



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Work Session, 5:30 PM, Council Chambers Conference Room, City Hall,  
114 North Broad Street, Salem, Virginia 24153  
Regular Session, 6:30 PM, City Hall, 114 North Broad Street, Salem, Virginia 24153

---

### WORK SESSION

---

#### 1. Call to Order

A work session meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Salem, Virginia, was held in the Council Chambers Conference Room, City Hall, 114 North Broad Street, at 5:30 p.m., on Wednesday, September 10, 2025, there being present the following members of said Commission, to wit: Denise P. King, Reid Garst, Jackson Beamer, Mark Henrickson, and Nathan Routt, constituting a legal quorum, with Chair King, presiding; together with Christopher Dorsey, City Manager and Executive Secretary and, Robert Light, Assistant City Manager and Deputy Executive Secretary, both ex officio members of said Commission, William Simpson, Assistant Director Community Development and City Engineer, Mary Ellen Wines, Planning & Zoning Administrator, Maxwell S. Dillon, Planner, and Jim Guynn, City Attorney; and the following business was transacted:

Chair Denise King reported that this date, place, and time had been set in order for the Commission to hold a work session. The work session meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

#### 2. New Business

A discussion was held regarding the items on the current agenda as well as the October agenda as follows:

- A. "Comprehensive Plan 2045" for the City of Salem
- B. Chapter 78 Subdivisions' code changes
- C. Chapter 106 Zoning Ordinance Code changes
- D. Items on the October agenda
  - 1. 522 South Market Street RSF to HBD

#### 3. Adjournment

Chair King adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

---

## REGULAR SESSION

---

### 1. Call to Order

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Salem, Virginia, was held in the Council Chambers Conference Room, City Hall, 114 North Broad Street, at 6:30 p.m., on Wednesday, September 10, 2025, there being present the following members of said Commission, to wit: Denise P. King, Reid Garst, Jackson Beamer, Mark Henrickson, and Nathan Routt, constituting a legal quorum, with Chair King, presiding; together with Christopher Dorsey, City Manager and Executive Secretary and, Robert Light, Assistant City Manager and Deputy Executive Secretary, both ex officio members of said Commission, William Simpson, Assistant Director of Community Development and City Engineer, Mary Ellen Wines, Planning & Zoning Administrator, Maxwell S. Dillon, Planner, and Jim Guynn, City Attorney; and the following business was transacted:

Chair Denise King called the September meeting of the City of Salem Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Chair King reported that this date, place, and time had been set in order for the Commission to hold a public meeting.

- A. Pledge of Allegiance
- B. Roll call

Mr. Routt - Here  
Mr. Henrickson - Here  
Mr. Beamer - Here  
Vice-Chair Garst - Here  
Chair King – Here

### 2. Consent Agenda

- A. Minutes

Consider acceptance of the minutes from August 13th, 2025, regular meeting.

Chair King stated that under the consent agenda, they have the minutes of the August 13th, 2025, Commission work session and regular meeting. Chair King asked the Commission if anyone had any questions, additions, or comments. Hearing none the minutes will be considered accepted.

### 3. New Business

- A. Adopting a Resolution of Recommendation

Consider adopting a resolution of recommendation regarding Salem's Comprehensive Plan "Back to Salem's Future, Plan 2045". The plan addresses housing, redevelopment, open space, city government, transportation, & infrastructure, land use, and other information used to outline the City's long-term vision and goals for development and growth.

