

Fruita Planning Commission

Tuesday, February 14, 2017

A. CALL TO ORDER

All Planning Commissioners were in attendance.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Doug Van Etten led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

D. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mel Mulder- I move to approve the Agenda as is.

Keith Schaefer- I second.

7 yes votes; motion passes to approve the Agenda.

E. WITHDRAWN ITEMS

None.

F. CONTINUED ITEMS

None.

G. CONSENT ITEMS

Application #: 2016-28

Project Name: Selover Annexation

Application: Annexation

Property Owner: Kathleen Selover

Representative: Kathleen Selover

Location: 1024 18 Road

Request: This is a request to annex approximately 1.59 acres of property into the city limits of Fruita and designate a Community Residential zone.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 8, 2016 Planning Commission meeting

Mel Mulder- I move to approve the Consent Agenda

Keith Schaefer- Second.

7 yes votes; motion passes to approve the Consent Agenda.

H. HEARING ITEMS

Doug Van Etten read the project as follows:

Application #: 2016-27
Project Name: Fruita RV Resort
Application: Conditional Use Permit
Property Owner: LSC Northwest Colorado, LLC
Representative: Robert Jones II, Vortex Engineering, Inc.
Location: 1235 Greenway Drive
Zone: Industrial
Request: This is a request for approval of a Conditional use Permit for a recreational vehicle campground in an Industrial zone.

Robert Jones II- Good evening Mr. Chair and Commission members, my name is Robert Jones II I am with Vortex Engineering. I am the applicant's representative and tonight I will be presenting the Fruita RV Resort project. The site is located north of I-70, immediately east of the Sooner Court industrial subdivision and south of Highway 6 & 50. The project is approximately 15.49 acres and is presently vacant and zoned LIRD within the City of Fruita. It is surrounded by similarly zoned LIRD property both to the east and to the west. The Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application before you tonight is for the approval of a RV Resort comprising of a combination of amenities and 142 RV and cabin sites. The spaces range in size based upon the size of different RV's. There are 14 cabins, if you will, located along the eastern side of the property. All of the sites are to have hookups for water, sewer, and electric and other park amenities including wifi and cable. The site itself was designed with the intent to maximize open space and the RV spaces were designed above and beyond the minimum requirements to provide for more space between units. There are also other elements like a pond, a dog run, and some larger landscape buffers. There is a pool and also a live-in manager's residence approximately 960 square feet in size. As well a convenient store that is about 2,900 square feet in size. There is a pool, a hot tub, and a second story monument viewing area with is located on top of the convenient store. In addition to that, there is a direct connection to the Little Salt Wash Trail system that was just recently completed underneath Highway 6 & 50. There are some variances and exemptions from the guidelines that have been requested in order to provide a usable and environmentally friendly RV resort. I will quickly run through them here, based on section 17.27 of the code (Land Use Code) which governs campgrounds and recreational vehicle parks, we are requesting an exemption to the maximum gross area allowed from 10 acres to 15.49 acres which is requested to provide for additional open space and amenities. The interior streets, we are requesting an exemption for 2-way streets to be reduced in width from 28 feet to 24 feet (Mr. Jones showed on the site plan which streets that would be). As well as the proposal to construct the internal streets with gravel that would still support fire trucks and recreational vehicles and other heavy vehicles through all weather conditions. The reason for that is to try and minimize the heat island effect that happens with black asphalt. Similarly, the reduction from 28 feet to 24 feet, trying to minimize asphalt. There was a boundary fencing exemption that is requested from the

requirement to install an 8 foot high solid fence on the side and rear of the property. The east side of the property abuts the Little Salt Wash and we truly felt that increased landscaping as a buffer would be a more positive element both for the users of the park and adjacent property owners and given the south side of the property abuts the interstate (I-70). There were some minor exemptions coordinated with Lower Valley Fire District and they did not have any objections that were relative to fire hydrant spacing and fire extinguishers. We believe the project is a very exciting opportunity for the City of Fruita to embrace a resort that will compliment and build upon tourism in the area. It has close access to town via the established trail system and the proximity to I-70 will be a sure draw and we believe will provide an extremely beneficial economic impact to local businesses as well as the City of Fruita. The Fruita RV Resort meets or can meet the majority of the applicable sections of the Fruita Land Use Code and implement the policies of the Fruita Community Plan, and we respectfully request your approval of the CUP as presented. With that I will turn it over to staff.

