

February 15, 2022

7:00 p.m.

Planning Department

City Annex Building

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Brent Dixon, Joanne Denney, Arnold Cantu, George Morrison, Margaret Wimborne, Lindsey Romankiw

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

ALSO PRESENT: Assistant Planning Director Kerry Beutler, planners Naysha Foster, Caitlin Long Anas Almassrahy and Caitlin Long and interested citizens.

CALL TO ORDER: Brent Dixon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

CHANGES TO AGENDA: None.

MINUTES: None.

Business:

1. PLAT 21-039: FINAL PLAT. Stone Creek Estates Division No. 4:

Applicant: Brian Jacobson, 980 Pier View Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Jacobson stated that the preliminary plat was approved February 1, 2022, and nothing has changed since then. Jacobson presented that this is an 11- acre parcel with 32 residential lots. Jacobson stated that Division 4 will be the final division.

Long presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Wimborne asked if Blackstone and Greystone will be going to 49th and confirmed that there is access into the Brookside Subdivision. Long confirmed that there will be a bridge built to connect to Old Stone Lane.

Wimborne moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Stone Creek Estates Division No. 4, Morrison seconded the motion. Denney called for roll call vote: Cantu, yes; Dixon, yes; Morrison, yes; Romankiw, yes; Wimborne, yes. The motion passed unanimously.

2. PLAT 22-001: FINAL PLAT. Skyline Manor Townhomes Division No. 2.

Applicant: Barry Baine, Connect Engineering, 2295 North Yellowstone, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Baine indicated that this came before the Commission as a PUD. Baine indicated this is on the corner of Skyline and Pancheri. Baine indicated that this PUD was approved in December. Baine indicated that it is 10 lots that will be single family attached homes. Baine stated that this is over ½ acre and has cross access easement.

Morrison asked about amenities. Baine stated that this is a connection to Division 1, there is a common lot in Division 2, and it connects to Division 1 that has additional amenities.

Foster presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Dixon asked if there is a potential issue with this Division on the north side of the lots. Foster stated that Division 1 and Division 2 PUD they asked for a reduction in setbacks and that was

approved as part of the PUD. Dixon asked about the unplatted area. Baine indicated that there is an existing home between the two divisions, so that is not part of this plat.

Dixon pointed out that if at some point in the future the owner of the unplatted area did decide to leave and there was an odd lot for development it could easily be brought into this PUD. Dixon feels that is a plus for this development.

Dixon moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Skyline Manor Townhomes Division 2, as presented, Cantu seconded the motion. Denney called for roll call vote: Cantu, yes; Dixon, yes; Morrison, yes; Romankiw, yes; Wimborne, yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearing(s):

3. PUD 21-006: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT. Caribou Crossing Townhomes.

Denney opened the public hearing.

Applicant: Barry Baine, Connect Engineering, 2295 N. Yellowstone, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Baine stated that this property was just annexed in January. Baine stated that this property is behind WinCo and is 2.5+ acres with an initial zoning of LC. Baine stated that they are bringing a PUD concept for affordable single-family housing. Baine stated that there is R-1 to the north and is surrounded by LC, with multi-family directly to the south. Baine stated that they are proposing to put 29 single family homes on the property, and they will have a final plat. Baine stated that they will have 2 car garages and 1 car garage townhomes. Baine stated that they meet the requirements for the LC Zone which refers to the R3A zone for residential. Baine stated that the density required for R3A zone is 35 units per acre. Baine stated that they are currently at 11 units per acre. Baine stated that they are seeking just above R1 density which is a good transition as it goes from multi-family and commercial to the single family. Baine stated that this property is vacant and will be City infill. Baine stated that this is a walkable area for stores and access to City systems. Baine stated that there is sewer and water in Easy Street. Baine stated that they are planning to exceed the required 58 parking stalls and they will provide 79 parking stalls with the layout. Baine stated that they are seeking a variance with this PUD with the setbacks on the south side and the north side. Baine indicated that in order to get a full parking driveway in the front of the units they are seeking for a reduced setback from the required 25' to 15-16'. Baine stated that on the south where it adjoins to multi-family the setbacks will be more consistent with multi-family. Baine stated that there is a masonry wall that goes along the that is 9' tall. Baine stated that they will still follow the landscape buffer with trees also. Baine stated that with the wall and landscape buffer it justifies the variance on the setback to get the additional parking that the homeowners want in the site. Baine stated that they are providing the 25% common space with a gazebo. Baine stated that there has been talks with City Parks and Recreation about working with them to turn the area directly into the west into some sort of parks system for the PUD and the City. Baine stated that the entry will be appealing with signage and landscaping.