Max Dillon, Planner, greeted the Commission and began by providing a high-level recap of the comprehensive plan, explaining that it had been in development for some time. He explained that the Planning and Zoning staff had initiated the process for a new comprehensive plan in October 2023. The goal from the beginning had been to develop a plan that capitalized on the various elements that make Salem unique while recognizing that cities must evolve over time to meet market demands, citizen preferences, and best planning practices. To support this vision, the "Back to Salem's Future" brand was created, encompassing a set of strategies and actions intended to position Salem for a promising future while honoring its historic identity. He elaborated that the plan addressed numerous interconnected topics such as transportation, housing, parks, and commercial redevelopment. It was organized into themes and strategies designed to reflect the natural overlap among these issues. He emphasized that throughout the planning process, staff had conducted extensive community engagement efforts. These included online public polls, regular updates on the city website, social media posts, email subscriptions, and a total of 10 public meetings and open houses. Subcommittees made up of City Council members, Planning Commissioners, and staff also participated in shaping the plan. Mr. Dillon acknowledged that many of the Commission members had been deeply engaged in the process. He remarked that the planning occurred during a particularly challenging period for local governments, where public engagement had become increasingly contentious. Nonetheless, the plan prioritized inclusivity and the diverse needs of the community. Mr. Dillon clarified that the plan encouraged a housing portfolio supportive of various preferences and income levels while rejecting the idea of growth for growth's sake. Instead, it recognized that local realities and political factors shape the future more than broad population projections. He pointed out that the plan would serve as a foundation for future initiatives such as small area planning, a potential housing study, and eventual zoning and subdivision ordinance rewrites. He mentioned that although Salem participates in regional transportation planning through the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission, the city had also requested a review from VDOT to ensure alignment with broader state plans. VDOT confirmed the plan's compatibility in a formal memo. He highlighted that one of the defining strengths of the document was its structure. Many comprehensive plans, he noted, are adopted only to be forgotten because of poor usability. This plan, however, had been deliberately designed to be user-friendly, readable, marketable to businesses, accessible to citizens of various education levels, and actionable by city staff. Mr. Dillon explained that instead of duplicating existing strategic plans, the document referenced them and their sources. It also included an "Action Plan" to help prioritize implementation strategies. He concluded by stating that the plan satisfied Virginia State Code requirements, aligned with VDOT, and most importantly, was based on community input and several rounds of revision. He emphasized that while the current plan was a milestone, it marked the beginning of further planning efforts.

Chair King asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission. She thanked Mr. Dillon and Ms. Wines, adding that when she first reviewed the comprehensive plan, she had felt it included too many pictures. However, upon comparing it with plans from other localities, she came to realize that visuals were important for conveying Salem's features to those unfamiliar with them. For instance, while locals understand references like "the duck pond," outsiders wouldn't grasp the significance without a photo. She concluded by thanking Max and Mary Ellen for enlightening her throughout the process.

Mr. Dillon responded, "Certainly, and thank you."

Chair King then opened the floor for further comments.

Vice-Chair Garst, Mr. Beamer, Mr. Henrickson, and Mr. Routt all commended Mr. Dillon and Ms. Wines for their work.

Vice-Chair Garst noted that he hoped the "community engagement" summary would include a clear list of the public outreach efforts for the record.

Mr. Dillon agreed, stating that they would ensure those materials were included.

Chair King added that, if citizens questioned the level of public engagement, they could point to the comprehensive summary of outreach efforts as proof.

Mr. Henrickson emphasized the importance of recognizing the citizens and stakeholders who contributed to the process. He said that he and his fellow commissioners had spoken to many people throughout Salem, gathering diverse opinions. While the plan was general in nature, he believed that was by design to allow flexibility in the future. He noted that he had studied the document extensively and could practically recite page 132. He thanked everyone involved again.

Mr. Dillon responded by thanking the citizens, Commission members, board members, and Council members who participated. He gave a special shoutout to Glenn Walters, of Town Studio, who had played a major role early on, even though his involvement lessened toward the end of the process. Mr. Dillon acknowledged the challenges but appreciated Glenn's responsiveness.

Chair King opened the public hearing. She directed the citizens who had signed up to speak to come forward as their names were called and reminded them of the 3-minute speaking limit.

Vice-Chair Garst announced the speakers: Ms. Reinhart, Ms. Crotts, and Mr. Breen.

Ms. Reinhart, 213 N. Broad Street appeared before the Commission raising concerns about the lack of clear zoning information in the plan. She recalled older plans that included specific descriptions of multifamily residential areas and corresponding zoning maps, which she felt were missing from this version. While the presentation was visually appealing, she wanted assurance that residents would have opportunities to comment

during future zoning code revisions. She worried about the possibility of neighboring properties being redeveloped into apartments or short-term rentals without proper community input. She also questioned whether a 60-day review period could be granted to allow further feedback, especially since the latest version was only uploaded to the website on September 5th. She emphasized the importance of translating the plan's language and visuals into policies that benefit and reflect the community.