Dahna Raugh- This is a request for a Conditional Use Permit for a RV park. The Land Use Code allows RV parks in certain zones but every zone it is allowed in, requires a Conditional Use Permit. I know the applicants have said that there are 142 spaces and for the life of me, I can't find the other 2. I see 140 but maybe I miss counted, it is a question that needs to be resolved. The biggest issues with this RV Park are compatibility and access. There is only one access from this property right now and that is from Greenway Drive which is basically just one long dead-end road (Dahna put up the location map from the Staff Report to show where access is from). The Colorado Department of Transportation requires a traffic study to be done to look at what type of impacts are expected at this intersection and to see what type of changes might need to be made there to accommodate the traffic that will be created by this RV Park (the intersection of Greenway Drive and Highway 6 & 50). Greenway Drive isn't paved for the most part and whatever gravel improvements are there are fairly minimal. Unpaved roads typically cause problems with erosion, blowing dust especially in the spring and summer months when it is dry and windy. Dust and debris can be tracked out onto the public right-of-way, so the roadway really needs to be paved to accommodate for the traffic that is to be expected here, and not only the RV traffic but the future traffic as well. There will be a mix of industrial traffic and the RV traffic. One of the other big issues, access again, the Land Use Code requires 2 access points when a development creates a significant amount of traffic. This development creates that significant amount of traffic that requires the 2 access points. Staff knows very well that access point is going to be difficult to figure out. (Dahna showed on a map where access to this property comes from and how difficult it may be to get a second access point). The Fruita Greenway Business Park Plan, which is a component of the city's Master Plan which covers this whole industrial area. It shows Greenway Drive as the major spine throughout this area, connecting all of the industrial area. There are only 3 points of access, 17 Road, 16 Road and 15 Road, so access has always been an issue for this area. The other big issue is compatibility, the property is zone industrial and everything to the east, west and north is zoned industrial. This is the city's only industrial area and as you know industrial areas can be noisy, stinky, smelly, and smoky and those types of uses are typically compatible with RV parks. Again, this is Fruita's only industrial area and for the most part is currently vacant (Dahna showed on a map of where there are currently businesses in this area). Everything is zoned industrial around here so you could get

something noisy, stinky, smelly, and smoky here. (Dahna showed on a map where Fruita has a large sewer lift station that basically handles all of Fruita's sewage and said when Fruita built the lift station, they built it with the thought that it was in an Industrial zone and not next to an RV park and stated that the applicants should be aware of the lift station and the possibility of industrial type uses next to their property). The city of Fruita should not hinder its ability to attract and develop industrial land uses with an RV park that lands in the middle of an industrial zone. That is definitely something for the applicants to be aware of, that the city should not be crimping its ability to develop industrial land in favor of the RV Park. An RV Park can be located in the General Commercial zone, Monument Preservation zone, Community Services & Recreation zone, the Agricultural zone and is typically compatible with lots of those land uses, it's also allowed in the Industrial zone but there are some compatibility issues there. This property obviously has issues with roadway access and provision of utilities that is just not there yet, there is a lot of work to be done to get this property ready to develop for this particular land use or any land use. The property to the west of the Big Salt Wash (Pabco Industrial Park) already has roads, water, sewer and electric and is ready to go. We are hoping that is the area that will develop before (the subject property area). The applicants should be aware that the city will not be in favor of discouraging industrial development in this area.