Dixon asked about the distance between garage doors and the sidewalks on the tandem parking. Baine stated that it is 20' so it is longer than the average vehicle. Dixon wanted to clarify that the tandem parking wouldn't block the sidewalk. Baine stated that the City Staff had that same

concern and urged them to extend to the full 20'. Dixon asked on the end of the sub streets is there going to be a turn around. Baine stated that it is less than 150' so it is not required per fire.

Morrison asked if there is any guest parking. Baine stated that total required parking with 2 spots per unit would be 58 parking stalls and with the tandem stalls and requesting the variance they would have 79 parking stalls which would be 21 additional parking, as well as street parking.

Foster presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Dixon asked if this property includes part of the original right of way for Kelsey Ave. Foster stated that it is a private easement. Dixon asked if the right of way has been vacated. Foster indicated that it has been vacated. Foster indicated that they wouldn't develop Easy Street into Kelsey Ave, as the property to the north is all established residential, and the street was vacated when the masonry wall was constructed when WinCo was built as part of the development agreement. Dixon asked if a park is developed to the northwest would the primary access to the park be Northeast Bonneville or through this private street network. Foster stated that it would be from Northeast Bonneville and the developer is also proposing walking through a fence to connect. Baine clarified that they have been in talks, but it is not for sure thing on the park, and he doesn't want decisions based on a park. Baine stated that the PUD doesn't have any of the park included in it. Dixon is trying to understand if they are trying to establish a potential for future road network or if what is being proposed is a pedestrian access. Baine stated that in talks with Parks and Recreation the main access would come from NE Bonneville, and the other access could possible by pedestrian access only. Baine again stated they are very initial talks. Beutler clarified that Easy Street is a private road and not public. Beutler stated that the roads within the proposed PUD would also be private. Beutler stated that if there were a public park built to the west that public access would come from NE Bonneville.

No one appeared in support or opposition of this application.

Denney closed the public hearing.

Dixon stated that they have had mixed reviews on tandem parking as far as how well it works. Dixon feels that shortening the rear setbacks is ok due to the significant wall that is the primary buffer between this buffer and the existing property. Dixon feels that the amenity is appropriate, and if the park is developed then that will add benefit for this property. Dixon does like the recommendation for a pedestrian cut through the wall so people can get back and forth between the neighborhoods and shopping centers. Dixon feels that it is unfortunate that Kelsey Ave has been vacated.

Morrison thinks this is a good fit for this property and presents an excellent buffer from multi-family to single family housing, and this is what missing middle should look like.

Wimborne echoed Dixon's comments on parking. Wimborne feels that tandem does work in a lot of situations and does commend the developer for providing additional parking for visitors as this is a tight space.

Wimborne moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Planned Unit Development for Caribou Crossing Townhomes with the requirements outlined to

provide the pedestrian connection from Easy Street to Kelsey Ave. Morrison seconded the motion.

Dixon asked if the motion includes recommendation for the variance to the rear setbacks. Wimborne stated that she didn't explicitly state it but did say the conditions as outlined and then the connections, Wimborne feels that the conditions as outlined included the setbacks.

Staff didn't feel that the motion needed to be restated.

Denney called for roll call: Cantu, yes; Dixon, yes; Morrison, yes; Romankiw, yes; Wimborne, yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. RZON 22-001: Amendment of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, Sections 11-2-6, 11-3-4 and Tables 11-2-1 and 11-3-3 allowing for accessory dwelling units in all residential zones and establishing land use standards.

Denney opened the public hearing.

Applicant: City of Idaho Falls.

Long stated that Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) were introduced with the City-wide Code changes in April 2018. Long stated that they are almost ready to adopt the new Comprehensive Plan Imagine IF, and one of the action items was to permit ADU's in all zones.

Long presented that ADU's will be permitted in all residential zones, and that would need to change the code to permit ADU's in RP, R1, and RMH. Long stated that in addition to allowing them in all residential zones they are working to create ease to build the ADU's.

