

**ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah**  
**March 6, 2012**

**I. GENERAL BUSINESS**

**A. Welcome and Roll Call:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman Jannicke Brewer. The following commission members were present and constituted a quorum.

Chairman: Jannicke Brewer

Commission Members: Todd Barney, Steve Swanson, Tami Hamilton, Steve Cospers, Bryce Higbee

Commission Members Not Present: Jason Thelin

Staff: April Naidu, Marla Fox

Others: Craig Aramaki, Chris Lamoureux, Michael Tycer, Bob Schirmer, Leslie Clark, Ken Berg, Caleb Warnock, Aaron Frazer, Logan Hunter, Camden Cooper, Max Cressler, Steve Shippen

**B. Prayer/Opening Comments:** Steve Swanson

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**III. ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Conditional Use Permits for Home Occupations:**

**Utah Leadership Training Academy – 2 N. Village Court - Christopher Lamoureux:**

The Planning Commission had no questions.

**Lynndyl Sigurd Publishing – 707 W. 800 S. – Caleb Warnock:**

The Planning Commission had no questions.

**Paradiddle – 420 Glacier Lily Drive – Craig Aramaki**

The Planning Commission had no questions.

**Craig Aramaki, Attorney at Law – 420 Glacier Lily Drive – Craig Aramaki**

The Planning Commission had no questions.

**MOTION:** Steve Cospers moved to grant conditional use permits for home occupations to Christopher Lamoureux dba Utah Leadership Training Academy at 2 N. Village Court; Caleb Warnock dba Lynndyl Sigurd Publishing at 707 W. 800 S.; Craig Aramaki dba Paradiddle at 420 Glacier Lily Drive; and Craig Aramaki dba Craig Aramaki, Attorney at Law at 420 Glacier Lily Drive. Tami Hamilton seconded. Ayes: 6. Nays: 0. Todd Barney, Steve Swanson, Tami Hamilton, Jannicke Brewer, Steve Cospers, and Bryce Higbee voted aye. Motion passed unanimously.

**B. David's Court Plat E – Revised Final:**

April Naidu said David's Court Plat E consists of 2 lots on Healey Boulevard. The Planning Commission saw these lots before a few years ago as part of Plat D. After Plat D was approved the applicant revised the plat in order to only record one lot and indicated that the other 2 lots would come as Plat E. April Naidu explained she had talked to David Church about the process and he said we could do it as a revised final plat. Nothing has changed since the Planning Commission saw these lots before and they meet the zoning requirements. April Naidu listed the conditions outlined in the engineer's review letter and indicated the red lines had been taken care of.

Jannicke Brewer asked that SWPPP be written out as it is difficult to remember months later what it stands for. It is the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Jannicke Brewer also indicated that the original preliminary plan from 2008 showed a building envelope on lot 1 and would like that to be added back in. This would help clearly identify the rear and side property lines.

**MOTION:** Todd Barney moved that the Planning Commission recommends a revised final approval to City Council for David's Court Plat E subject to the following:

1. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan be submitted and approved by the City Engineer prior to the plat being recorded.
2. The City's water policy be met.
3. A bond be provided for the required improvements.
4. The building envelope for lot 1 be shown on the final plat that was approved as part of the preliminary plat in 2008.

Steve Swanson seconded. Ayes: 6. Nays: 0. Todd Barney, Steve Swanson, Tami Hamilton, Jannicke Brewer, Steve Cospier, and Bryce Higbee voted aye. Motion passed unanimously.

### **C. Telecommunications Ordinance:**

April Naidu said that the Planning Commission started a discussion on some possible amendments to the Telecommunications Ordinance at its last meeting. At that meeting the Planning Commission mainly discussed the issue of stealth design and how to define it. Also, the Planning Commission indicated at its last meeting it would be helpful to talk to a qualified RF engineer about the technical issues so that the Planning Commission had a better understanding and could separate out the facts from the emotion as they work on revising the ordinance.

April Naidu introduced Michael Tycer who is a senior RF engineer for Cricket Communications. Mr. Tycer's contact information was given to the City by Alpine City resident, Stephen Crain, who had worked with Mr. Tycer previously and highly recommended him as a good source to help us understand the technical side of this issue.

Jannicke Brewer explained that the Planning Commission knows a little about radio frequency, but did not know much about the difference between radio frequency and microwave dishes and more importantly how carriers determine where to place a tower.