There are other, smaller, concerns as well. There are issues with this property being in the floodplain. With many changes in this area (a new bridge and the Little Salt Wash Trail), the floodplain is being re-evaluated. The applicants are asking for exceptions, one of which was the maximum size (of an RV park). The city recently made changes to Chapter 27 of the Land Use Code and the 10 acre maximum was in the old code. Another change that was made to the code, the property is zoned Industrial now and was before zoned Limited Industrial Research & Development (LIRD). The applicants have also asked for no pavement in the RV Park, the Code requires pavement and one of the main reasons for that is with lack of pavement you get problems with erosion. The code requires it to be paved and Staff recommends the rules to be followed and it to be paved. The applicants have also asked for an exception to the width of two-way traffic lanes, the lane width is required to be 28 feet and the applicants have asked for it to be 24 feet. The code requires 28 feet and staff recommend it to be 28 feet. The applicants are requesting not to provide a 6 foot fence all around the property that is required by the code, Staff agrees with this and believes it doesn't make a whole lot of sense in this particular instance. You don't want to fence off the Wash because that's really nice and a fence along I-70 isn't really going to do much, Staff also believes that the increase in a landscape buffer around the property is accomplishing what the fence requirement is intended to accomplish. The applicants have asked for exceptions to the fire protection requirements, Staff recommends these exceptions be handled by the Lower Valley Fire Protection District and the Mesa County Building Department. We work closely with those 2 entities and we rely on them to help us ensure that building codes and fire codes are being met, so whatever agreements they can work out, staff is in favor of that. The applicants have also asked for a blanket 10% variance across the Site Plan, Staff does not support this. We understand the applicants have asked for this variance in order to have some flexibility, but I want to ensure everybody including the applicants that Staff is extremely flexible. But a blanket 10% variance across the whole Site Plan can put staff in a bad position, there is nothing that indicates under what circumstances we can approve it or what circumstances we can't approve it and basically in

my mind it just takes everything you see here (the Site Plan) and reduces it by 10%. So instead of a 28 foot wide road, you have a 25.2 foot wide road. So I just want to assure the applicants that Staff is very flexible but we are not in favor of the 10% variance request.

Staff is not aware of any significant concerns from any utility or service providers. Their issues, I think, are very similar to the city's issues. If you can figure out how to get the roads and utilities there, we should approve this because it meets or can meet all of the requirements of the Land Use Code, specifically Chapter 27 which is RV Parks and Campgrounds and it also meets or can meet all the approval criteria that must be considered for Conditional Use Permits (CUP). And because it meets or can meet all of the requirements if all review comments and issues identified in the Staff Report are adequately resolved, Staff recommends approval. We have received no written public comments at this time.

Public Comments:

None.

Rebuttal:

Robert Jones II discussed the issues with the extension and placement of the water lines that would serve the subject property. Mr. Jones also mentioned that he and Ute Water have been discussing how the water lines and water mains will be placed. Mr. Jones justified why the applicants have requested the two lane traffic lane be 24 feet instead of 28 feet is based on the size of standard lane widths on major highways. Mr. Jones feels that the extension of a major collector roadway is out of the question for this development and possibly out of the question for future developments here as well due to the high costs of infrastructure to get over the Big Salt Wash. Also, there are no right-of-way connections that are currently established between 17 Road and 16 Road as well as a bridge that needs to be placed over Big Salt Wash. Mr. Jones feels that this concept has been known since the adoption of the Greenway Business Park Plan the City adopted. Mr. Jones feels that it is not practical for one developer to install that level of infrastructure that would be needed for the secondary access as recommended in the Staff Report. Mr. Jones asked the Planning Commissioners to consider a recapture agreement for future developments that would benefit from the improvements made on Greenway Drive. Mr. Jones also confirmed that there are 140 spaces and not 142 like he stated in his opening presentation. Part of the thought behind the request for the 10% variance is to allow for flexibility things such as the placement of the dump station on the Site Plan.

Whitney Rink asked if there were any other locations looked at that might be better suited for the access and compatibility issues identified by Staff.

Mr. Jones acknowledged that yes there are other sites where this project could have been applied to but this specific site has some great natural qualities and unique elements that is a draw for this particular project and the market of RV Parks from a marketing stand point. Mr. Jones doesn't see the incompatibility issue of this particular location. The property is vacant and available and has great value to the applicants.

Planning Commissioner Comments:

Richard Hoctor- Mr. Hoctor had concerns about the traffic issue when turning to go westbound from Greenway Drive onto Highway 6 & 50.

Mr. Jones showed a picture of a concept plan/CDOT access control plan at the intersection of Greenway Drive and Highway 6 & 50.

Mr. Hoctor asked if each space in the RV Park would have a fire pit.

Mr. Jones replied by showing the different types of layouts for the spaces.

Mr. Hoctor asked how long could people could stay at the RV Park and thinks that the applicants may be creating a neighborhood.

Dahna Raugh replied to Mr. Hoctors comments and read the rules from the Fruita Land Use Code stating that a certain number of units could actually stay for longer than 6 months at a time. There could be about 34 of these RV spots that are occupied for longer than 6 months. Mrs. Raugh mentioned that it is very difficult to police this particular rule.