Long presented the change to 11-2-6 (N) (1)(d) that clarified Caretaker's residence; 11-2-6 (N)(2)(h) prohibiting Recreational vehicles as ADU's; 11-2-6 (N)(3) requiring a parking space on the lot where the ADU is located; 11-2-6 (N)(5) ADU's will not be calculated towards density calculations.

Long presented the change to 11-2-4 (C)(2) remove the rear lot coverage and added R2 and TN to include that the lot coverage is only areas under roofs.

Long wanted to go over the process of getting an ADU. Long indicated that it comes in as a building permit, which is reviewed by the building permit, and then also reviewed by the planning department to ensure that it meets all the ADU requirements. Long stated that they haven't had a lot of ADU's come forward, and they will monitor it to work out any bugs.

Long stated that they did have a comment brought to them about limiting ADU's to one bedroom. Long wants the commission to discuss that and if they want it added, it can be added before City Council.

Morrison asked what the maximum square footage for the ADU could be. Long stated that currently the ADU has a maximum of 750 square feet and included in that 750 square feet there is another requirement that the ADU only have one bedroom, and the public has asked that the 1-bedroom requirement be removed.

No one appeared in support or opposition.

Denney closed the public hearing.

Denney asked the Commissioners about their feeling on the one bedroom.

Wimborne doesn't feel that it is required, as you can have one bedroom and have 8 people in the living room, so limiting to one bedroom doesn't put the limit on that you would think you are putting on, but rather the 750 square feet will limit appropriately.

Morrison asked if there has been success or failure in other cities with ADU's. Long stated that it varies on how aggressive the city wanted to be, and the cities that were more successful removed a lot of the restrictions, so they didn't require parking on the property, had different size restrictions, and had very robust programs that supplied floor plans, targeted residents to build ADU's. Long felt that those programs had a lot of success, and if you let it be, it happens more organically.

Dixon asked about the prohibition on recreational vehicles and asked if it is a structure that doesn't have a foundation. Long stated that essentially that is what it would be, something on wheels that can be moved would not be permitted. Dixon asked about the foundation requirements for RMH. Beutler stated that RMH is the mobile home zone, and the unit would be required to meet the foundation or tie down requirements. Beutler stated that an RV is mobile and could move instead of being tied down. Beutler stated that there are already restrictions in the City of Idaho Falls, that you cannot live in a RV unless you are in a designated RV Park. Beutler stated this addition was an effort to reemphasize that requirement to make it clear. Beutler added that the short-term rental standards also indicate that it cannot be an RV. Dixon confirmed that the RMH Zone cannot have a trailer and it has to be off the wheels and tied down. Beutler clarified that if it is an RV park that it can be a trailer. Dixon clarified that the primary residence could be an RV, but the secondary residence couldn't be an RV. Beutler stated that RV Parks have specific development standards. Dixon is trying to understand ADU's as an allowed use in every zone, and he is looking at some zones and trying to understand what it means in that zone. Foster stated that in an RMH zone you can have a single wide, a double wide, manufactured home, but it has to be in a foundation, unless it is in an RV Park. Foster stated that you can have a double wide on a permanent foundation with an ADU. Beutler clarified that RMH zone does allow for an RV Park, but an RV Park has limitations to its use. Beutler stated that a mobile home and manufactured home park is a separate use all together, and it is similar with the pad sites, and the park is under one ownership, and they lease pad sites to place their homes. Beutler stated that adding ADU's to RMH zone is because even in an RMH zone you are also allowed to have a single-family home, so the intent is to provide ADU's anywhere a single-family home is allowed. Beutler added that you will not have ADU's in mobile home parks or RV parks because those are separate uses and have different development standards. Dixon asked if there is language stating that it is not allowed. Beutler stated that it is not the same use. So the use table in the staff report there will be uses called out.

