the previous General Plan amendments applied to existing development within what was the County and were not intended to set precedent.

Mr. Huntington stated most of the arguments presented tonight were economic as far as why the GPA should be granted. This is really not an economic issue but a quality of life issue. The General Plan is a visionary document, trying to foresee how the community will develop. It also has to recognize growth as critical. This parcel is probably inappropriately zoned and needs to be somewhat denser. The vision in the General Plan is higher density will be in the core of the community and there will be larger parcels farther away from the core. It provides for very large parcels backed up to the National Park. This area warrants additional density but he is not keen on the way it's being addressed. The 3.5 zoning is being offered to get the minimum lot size down to achieve their economic goals. He would like to see another approach, either a Planned Development or something that feathers the whole area out in zoning from the parcel to the north.

Mr. McKoy commented the General Plan makes a dramatic change in this parcel and he likes the idea of finding some way to graduate zoning and finding a compromise.

Mr. Huntington stated he thinks this offers a great opportunity for Planned Development where Long Canyon was can be set aside and dedicated to a conservation group or the Town so it becomes public lands. All of this is offered for discussion.

Mr. McKoy is of the same mind.

Mr. Huntington asked if anyone supported the 3.5 zoning for the whole parcel. None of the Commissioners supported the 3.5 density. Mr. Goodpaster supports the 107 homes but sees legal problems. He would like to see a different proposal.

Mr. Huntington asked staff to work with the applicant and bring something back to the Commission. He is trying to get to legally having the 107 lots but addressing it in a way that offers more protection.

Ms. Criste stated they would discuss both the Planned Development possibilities and the potential for a new designation or changes to the design of the Tract with the applicant. She suggested the item be tabled.

Mr. Huntington stated the consensus is that the parcel is inappropriately zoned but the Commission does not agree with the 3.5 zoning.

The applicant is in agreement with bringing the item back at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Goodpaster moved to table the item which was seconded by Mr. McKoy and passed unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Cooper rejoined the meeting.

### **3. TENTATIVE TRACT MAP TM 17476, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PD 01-06, ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT EA 02-06 - SILVATEX**

A request for planned development for a 58.23 acre site, as well as the subdivision of the 58.23 acres into 43 single family lots and, lots for open space, parks, sewage treatment and storm water detention located

on the north side of Paxton Rd., approximately 250 feet east of Imperial Dr. and identified as APN 601-021-40 and 43.

With reference to the complete printed staff report preserved in the meeting and project files, Contract Planner Nicole Criste presented the staff discussion to the meeting. Printed copies of the PowerPoint presentation used by Ms. Criste are preserved in the meeting and project files. Ms. Criste presented a Memorandum, copies of which are preserved in the meeting and project files, requesting amendments to the Conditions of Approval as presented in the meeting packets.

Mr. Cooper requested and received a definition of “toe of slope” as meaning the point at which alluvial fan topography significantly changes to a severe slope. Mr. Cooper questioned COA #13 and requested that the words “and a site plan showing which model is to be located on which lot” be deleted from the Condition. He requested that new COA 22a in the Memorandum be amended to add the “wastewater treatment plant”. COA #55 was deleted because it duplicates part of COA #22.

Mr. McKoy questioned a possible QUIMBY fee credit for parklands and suggested the issue be addressed early in the process.

Mr. Huntington commented 25 foot setbacks are required while 20 foot setbacks are shown on the Tract Map and requested that a variable setback be allowed.

Mr. Willman questioned the proposed gate on Mandarin Rd. and was informed it is emergency access which will be controlled by a Knox box. He voiced concerns about control of storm water runoff and was referred to COA #35. Ms. Criste stated storm drains will also be installed through the project. The Town Engineer will have to approve the Drainage Plan.

Ms. Criste stated the COA's will be restructured prior to being sent to the Town Council.

Mr. Huntington questioned the width of the trail through the open space. He stated for the record that the applicant called him and he reviewed the project with the applicant prior to this meeting.

Mr. Huntington opened the public hearing.

Design Engineer Mike Platt with Hacker Engineering stated storm drains through the project have been sized based on the preliminary hydrology study. The design will keep the 100 year flows within the streets to the lower basins. Based on the revised street right-of-way to 60 feet, a few of the lots will be changed to 12,000 square feet. He requested variable setbacks from 20 to 25 feet.

Applicant Chris Unanwoke of Silvatex thanked staff for working so closely through the 21 month development process. He questioned the requirement for undergrounding power lines not on the project property and discussed the issue with Ms. Criste. He stated they have discussed the sewage system with the CA Regional Water Quality Control Board and plan to use the EcoFluid System. It is the most technologically advanced and has the fewest moving parts. It is being designed for a worst case scenario and can be connected to future sewer lines when they are installed on Paxton Rd.