Mr. Hoctor asked who enforces that rule and Mrs. Raugh said it is the job of the city's Code Compliance Officer to enforce.

Whitney Rink understands that the 10% variance request can be very difficult to manage and was wondering what the applicant is going to do to address the concerns the city has with that request. Mrs. Rink asked why they couldn't pave the required 28 foot road.

Mr. Jones mentioned that over total amount of road that would need to be paved, it would cost half a million dollars or more to accomplish.

Mel Mulder made a statement that he had measured an RV and it was 12 feet wide and feels that at minimum the road should be paved at the required 28 feet. Mr. Mulder knows that these RV's will take up a lot of room on the roads and emphasized that the roads be built to standards. Mr. Mulder feels that the secondary access should be dealt with at a later date and feels that the 28 foot paved roads is of more importance. Mr. Mulder mentioned as the surrounding properties get developed, there will be more and more commercial and industrial traffic on Greenway Drive and there is nothing that can really be done about this but just wanted to bring it to the attention of the applicants. Mr. Mulder also wanted the applicants to be aware of the potential of future industrial development that may take place surrounding the subject property that may not be compatible to an RV Park. Mr. Mulder thinks this is a great project in a decent location and believes the issues can be resolved.

Sam Atkins (City Engineer) clarified which roads need to be 28 feet.

Keith Schaefer wanted to know what the history of this specific location was and how the history affects the current project.

Mrs. Raugh gave an explanation of the history of the area and how it has become what we know today. The money wasn't available for the infrastructure and so the Plat was recorded with a non-conveyance agreement saying the lots cannot be bought and sold separately. The city at the same time was planning and developing a bridge over the Little Salt Wash and the Little Salt Wash trail connections.

Mr. Schaefer thinks the secondary access would be very difficult to achieve and seems that it is not something that should be the responsibility of the developer/applicants. Mr. Schaefer would like to see this project get approved and agrees with the other Commissioners about the fact that the applicants should be aware of the potential industrial development that could take place on surrounding properties.

Dave Karisny feels that a secondary access is absolutely needed for this development. There is a 140 habitable spots in this RV Park with thousands of vehicle trips a day. Mr. Karisny cannot recall ever approving anything without a second access with this amount of traffic. Mr. Karisny feels that this project is a great fit for Fruita, but was curious as to why they think this is the right spot for the project. Mr. Karisny agrees that the interior two way streets should be paved to the required 28 feet. Mr. Karisny went through the approval criteria and agrees with all Staff comments. Mr. Karisny pointed out that the internal trail system proposed for this project would be mostly gravel and crushed rock, Mr. Karisny encouraged that the applicants build a trail that would be more suited for handicap accessibility. Mr. Karisny agrees that the applicants should not be granted a 10% variance for this project. Mr. Karisny stressed to the applicants that this project is in an Industrial zone and that the city anticipates Industrial development in this area. Mr. Karisny feels that it would be unwise to approve a habitable area in an Industrial zone. Mr. Karisny has a concern with length of stay at the RV Park and how it would have the potential to be just like the Monument RV Park Fruita current has. Mr. Karisny made reference to the fact that there is a school bus that picks kids up from Monument RV Park and would not like to see that happen with the proposed Conditional Use Permit for an RV Park. Mr. Karisny would like to see a stipulation on the Conditional Use Permit to limit the length of stay in order to discourage potential issues with school kids being picked up near the railroad. Mr. Karisny gave an example of what the stipulation would be and said that the maximum stay be limited to two weeks.

Heidi Jo Elder felt that all her concerns and/or questions have been answered by the applicant and other commissioners. Mrs. Elder feels that this development is great for Fruita but the location of the project might be better suited somewhere else in the City. Mrs. Elder also stressed to the applicant that this is in an Industrial zone and that there will be Industrial businesses nearby. Mrs. Elder agrees with fellow commissioners that the internal two way roads should be built at 28 feet instead of 24 feet. Mrs. Elder also agrees with Staff that the road (Greenway Drive) must be paved.

Mr. Hoctor and Mrs. Raugh had a discussion back and forth about what the RV park managers will have to enforce and how the RV Park will function.