Dixon asked why they don't count the ADU as part of the density calculation. Long stated that their research stated that it is by right, and by right if you have a dwelling unit, you can have an accessory dwelling unit, so that is why they didn't include it in the density. Dixon stated that you are doubling the allowed density without making it clear that you are doubling the allowed density. Dixon stated that for every dwelling unit you can have an ADU so if the density is limited to a certain number of units per acre you just doubled that number. Long stated that ADUs have guidelines and square footage requirements and they are smaller and have a purpose of a mother in lawsuits, or caretaker quarters. Long stated that it might not be a full dwelling,

just an ADU to the main dwelling. Dixon argued that there aren't standards that the main dwelling unit be any particular size. Dixon stated that the main dwelling could be 751 square feet and the ADU 750 square feet, and most people would view that as a twin home. Dixon stated that this proposal would eliminate the idea of a single family detached home. Beutler stated that single unit detached home is allowed in every zone in the City. Dixon stated that if everyone has an ADU then you no longer have a single unit detached, you now have a double unit detached. Beutler stated it is unlikely that will occur. Beutler stated that ADU's are viewed as having very little impact to the neighborhood. Beutler stated that it was never the goal of the City to only have single family detached, and rather they want to diversify the housing choice. Dixon argued that it is a form of diversity to have neighborhoods that only have single family detached.

Wimborne asked if a neighborhood could create covenants that would restrict or limit ADU's in specific neighborhoods. Morrison stated that there are many neighborhoods that have an HOA. Beutler stated that it is possible, but there is a Bill being presented to the Legislature that will prevent any major restriction of allowing ADU's in a residential zone. Beutler stated that the Legislature did a similar thing a few years back with short term rentals, so that same proposal is coming forward with ADU's. Beutler added that it will prevent an HOA from having protective covenants that would prevent an ADU from being established.

Wimborne moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Amendments to Sections 11-2-6 and 11-3-4 and Tables 11-2-1, 11-3-3 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Pertaining to the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as outlined, Cantu seconded the motion. Denney called for roll call: Cantu, yes; Dixon, no; Morrison, no; Romankiw, yes; Wimborne, yes. The motion passed 3-2.

Dixon opposed the motion because he feels this is doubling the potential density and he doesn't understand it needs to be done this way as opposed to simply stating the allowed densities have been doubled, and he feels it is a hidden doubling of the density; and zoning is in place for people to choose in what type of a neighborhood they live in and not have to live next to an 8 plex if they don't choose to, and this will remove the guarantee of living in a single family neighborhood even though single family detached is the most popular form of housing in the City.

Morrison agreed with Dixon and feels this should be brought forth in an individual session of the Planning Commission and work on it more.

5. RZON 22-002: Amendment of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, Sections 11-2-6, 11-3-3, 11-4-4, 11-7-1 and Tables 11-3-1, 11-3-3, 11-4-1 clarifying the development standards related to manufactured and mobile homes.

Denney opened the public hearing.

Applicant: City of Idaho Falls.

Foster gave background on the RMH standards. Foster indicated that the RMH Standards were adopted in the 1970's and they've slightly changed since then. Foster stated that the proposed amendment would change section 11-2-6 for Standards for Allowed Land use and amending the

minimum lot size requirements, adding 11-2-6 (V)(1), (2), (4), (5), (6) and (7). Foster presented that they are proposing a minimum lot size of 2 acres; and recommend that each unit have a separation distance of 15'. Foster presented to strike sub section 2 regarding the principal entrance of the Mobile home park. Foster indicated they have added to (5) that they include a hard surface of 9x20 with a minimum of 180 square feet. Foster presented (6) that the mobile home park should be under a unified ownership and planned as a whole. Foster presented (7) as an addition for an amenity to the mobile home park after 10 spaces.

Foster stated that research shows that the RMH zone has had a density of 8 units per acre since it was adopted in the 70s and they feel that is not appropriate, and that there have been requests to increase it to 35 units per acre, but odds are they will never see that type of density, but they did want it to be a high density opportunity for the mobile home parks to provide affordable housing. Foster stated that R3A is 35 units per acre, so staff has discussed using the 35 units per acre as a density for a mobile home park.

Foster went through the table for Landscaping and Buffer Requirements.

Foster stated that in 11-4-4 they propose to strike (c) regarding the perimeter of the mobile home park, and the reason therefore is they want to leave room for them to move homes in and out of the park. Foster presented 11-4-4 (H)(5) was added with a special provision for mobile home parks located next to single dwelling units.

Foster stated that they tweaked the definition in 11-7-1 to include the 2-acre minimum for a mobile home park.

Foster indicated that they tried to keep it simple in the amendment and see how it goes. Foster stated they have had a lot of calls of people wanting to develop mobile home parks, however it doesn't pencil with the current density.