Mr. Tycer explained that a tower for cell phone providers are usually the monopoles with antennas at different layers to provide coverage for mobile phones. He further explained that each cell site has to be connected back to a switching center to route calls which connects to local telephone company. How it is connected from the tower to the switching center is by T-1's, high speed data circuits. You can do this through Century Link or through microwave. Microwave is a point to point specific path and the broadcast is between the dishes in a straight line which provides the backhaul which will take it back to the switching center. The tower without the backhaul is useless and will not be able to connect to the switching center and to the local telephone company or long distance trunk groups to process calls. This is the basic difference between a regular cell tower and microwave dishes.

Jannicke Brewer asked if it was true that microwave dishes are used more for internet. Mr. Tycer said he did not think in general that they were used as a broadcast antenna. He stated that he knows in the case of Clearwire (another wireless internet service provider), and assumed it would be the same for Digis, that microwave dishes are not used as a broadcast antenna meaning they do not broadcast out the signal for coverage, but are going to be for backhaul to eventually link back to the switch.

Steve Cospier asked if the signal comes from wherever Digis is sending the signal for the internet and it is received by the microwave which then goes back to the switching center and then to the phone lines. Mr. Tycer said yes, it is basically just a path back to their switching center. The switching center is basically a hub - termination points for

all the cell sites and connection to long distance trunk lines and local phone groups. It can become expensive to use T-1's and if fiber optic cable to be able to provide carriers the speed is not available, they have to use microwave.

Steve Cospers questioned if you have to have a receiver next to your computer and if it was getting a signal from outside the house. Steve Swanson clarified that we are talking two different things: telephone and internet. Steve Cospers asked what the actual physical broadcaster is that would go to the homes. Mr. Tycker assumed the provider would have some sort of additional antennas on the tower besides the microwave dishes. They typically can be a pole if it is an omni-directional whip antenna or they can have individual directional panel antennas to directionally broadcast the coverage footprint. Steve Cospers asked if the microwave dish was only a receiver. Mr. Tycker said you can use the same microwave dish to transmit and receive.

Steve Cospers asked why the placement is so critical in certain areas as far as coverage is concerned. Jannicke Brewer asked Mr. Tycker to explain if he were to come in with an application what would he look at. Mr. Tycker said each provider will probably have reasonably similar criteria for this and used Cricket as an example. He explained he would look at the current coverage footprint in the area so he would look at current towers that they are using to provide coverage and see how close he could put a new tower to the existing footprint that will provide the most return on investment. He would need a tower with a good line of sight to the surrounding areas and that has a little overlap with the existing footprint because if you do not have overlap you drop calls. Mr. Tycker explained that Cricket prefers to look for existing towers because it is more cost-effective and existing towers are already zoned so it is a much easier process.

Mr. Tycker continued that if an existing tower is not available they will look for a willing landlord that has a higher elevation or something that is going to get us above the surrounding buildings and trees and clutter. It does not do any good to have a tower that is shorter than the surrounding trees and buildings because the footprint will be a half a block or a block and it is not worth building a \$150,000 site to transmit such a short distance.

Steve Cospers, going back to the microwave dish, asked if the final transmitter would look the same whether it was for phone or internet. Mr. Tycker said the antennas will vary a little depending on the frequency and the strength of the antennas you want for the service area. Steve Cospers asked how far out the frequency goes. Mr. Tycker said it will vary on the frequency and power of the transmitter. Mr. Tycker said in general it could be anywhere from a quarter mile to two miles, again depending on various factors.

Steve Cospers asked if the distance between Shepherd's Hill and the Alpine Cove area was more than two miles. Jannicke Brewer wondered the same thing and continued asking if the tower Mr. Tycker mentioned in Cedar Hills would allow Cricket to provide better service to Alpine. Mr. Tycker said that one in Cedar Hills would probably not get north of the ridgeline which he assumed was the Shepherd's Hill area because of the terrain. Mr. Tycker explained the farther you move away from the tower the signal gets weaker. If you have sight of the tower you will probably have fairly good coverage unless you are twenty miles away. After a certain distance the signal will not be able to penetrate mortar, brick, etc. Mr. Tycker said terrain can help you in some instances where the signal can bounce off the mountain side, but by and large if you are a couple miles away inside coverage will not be very good.