Mrs. Raugh talked about how the Fruita Greenway Business Park Plan has helped this Industrial area move forward without having developers put in more infrastructure as needed and that the plan also helped CDOT and Mesa County establish the major access points on 15 Road, 16 Road and 17 Road and that these access points would be the only points on Highway 6 & 50 to access the Fruita Greenway Business Park/Industrial zone.

Mr. Schaefer feels that if the city is going to require a second access for every project, we will not have many projects get approved.

Mr. Karisny said that 2 access points will not be required for each project and that the scope and size of this particular project with the amount of traffic that this development will have is why a second access point is being recommended.

Mr. Mulder highlighted again that the Monument RV Park does have school busses pick up kids from their location and that he would not like to see that happen with this development. It would be too risky with how close they are to the railroad crossing. Limiting the amount of time the RV's can stay will hinder the possibility of children being picked up by school bus at this particular location.

Doug Van Etten asked if the project was approved, would the Planning Commission be able to limit the length of stay for this particular RV Park?

Mrs. Raugh said if the Planning Commissioners do not include in their motion the issue with length of stay, this RV Park would be allowed to have extended stay as stated in Chapter 27 of the Fruita Land Use Code.

There was some confusion of whether CDOT or the City is requiring the secondary access point. It was made clear that the City is requiring the secondary access and that the Traffic Study that would be done by CDOT would not highlight or touch on a secondary access point.

Mr. Atkins highlighted that there is no right-of-way connectivity between 17 Road and 16 Road, which supports the argument that Mr. Jones is making in that there is no way right now that Greenway Drive can be connected to the west for a secondary access. The reason is that the property to the west, located on Sooner Court, has a private access across the railroad which is not intended for future development. Mrs. Raugh also pointed out that the Sooner Court is available to the particular property/business that its allowed for and said there is a chance that the property owners who do have that access could block of the property with a concrete wall which wouldn't allow any vehicles to access Greenway Drive or the subject property. This would eliminate the second access. Mrs. Raugh questioned the Planning Commissioners whether or not they want to enforce the need for the secondary access as mentioned in the Staff Report or not and that they would need to include that in their motion.

Mr. Mulder is concerned about the vehicle stacking potential on Highway 6 & 50, Coulson Street and Greenway Drive. Mr. Mulder thinks that if there is a train on the railroad, the RV's could stack up quickly and cause an issue.

Mr. Schaefer feels that having to extend all the utilities and pave Greenway Drive and make changes that CDOT would require on Highway 6 & 50 is too large of a financial risk, so he feels the city should approve the CUP and let the project fall somewhere else.

Mr. Mulder made a motion but the Planning Commissioners discussed the detail of what the motion should include.

Motion: Approval with the condition that all review agency comments and issues identified in the Staff Report are adequately resolved with the two exceptions being the secondary access not required and no stays beyond six months be permitted.

Keith Schaefer- I second.

6 Yes Votes; 1 No Vote. Motion passes.

Mr. Karisny voted no because he believes the secondary access should be required and that the RV Park would not be compatible with future or existing land uses in the area.

Doug Van Etten read the next hearing item as follows:

Application #:	2016-29
Project Name:	Fruita RV Storage
Application Type:	Site Design Review
Property Owner:	LSC Northwest Colorado, LLC
Representative:	Robert Jones II, Vortex Engineering, Inc.
Location:	1232 Greenway Drive.
Zone:	Industrial
Description:	This is a request for approval of a Site Design application for a recreational vehicle storage facility in an Industrial zone.

Robert Jones II- The application in front of you tonight is a Site Plan application requesting approval of an RV storage facility. It is a combination of different types of storage facilities consisting of covered, uncovered, and semi covered storage spaces. There will be climate controlled storage spaces. The full build out will consist of approximately 288 indoor and outdoor units. There is also a small 400 square foot office. In terms of infrastructure, the service to the property is off of Greenway Drive (Mr. Jones showed on the Site Plan map where access would be from and where the storage spaces are located). Storm water will be accommodated via detention basin which is being developed with the RV Resort project (Mr. Jones showed on a map where the storm water is planned to go). Water and sewer would be accessed via Greenway Drive as well and used for the small office on site. Ordinarily this project would be approved by Staff but the applicants have requested Vested Rights. This project, Fruita RV Storage, meets or

can meet all the applicable sections of the Fruita Land Use Code. With that, we respectfully request approval of the Fruita RV Storage Site Design application.