Morrison asked about the deletion of 11-2-6 (V)(2) and showed concern about the traffic and the entrance provision. Foster stated that they aren't sure how to interpret whether they were going to have 2 entrances, and the Fire Code will mandate that once its over 30 units or more. Foster stated that this is an area of the ordinance that has been in place since the 1970's and they weren't sure how to interpret it, and so thus they weren't sure how to enforce it, so they felt it best to remove it. Beutler added that there are other mechanisms to deal with this including the Access Management Plan that dictates where access points are located and what the proper spacing will be and the street based on its classification. Beutler stated that the same would be true for any development. Beutler stated they deal with access management through other methods, not the zoning ordinance. Beutler stated that (2) is outdated to the way that the City manages access. Dixon asked about how they dictate the access points on private roads, as the roads will likely be private, and does the same Access Management standards apply for private roads. Dixon doesn't feel that the trip number is the issue, but rather a long trailer that is coming in and out.

Dixon is surprised that the current mobile home parks are 8 units per acre. Foster stated that she couldn't find a logical explanation for the low density. Dixon agrees with the change to the higher density. Dixon asked about 11-2-6(V)(2). Dixon asked if someone is laying out the mobile home park then they would have to have a wider minimum for a double wide versus a single wide or is the assumption that all of these are not on foundations. Foster stated that they

wouldn't be on foundations in a mobile park, so each unit would need to be at least 15 feet of separation between the units. Dixon suggested that they take into account a "kick out" part on a recreational mobile home, and they are unsure if the current wording addresses that. Foster stated that RV Parks are separated from mobile home parks. Dixon stated that the 15' separation is not clear if it is 15' from the ground or 15' from the farthest point sticking out. Dixon is unclear on the difference between Table 11-4-1 versus the added paragraph (H)(5). Dixon asked which one would take precedence. Foster stated that it would be a 7' setback with a 6' masonry wall or fence, so it is not one or the other, it is both. Dixon asked about 11-4-4(G)(4)(c). Dixon doesn't agree with the argument about access into the mobile home park. Dixon feels that they still need to have things look good from the street and that there will be designated access points where the private roads are. Dixon suggested allowing having the private road having more width before a tree, but just simply removing the landscape buffering requirements he doesn't agree with that. Dixon feels that other than that the changes make reasonable sense.

Beutler asked the Commission about other areas of the Code where they allow them to "clump" the trees together like for car dealerships to provide access. Beutler asked if it would make sense for the Commission to maintain the landscape buffer but provide flexibility to adjust the trees or move them in order to still allow for easy access in and out. Morrison would agree with that.

Morrison asked if there is a difference between a mobile home park and an RV Park. Beutler stated that there are separate definitions listed separately in the use tables. Beutler stated that many of the manufactured home parks also have an RV section that meets the RV Park Section. Dixon asked if the 2-acre minimum would apply to the total or just the RV Park portion. Beutler stated that it would apply to the mobile home park portion. Dixon confirmed that the total development would have to be in addition to the 2 acres for just the mobile home park.

Dixon asked how staff would like to proceed tonight and should the Commission Table the action until they can come up with some of the changes. Beutler stated that it is up to the Commission and if they are comfortable to express the conditions and staff can address them before going to City Council, or if you'd rather see it again, they can do that.

Support/Opposition:

Jeremiah Bigelow, 5035 E 34 North, Ririe, Idaho. Bigelow came into the City 2 years ago. Bigelow stated that they were annexed and zoned. Bigelow hasn't done anything yet as they were waiting for this meeting. Bigelow stated that they felt the previous code was too restrictive and they couldn't make the development work with the density. Bigelow likes the ability to be more creative as housing is getting so expensive.

Denney closed the public hearing.

Morrison asked what the Commissioners think about coming back and discussing this or finishing tonight.

Wimborne asked to summarize the changes.

Dixon stated that he saw two areas for changes including: 11-2-6(V)(2) discussing the 15' separation distance and that needs to be worded so that it includes how ever much a kick out sticks out on the dwelling; and 11-4-4(G)(40)(c) regarding striking the landscaping along the

road, and the modified suggestion was to keep the landscaping requirement but add flexibility to allow for ease of access.