Jannicke Brewer asked what "wi-max" is. Mr. Tycker said it is already in use and thought AT&T used it for part of their data service. He said it is just another wireless technology to provide service.

Jannicke Brewer said she had read recently that as we require or want more of wireless services and as more people use it that we will need more towers and towers closer together. Mr. Tycker said that as people use phones for more data services, such as watching television or sending data on your phone, you need strong signals and the only way to solve that is put up more towers because people will not put up with slow service. What they have found they may have towers a couple miles apart and as the customer base increases and use on the towers increases they have to split the distance and put a tower in the middle to maintain the same level of service.

Steve Swanson asked if they could just increase the number of receivers. Mr. Tycker said part of it is a matter of physics. If you are far away and you keep increasing the number of people drawing power from that you can do a

few things like put on higher gain antennas to boost coverage a little, but these measures only work for a little while and if you keep increasing demand on the tower you reach a breaking point where you will not get any more out of the tower and the only solution is another tower.

Steve Swanson said he often sees towers with multiple layers of antennas and asked if those are different carriers. Mr. Tycer said yes and explained that carriers will collocate on the same towers. Steve Swanson then asked how many customers can be served by one antenna. Mr. Tycer said it will vary depending on several factors and it could serve anywhere from a dozen to hundreds. Steve Swanson clarified that increasing the number of antennas does not mean anything. Mr. Tycer said that was correct. Mr. Tycer explained that different types of antennas on the same level provide different services. Different technologies after a certain threshold is reached will require additional antennas be added.

Steve Swanson asked if Cricket were to come in and established a cell site in Alpine and you go from 100 to 1,000 customers, what changes would have to be made to the tower. Mr. Tycer said most of the changes would probably be transparent and not be noticed by anyone such as additional cards and the like in the radio cabinet at the bottom. Eventually if a threshold was reached that you need to add transceivers in the cabinet you would have to add an additional antenna to the tower. Steve Cospers asked if that causes clutter and if they interfere with each other. Mr. Tycer said they have to be careful with that and explained there has to be a certain amount of vertical separation on a tower so there is no interference and when placed on a roof, for example, there is an even greater horizontal separation. Mr. Tycer said the FCC also regulates the frequencies so there is not interference.

Jannicke Brewer explained that the City's current ordinance states that a new tower must be built to allow at least two additional carriers on a pole. Mr. Tycer said the location on a tower can dramatically impact your coverage footprint – the higher on the pole a carrier is located the better coverage it will have.

Steve Swanson said the ordinance prohibited roof mounted antennas and wondered if that was just on homes or if it applied to commercial buildings as well. Jannicke Brewer stated that the ordinance listed City-owned property and Shepherd's Hill as the only locations for towers currently.

Steve Cospers mentioned some homes have boosters and indicated he did not think the ordinance was written with them in mind. Jannicke Brewer asked Mr. Tycer to tell them about boosters. Mr. Tycer explained that a booster is basically a repeater. It is not the actual source of the transmission, but will take the signal from the edge of the coverage where the signal is starting to get weak and will amplify and spread it around again. Mr. Tycer continued that in general he does not prefer to use a repeater, but if they have to go through the full zoning process and leasing he would rather get the budget to build a full site. However, repeaters can work well along rural highways because building a full site is expensive and so sometimes it is cheaper to build a repeater and re-radiate the signal from the previous tower. This way you can extend the footprint without having to buy expensive radio cabinets that go at the base of the towers.

Steve Cospers asked Mr. Tycer if he had to put one in a packed place like Alpine would he approach a homeowner. Mr. Tycer said no because zoning ordinance are usually such that they would not even look at that. He explained that when he looks for a site he will draw a map that looks at the existing coverage footprint and will draw a ring about half a mile to a mile in diameter and will have someone that does site acquisition work for them find about three likely candidates in that search ring. Then he will enter the height, latitude, and longitude and find which will provide the best bang for their buck and then approach the property owner.

Jannicke Brewer stated that in each zone the ordinance has a provision on ancillary structures such as chimneys, flagpoles, television antennas and similar structures not used for human occupancy are excluded in determining the height of a building and cannot be taller than 15 feet above the roof line. So if someone wanted a four foot antenna or a dish on the roof they could.