Ms. Donna Crotts, 307 N. Broad Street, appeared before the Commission stating that her perspective had shifted somewhat after listening to the meeting. She appreciated the diligent work put into the plan but noted a lack of recent citizen meetings since April, particularly after the plan had been revised. She raised concerns about Salem's slow population growth and questioned why young people weren't returning. While Salem was once known for its schools, she believed the quality had declined. She emphasized the need to investigate what younger generations think and want from the city.

Vice-Chair Garst thanked her and added that staff had previously visited the high school to gather student feedback early in the process.

Mr. John Breen, 142 Bogey Lane, appeared before the Commission criticizing the foundation of the comprehensive plan, claiming that the survey used to support it was biased and flawed. He expressed concern that developers were already referencing it and that the plan might lead to additional consulting fees. He believed the city should revisit the original contract to verify whether all deliverables had been met and was alarmed to learn that the documents were owned by Town Studio rather than the City of Salem. Breen suggested that the process be paused, giving citizens who contributed a final opportunity to review the plan.

Chair King asked if anyone else wished to speak. Seeing none, she closed the public hearing. She asked the staff if they had any final comments. Hearing none, Chair King made a point to state that the Commission took citizen input very seriously and regretted that Chris McCart, a citizen and researcher, was not present. McCart had brought VDOT's 2022 guidelines to the Commission's attention, which led Chair King to follow up directly with VDOT. After reviewing the documents, she noted that the language was confusing—at one point requiring VDOT approval and elsewhere making it optional. Following up on McCart's concerns, the city sent the plan to VDOT, which reviewed and approved it. Chair King thanked Ms. McCart and emphasized that citizen concerns were acted upon. She also detailed the extent of public outreach: open houses, events like Pumpkin Fest, outreach at Salem Red Sox games, church visits, business meetings, and engagement with school staff, realtors, and home builders. The city had also distributed a citywide mailer, although not everyone received it due to address records. She emphasized that few other actions could have been taken to ensure public input.

Vice-Chair Garst added that the current draft of the plan was essentially unchanged from six months ago. The September updates were mostly related to VDOT documentation.

Mr. Dillon clarified that the first comprehensive draft was posted in May and earlier sections had been released for review. The September version involved design and organization tweaks but no significant content changes.

Chair King then asked Mr. Dillon and Ms. Wines to explain the process for future small area plans and potential housing forums involving public participation.

Ms. Wines confirmed that small area plans would include public input through open houses, hearings, and comment opportunities.

Vice-Chair Garst asked if the model would follow the "East Bottom" plan approach.

Ms. Wines confirmed, explaining that meetings would be held in the neighborhoods in question, with broader community access encouraged.

Chair King said that this approach would likely be standard for future planning efforts, and emphasized the goal of engaging residents directly in their neighborhoods.

Vice-Chair Garst noted that the East Bottom plan was referenced in the comprehensive plan as a model for future efforts.

Ms. Wines affirmed this, adding that the zoning rewrite process would include a committee, citizen participation, open houses, and public hearings. The city intended to gather broad input on housing as well.

Chair King asked for any final comments. Hearing none, she called for a motion.

On motion by Commissioner Routt, seconded by Commissioner Beamer, and duly carried, the resolution of recommendation regarding Salem's Comprehensive Plan "Back to Salem's Future, Plan 2045" be hereby adopted and forwarded to City Council

Roll call vote.

Mr. Routt - aye  
Mr. Henrickson - aye  
Mr. Beamer - aye  
Vice-Chair Garst - aye  
Chair King - aye

Chair King stated that the Commission is a research and recommending body to City Council, however in this instance it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to oversee the creation of the comprehensive plan, and this will go on to City Council with the Commission's recommendation to approve it.

## B. Chapter 78 – Subdivisions

Consider amending Chapter 78 – Subdivisions – Articles I – Generally, Section 78-103, Article II – Administration, Sections 78-200, 201, 204, and 206, Article III – Definitions, Section 78-300, Article IV – Review of plats, Sections 78-400, 401, 402, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408, 416, 421, and Article V – Security for the construction of public improvements, Sections, 78-501 and 503, Article VI –

Requirements for design standards and public improvements, Sections 78-600, 602, 606, 607, 611, 615, 617, 625, 629, 634, and 642, Article VII – Vacation of plats, Sections 78-701 and 706 of the CODE OF THE CITY OF SALEM, VIRGINIA pertaining to plan review by designated agent and timeframe of local approvals.