Bill Souder of Yucca Valley commented the current Lighting Ordinance exempts architectural lighting on homes which can cause light trespass. He requested that a Condition be added to install fully shielded lights within the project.

Michael Edrington of Yucca Valley supports the project. He sold the property to the applicant and is very pleased with the project design. It will be a great development and an economic boon to the Town.

Mike Lindley of Yucca Valley is opposed to the project and lives adjacent to the project site. The project will not compliment the neighborhood. The view lots in Western Hills will be looking right down on the project and who knows what might be stored in the backyards. He is concerned about the potential smells and noise which may be emitted by the sewage plant. He is concerned if Mandarin Rd. is not gated that traffic will increase to access Paxton Rd.

Jay Bloodworth of Yucca Valley asked where the displaced Joshua Trees will go and for the location of Lot K park area. His wife is concerned about increased traffic on Paxton Rd. Mr. Huntington replied the open space is the northeastern portion of the property. Ms. Criste stated the Joshua Trees must be mapped by a qualified person and as many as possible be incorporated into the project. There is a mandatory adoption program for those not being used in the project.

Victor Borcherrs of La Quinta, CA stated he represents the owners of 140 acres to the NE of the project. They are in favor of the project and congratulate staff for the fabulous use of the lands and the way it has been designed. It is the appropriate design.

Mark Cambiaso of Yucca Valley stated he is not trying to stop growth but he can't get onto Paxton Rd. from Imperial Rd. now because of the traffic. He questioned traffic control. Ms. Criste replied Paxton is slated for a stoplight at SR247.

Mr. Unanwoke stated the sewage plant will not create noise or odor because of the low quality BOD (Biologic Oxygen Demand) and can be placed next to a home. It is state of the art and will limit the phosphorous and nitrate aspect of the sewage. Because of the topography only about 40% of the site will be disturbed. They are proposing pad grading only. Because they are not mass grading most of the Joshua trees will stay in place.

Mr. Huntington closed the public hearing.

Ms. Criste stated the requested reduction in minimum lot size makes sense because of the extra 10 feet of right-of-way on each side. The lots are on average 135 to 140 feet deep. With a 25 ft setback and the rear setback there is still a fair amount of room on the lots. A 20 ft setback is not a significant reduction when there is a 10 ft parkway on the front of the lot. The Commission may want to do varying setbacks.

Mr. Cooper discussed the setbacks and lot size.

Mr. Huntington stated he is in favor of staggered setbacks because it is a more attractive street scene.

Mr. McKoy stated he likes the project and it looks like an asset to the area. They looked at the problems and did a nice job.

Mr. Goodpaster stated this could be a template for future development especially with the open space and hiking trails. He'd be all for it.

Mr. Willman asked if there will be a stop sign on Paxton Rd. Ms. Criste replied there will be a stop sign halting traffic exiting the project. She will talk to the Town Engineer to see if a stop sign on Paxton is warranted but it will be tied to traffic volumes. Mr. Willman loves the project, the lay out and the open space. He would like to see any Joshua Trees that need to be relocated replanted into the open space in the project.

Mr. Cooper stated it is a very nicely designed project. He wishes we could have more of these. The cluster development with open space is one of the few ways we're going to be able to develop the Town and still retain some rural atmosphere. He is very much in favor of the project.

Mr. Huntington stated it is a well conceived project.

Mr. Huntington reviewed the changes to the Conditions of Approval as discussed above, which will be reflected in the Conditions of Approval forwarded to the Town Council.

Mr. Willman requested that the construction entrance be limited to access from Paxton Rd. and that Mandarin Rd. will not be used by construction vehicles.

Mr. Cooper moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the Town Council approval of Environmental Assessment EA 02-06, Planned Development PD 01-06 and Tract Map TM 17476 as amended based on the findings and Conditions of Approval contained within the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Willman and carried unanimously by voice vote.

#### **CONSENT AGANDA - None**

#### **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

CUP 07-06 – Verizon – construct a cell tower on Paxton Hill  
TM 18312 – Ali – divide 7.5 acres into 14 SFR lots on Church St. 500 ft. S. of Onaga

#### **COMMISSIONER REPORTS AND REQUESTS**

Mr. McKoy requested an update on Home Depot. Mr. Best replied Home Depot has put their project out to bid. Their real estate committee will review the bids this month. There are still open issues regarding wastewater treatment.

#### **ANOUNCEMENTS**

The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission will be held at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007

The meeting adjourned at 10:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by



Jeannie Lindberg  
Sr. Administrative Assistant