Tami Hamilton asked Mr. Tycer to review the physical structures such as size of units, how far antennas or dishes need to be from the tower and asked if technology is getting better that those things can be smaller. Mr. Tycer said

part of that is technology and part is based on what the carrier needs. He used Cricket Communications as an example and said in most cases, especially in smaller towns, he can get away with three panel antennas that are seven inches wide and about six feet tall with the antennas snug up against the tower. He said if he gets additional customers and may need two antennas per section he will have to add a T-arm to the tower and have the two antennas on the end of that and that will be a little farther away from the pole because there has to be some physical separation for antennas. Mr. Tycer also used AT&T as an example explaining that having multiple technologies they will have four antennas and they will have to stick out a little farther to maintain the necessary separation.

Tami Hamilton clarified that the carrier would have to make the determination of what changes would be needed to add capacity and asked if they would then come back to the City. Mr. Tycer said they try to do everything above board and will go through whatever zoning process necessary for any changes so as to not irritate the City. If you irritate the City it usually does not help your case later on when you need to add another tower.

Steve Swanson asked if a carrier owned its own tower and needed to expand coverage by adding antennas could the City not just say instead of going wider with the antennas go vertical. Mr. Tycer said if there was enough space on the tower to do that there is really no reason the carrier could not do that. Steve Swanson clarified that you start at the top so available space would be at a lower elevation and Mr. Tycer confirmed that.

Tami Hamilton asked if there was any new technology coming up that would make things smaller. Mr. Tycer said technology is getting better with the gain and controlling the overshoot. He used the Salt Lake Valley as an example with the mountains on either side, especially with towers on the benches. He explained that 10-15 years ago antennas were not very good at controlling exactly where you put the RF energy so the main footprint was maybe shooting in Sandy, but the upper lobe of the antenna would show up across the valley in Riverton. Now antennas are getting better at controlling that overspray and the antenna patterns are tight so you do not have as much interference. This means a cleaner environment and higher gain and you do not need as many sites. Mr. Tycer further said that he does not see anything that is game changing technology. Steve Swanson asked if the antennas are getting smaller. Mr. Tycer said not so much.

Jannicke Brewer asked Mr. Tycer if he has designed stealth towers. Mr. Tycer said he has. Mrs. Brewer asked how he dealt with them. Mr. Tycer said they have done some creative things, but usually try to shy away from them unless they absolutely have to because it gets very expensive. He said they have done things such as put on fake steeples on churches that have RF friendly materials where the antenna is behind it. He also used the example of the "Charlie Brown" tree in Provo on University Avenue, but stated that he thinks that actually draws more attention to it than disguises it. He also indicated that in Arizona they have disguised towers as a cactus.

Steve Cosper asked Mr. Tycer if he was willing to address the health concerns with microwave dishes. Mr. Tycer said the carriers are very carefully regulated by the FCC and microwave dishes and paths have to be above where a human can walk. If a human walked in front of a microwave dish the path would be interrupted and you drop the cell site so from a practical standpoint you do not want anything interrupting the path. From a health concern, particularly with cell site towers, the 1996 Federal Telecommunications Act makes a point that you cannot legally deny a cell site based on health concerns. The radiation from the towers is such that they are so low power and low frequency range that it is non-ionizing radiation. This means the energy from this is not going to mutate any cells. It is thermal energy and if you stood three feet in front of the antenna it will warm your body and eventually it could give you a sunburn. If you back 10 to 15 feet away from typical radiation antennas you will be fine and those that are 30, 40, 50 feet up in the air there are no effects to human health. Microwave dishes tend to be a little higher power, but again are set up where they will not be in the path of a human anyway and you would not have any significant energy at ground level. Steve Cosper asked what health risk there is if a person did pass in front of it. Mr. Tycer said if you pass in front of it quickly it might annoy the cell technician. If you stand really close to it for a long period of time you can have thermal heating of tissues and can affect the eyes.

Steve Swanson asked how comparable it was to a satellite broadcast. Mr. Tycer said the television stations are a lot higher energy. For instance, Mr. Tycer said the power output of their amplifier at their cell tower site is 16 watts and regular incandescent bulbs are 60 watts.