Dahna Raugh- This is a Site Design Review for RV storage and typically this project would be approved by Staff but Vested Rights have been requested. It has some issues like the RV Resort we just discussed but these issues are not as severe. We still expect the traffic study, Greenway Drive needs pavement, some utilities need to be extended. Traffic for this project isn't expected to be as big of a deal as the Fruita RV Resort project. The secondary access isn't expected to be necessary. This development meets or can meet all of the requirements of the city if all review agency comments and issues identified in the Staff Report are adequately resolved. Staff has received no written comments. Staff is recommending approval, as long as all the review agency comments and issues identified in the Staff Report are adequately resolved.

No Public Comments

Rebuttal:

Robert Jones II- The only item to note would be in the engineering and public works comments. They have requested a separation of the Greenway Drive storm water as well as the storm water from the storage units. We typically design for public and private storm water to be collected. Mr. Jones showed on a map where storm water collection is designed to be collected and where it will go. Mr. Jones also discussed how storm water collection is designed. Mr. Jones pointed out that storm water would be piped from the RV Storage property to the RV Resort detention pond. Mr. Jones would like to keep the storm water management design as submitted.

Planning Commission Discussion:

Heidi Elder- I feel that we have hashed out a lot of issues with the last project (RV Resort), so I have no comments on this project.

Dave Karisny was wondering when the floodplain study comes back, if the applicants would need to make changes to their site design and storm water plan.

Mr. Jones and Sam Atkins don't anticipate anything to change.

Dave Karisny asked Sam Atkins to talk more about the separation of storm water.

Sam Atkins- I would not consider this a subdivision. I would consider this to separate parcels. If we were to allow this storm drain from one project to the other, that becomes a private storm drain because it's on private property. You would have a couple inlets on the city right-of-way that would contribute to that. The preference would be to keep the public portion of that in the public right-of-way and to separate the two sites as they are to separate parcels and two separate applications. However, my comments for this particular project relate and are meshed with the

other project. Let's say the RV Resort was not approved, the infrastructure would still need to be in place for each project.

Keith Schaefer and Mr. Jones discussed where the RV's would be stored and what the buildings looked like.

Mel Mulder had no comments.

Whitney Rink- So are you prepared to deal with paving all of Greenway Drive in the event that the RV Resort doesn't get approved?

Robert Jones II- Yes, that is the recommendation made by Staff.

Whitney Rink- Okay. And you plan to do the lighting plan?

Robert Jones II- Yes.

Richard Hactor- Is there an onsite manager here?

Mr. Jones- Yes, there will be someone in the office portion.

Richard Hactor- How do people access the storage units?

Mr. Jones- There will be a key code access points.

There was a discussion between Mr. Jones and Doug Van Etten about how the storm water management would be redesigned if the RV Resort project were to not get approval. Mr. Jones agreed that the current RV Storage Site Design would need to be redesigned to accommodate for the storm water detention.

Motion:

Dave Karisny- Mr. Chair, I move that we approve the Fruita RV Storage Site Design Review at 1232 Greenway Drive with the request of a Site Design Review approval for an indoor and outdoor RV storage to include all Staff and agency comments with the excepting of the applicants storm water.

Mel Mulder- I second.

Keith Schaefer- What is wrong with the storm water plan?

Dave Karisny explained that if both the RV Resort project and the RV Storage project are approved and built, they will share a storm water detention pond that will also accommodate water quality and also help irrigate the RV Resort property.

Robert Jones II- That's correct.

Dave Karisny stated Fruita Staff wanted it to be separate, and if the RV Resort doesn't get approval, the applicants will have to redesign the RV Storage property to accommodate for storm water detention. But if they both get approved, the applicants want to share the storm water detention pond.

7 Yes Votes; motion passes.

I. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

None

J. VISITORS AND GUESTS

None

K. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Time Change for the Planning Commission Meeting
No time change approved. Fruita Planning Commission will continue to meet at 7pm.
- b. Planning Commissioner Training
Mr. Schaefer was unaware of any emails on correspondence regarding the Planning Commission Training meeting.

Adjournment at 10:03pm

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Hemphill
City of Fruita Planning Technician