Wimborne stated that what is being proposed is for a mobile home park and most mobile homes/manufactured homes don't have those kick outs and only RVs and 5th wheels. Foster agreed with Wimborne and stated that they would measure. Foster stated that some mobile homes have a cantilever, and they would want to measure from the actual unit itself. Foster agreed to add language to beef that up so its black and white. Dixon stated that in the ADU there was an allowed uses in residential zones and there were 2 rows with one for manufactured homes and one for mobile home park and these requested changes have to do with mobile home parks, not manufactured home, so these are the ones that are allowed to be on wheels. Wimborne added that in addition to that there is RV Park and RV Park is where you would have the 5th Wheels and those kinds of things. Foster agreed with Wimborne. Foster stated that anything that needs to be licensed to be pulled down the road is an RV, and a mobile home needs to be licensed, but it is over a certain square footage to be considered a mobile home and not an RV and it is on a chassis. Dixon asked if that there is another part of the table that is not included. Foster indicated there is. Dixon stated that there are 3 things that apply to RMH including manufactured homes, mobile home park and RV Park. Beutler stated that if you look at the manufactured home it is allowed in every zone. Foster stated that a mobile home or manufactured home park allows you to bring in those types of dwellings without placing them on a permanent foundation. Dixon is confused and asked if in addition to mobile home park is there another entry into that use table that they don't have in staff notes for RV Park that also falls under this zone. Beutler stated that an RV Park is allowed in RMH Zone with a conditional use permit. Dixon clarified that it is different from the mobile home park. Dixon asked them to describe the difference between and RV and a mobile home. Foster gave the definition for a manufactured home which is allowed in RMH is a structure constructed after June 15, 1976 pursuant to Idaho Code following manufactured home construction and safety standards. Foster defined mobile home as factory assembled structures generally constructed prior to June 15, 1976 as defined by Idaho Code, and a mobile home generally has a chassis. Foster defined RV as any vehicle designed to provide temporary living quarters for recreational camping, travel, or emergency, a size or weight for which unrestricted use of the highway of the State can be maintained without special highway use permits. The term shall not include a van or camper shell, which does not have said contained sleeping accommodations, or restroom facilities. The Term recreational mobile home shall include without limitation all travel trailers, self-propelled motor home units, self-contained campers and camping tent trailers. Foster added that DOT defines them as anything under 425 square feet. Dixon asked if a travel trailer would qualify as a mobile home. Foster and Beutler disagreed. Wimborne stated that you don't need a special permit to take a travel trailer or move it. Foster added that you have to be a licensed mover in order to move a manufactured or mobile home in Idaho, and an RV doesn't require a license to move it down the road. Dixon stated that the word mobile implies that it is designed to be taken down the road as opposed to manufactured home which implies that it is a special load. Foster stated that manufactured home is a lot different than a mobile home, as it is manufactured somewhere else, and is not on a chassis, it is lifted, moved, and set, it is not like a single wide. Beutler stated that mobile homes predate 1976, and now you cannot move a mobile home anymore. Beutler stated that RVs are for temporary use, whereas a mobile home is for permanent use. Beutler stated that there are definitions for an RV Park and a mobile home park, so there is a difference, and they shouldn't be construed to be the same thing, as they are

separate, RVs are for temporary use, manufactured and mobile homes are for permanent living, and they have to be in a designated park. Foster stated that you do have to have a special permit for a mobile home or manufactured home to move them and you have to have a building permit to place the home, where an RV you do not have to have a building permit.

Wimborne stated that there was discussion in making changes to 11-2-6 (2) and on the change that Beutler brought up and those changes are important, and staff can make them, and they can move forward tonight.

Wimborne moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Amendments to Sections 11-2-6, 11-3-3, 11-3-4, 11-7-1 and Tables 11-3-1, 11-3-3 and 11-4-1 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Pertaining to the RMH, Residential Mobile Home Standards. Romankiw seconded the motion. Denney called for roll call: Cantu, yes; Dixon, no; Morrison, yes; Romankiw, yes; Wimborne, yes. The motion passed 4-1.

Dixon opposed the motion because the two items that were discussed to do modifications on before moving forward to City Council was not part of the motion.

Denney thanked the staff for their hard work.

Next Meeting February 15, 2022

Denney adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Beckie Thompson, Recorder