Bryce Higbee asked for an idea of what the price difference would be between using microwave dishes and fiber optics. Mr. Tycer said it would depend on various factors including how close fiber optics are located. Mr. Tycer gave an example that they recently looked at building a cell site where they were going to use existing copper telephone line for high speed T-1 line, but Qwest said at the time their facilities were exhausted and it would cost \$20,000 for them to run a new line. Instead of paying that they paid maybe \$10,000 and put up a microwave dish. Steve Swanson asked what the distance was on that \$20,000 and Mr. Tycer said it was not very far - about a block or so. Jannicke Brewer said an additional cost could be incurred if you need to obtain right-of-way or an easement to run fiber optics. Mr. Tycer said he does not know of any networks that have put in their own fiber hubs.

Jannicke Brewer asked if anyone in the audience had any questions related to "Telecommunications 101". There were no questions. Jannicke Brewer thanked Mr. Tycer for coming and answering their questions.

Discussion ended and the Planning Commission went back to David's Court Plat E.

The Planning Commission resumed its discussion on the telecommunications ordinance.

Jannicke Brewer said some of the issues to discuss include the definition of lattice as the ordinance was not clear if it was lattice construction and/or lattice appearance that was not permitted. The ordinance was also not clear if "City owned property" meant any City property or if specific properties should be considered. Bryce Higbee said he interpreted City owned property to mean any City owned property. Jannicke Brewer also mentioned there are no guidelines in the ordinance on replacing a tower or co-location.

Todd Barney asked if they could discuss eliminating the option to allow towers in Lambert Park and said that is the last place he would want to see more towers. The ordinance said "near the rodeo grounds", but the tower is by the water tank which Todd Barney said he does not consider "near" the rodeo grounds. Bryce Higbee asked if Jannicke Brewer was suggesting should City owned property be narrowed down to specific properties.

Steve Cospers questioned why it should be limited to City owned property said he thought this section should be eliminated as each application will have to discuss the location and we would get input from the residents. Steve Cospers said he has done some work for a telecommunications company and in Salt Lake City they have put them in all kinds of locations and some locations are very innovative such as in steeples, on the sides of buildings. Steve Cospers said Mountainville Academy might like to allow one in their steeple and would we rather have that than a new tower somewhere.

Todd Barney questioned why Shepherd's Hill was even in the ordinance since no other private property was included because there may be people who live on the hillside that may have a good location for a tower as well. Jannicke Brewer said she thought that Shepherd's Hill was included in the priority of location because there were existing towers there.

Bryce Higbee suggested that having no limit on location could open a potential for big problems because you have to decide for everyone if that is a good location and you may have one person say a certain location is fine and 20 people could say no. Bryce Higbee said he thought it would be better for the City to decide where the best places are to put towers and limit it so we do not have towers everywhere.

Todd Barney asked if Mountainville Academy came and wanted to apply to put one in their tower could they do that. Jannicke Brewer said under the current ordinance it would not be allowed. Steve Cospers said he thought the stealth issue was more important than the income issue for the City.

Steve Swanson said in some parks they have put receivers on light poles which is still city property and wondered if we prohibit doing that under the current ordinance. Tami Hamilton wondered if Burgess Park would work as a location if they could put antennas on lights there. Jannicke Brewer said there are no lights at Burgess Park.

Steve Cosper asked if it would be helpful to create a map with contours to find the best potential sites. Steve Swanson said it would be nice to have a map showing the pre-selected locations and approve or disapprove an application based on an applicant meeting the rest of the ordinance. Bryce Higbee asked if we were limited on tower height. Jannicke Brewer said the ordinance allowed towers up to 80 feet. Bryce Higbee said there is nothing preventing them building a taller tower except for maybe cost. Todd Barney said if they built taller towers they could locate more carriers on a tower. Steve Cosper asked why the ordinance limited a tower to three carriers. Tami Hamilton wondered why we would care how many carriers were on a tower. April Naidu clarified that the ordinance stated that each new tower constructed had to accommodate at least two additional carriers so there could be more.

Jannicke Brewer said she agreed with the residents around Shepherd's Hill that it is quite a group of towers there. Steve Cosper agreed that it looked cluttered. Jannicke Brewer suggested that the ordinance be amended to prohibit any more new towers on Shepherd's Hill, but allow the existing ones to remain and they can be replaced and to promote co-location there.

Steve Cosper asked if staff could create a map that would show the best potential sites that would be the least obtrusive and would provide coverage for towers. April Naidu said she did not think staff could provide that because optimal sites for carriers will depend on various factors that staff would not have information on such as whether the site is to increase capacity or coverage. Todd Barney said he thinks we should just limit it to specific spots and if a particular site is not optimal for a carrier then so be it.

Tami Hamilton said we also need to consider what is optimal so that residents can obtain services they would like to have. Jannicke Brewer asked if Mr. Tyser would be able to help with something general like a map identifying some locations. April Naidu said she could email him and ask. Jannicke Brewer said we will continue the discussion at the next meeting.

Steve Swanson asked if they were going to discuss roof mounted antennas. Jannicke Brewer said in each zone there is a provision for ancillary structures being allowed. April Naidu stated in the telecommunications ordinance it did prohibit roof mounted antennas so it seems we have two ordinances that may contradict each other. Bryce Higbee said he thinks they are probably referring to different types of antennas.

#### **D. Development Code – Articles 4.5 (Minor Subdivisions) & 4.6 (Major Subdivisions):**

April Naidu said that the Planning Commission has been working on proposed changes to these sections off and on for several months. At the last meeting the Planning Commission started discussing whether there should be a deadline when an applicant has to request a reinstatement of a final approval. Additionally, the current ordinance gives six months for each approval granted. At the last meeting the Planning Commission questioned whether six months for a final approval was enough time to record a plat. So there are two issues: (1) should the approval lengths be changed – for example, should everything stay six months, but final approval should last longer; and (2) should there be a deadline when an applicant needs to request a reinstatement. April Naidu said there are examples from other cities in the packet.

Bryce Higbee said he thought six months for a final approval is short especially with the way the economy is now. Jannicke Brewer said she thinks the applicant should keep track of when the approval is going to expire and not put that burden on staff. Jannicke Brewer also said the shorter times help the City know what is happening with a project. Steve Swanson asked if the reinstatement was contingent on whether there were any changes in the ordinances. April Naidu explained that if there are any changes in ordinances that would affect a plat or any changes in the plat, the applicant would have to go back to Planning Commission and/or City Council for the reinstatement and the reinstatement would be subject to the ordinance in effect at that time.

April Naidu said we still will have further discussion on this as we will have to hold a hearing and asked for direction to craft some draft language.

Jannicke Brewer added that we should have language on a deadline when an applicant has to request a reinstatement so it does not just sit there. Tami Hamilton suggested final approval be good for one year initially and then reinstatements be good for six months.

April Naidu said there are two options on this: (1) change the language to extension so the applicant has to come in before the approval expires to request an extension; or (2) leave the language as reinstatement and establish some time frame in which the applicant has to request a reinstatement, for example within 14 days of the approval expiring. Bryce Higbee suggested 30 days and explained that it is fine to have regulations, but they should be reasonable and clear so the applicant knows what he/she has to do.

Bryce Higbee asked if there should be a cap on the number of times a plat can be reinstated. April Naidu said we have had those discussions before and they have gone nowhere.

April Naidu clarified with the Planning Commission the proposed language they wanted to see was that a final approval would be good for one year and reinstatements would be good for six months; and a 30 day deadline to request a reinstatement from the day an approval expires.

#### **IV. COMMUNICATIONS**

Tami Hamilton asked if David's Court Plat E was something that staff could have approved. April Naidu said staff cannot grant approval of a subdivision plat, but staff can approve a reinstatement of a final approval if there have been no changes in ordinances that would affect the plat and if there are no changes in the plat.

Jannicke Brewer said the Board of Adjustment found in favor of the City in the recent appeal on the Digis tower and that there is a 30 day period in which it could be appealed to District Court.

#### **V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF: January 17, 2012 and February 7, 2012**

Jannicke Brewer asked that the minutes from January 17 on page 3 line 7 be clarified to indicate that Jason Thelin was asking about land uses in future annexation areas.

Bryce Higbee asked that the minutes from January 17 on page 5 line 38 be corrected that he did not suggest that Planning Commission approve home occupations via email but that he asked if it was possible to do so.

**MOTION:** Steve Cospers moved to approve the minutes as amended. Tami Hamilton seconded. Ayes: 5. Nays: 0. Steve Swanson, Tami Hamilton, Jannicke Brewer, Steve Cospers, and Bryce Higbee voted aye. Motion passed unanimously.

Jannicke Brewer stated that the Planning Commission had covered all of the items on the agenda and adjourned the meeting at 8:38 pm.