Mary Ellen Wines, Planning and Zoning Administrator, appeared before the Commission explaining that, as the Commission was aware, the state legislature, in response to the housing crisis, had made a decision this past year to streamline the development approval process. This change applied specifically to Chapter 78, the subdivision ordinance, and removed the Planning Commission from the development approval process. All the changes referenced by Mr. Light, she continued, essentially indicated that the Planning Commission was now removed from that role. Approval responsibility now rested with the designated agent, who, per Commission bylaws, was determined to be the assistant City Manager and, the Director of Community Development. Staff, as a whole, would continue to review major site subdivision plans and major subdivision plats. These plans would still go through a multi-departmental approval process. By state code, if these plans or plats met code requirements, the City was obligated to approve them. This was not a flexible or variable approval process — it was administrative. The state's intent was to remove barriers for localities, especially those where development approvals took years, in an effort to help address the housing crisis.

Vice-Chair Garst asked, for the benefit of the public, what authority the Planning Commission retained.

Ms. Wines answered that, in regard to major subdivisions and site plans, the Commission retained none.

Chair King added that the removal of the Commission's authority was in response to the housing crisis and acknowledged that several citizens had expressed dissatisfaction with the change. However, she emphasized that the City had no control over the matter — nor did City Council. Concerned citizens were encouraged to contact their state delegate and senator.

Mr. Henrickson reiterated that the change was due to state code and not the City of Salem's own decisions. The changes were aimed at larger municipalities with more complex bureaucracies. In contrast, Salem had historically processed development much more efficiently. Still, he acknowledged that the City was bound to follow the state code.

Ms. Wines noted that Salem had been fortunate and was not experiencing the housing crisis as acutely as other localities.

Mr. Henrickson commented that the tides were beginning to shift.

Ms. Wines responded with agreement.

Chair King opened the public hearing on the matter.

Mrs. Stella Reinhart, 227 North Broad Street, appeared before the Commission stating that she had a few questions. She noted that sometimes the state code required a minimum number of public hearings, such as one by the Planning Commission. Given that this change was recent, she admitted she had not yet researched it fully but wondered whether the City's charter might protect the current development process, similar to other localities like Falls Church, Virginia. In that case, their charter granted them the authority to continue operating under their previous system. She suggested checking Salem's charter. Her second concern involved minimum standards. She questioned whether, even if the state only required a single public hearing, the City could voluntarily add more. She expressed concern that recent development proposals lacked clear information for residents, particularly in regard to site plans. The process had lost transparency when those plans no longer required public hearings. She asked whether public engagement could be incorporated back into the process. She thanked the Commission.

Mr. John Breen, 142 Boogie Lane, appeared before the Commission stating that his concern about the state's imposition on local authority, particularly in Salem. He warned that the new policy concentrated unchecked power in the hands of a designated agent. As a result, an individual — or a very small group — could approve a plat or site plan without public or Commission knowledge. He viewed this as a threat to transparent governance. To address this, Mr. Breen proposed two specific actions: one, modify Section 78-201.1 to require (rather than allow) the designated agent to seek assistance when making decisions and two, amend Section 78 to require the designated agent to notify the City Manager, Planning Commission, City Council, and the public via the city's website within seven days of receiving any new plat or site plan. He added that associated staff reports should also be shared publicly. This, he argued, would ensure that residents and local officials remain informed. He also raised a question about who had the authority to appoint the designated agent, suggesting that the Virginia Code appeared to assign this role to the governing body, not the Planning Commission. He urged the Commission to revisit this point and consider stronger oversight language. He concluded by respectfully asking the Commission to consider these changes to ensure transparency and accountability.

Chair King asked if anyone else wished to speak.

Mr. Alexander Boone, 3934 Electric Road, appeared before the Commission stating he hadn't planned to speak but wanted to offer a different perspective. He appreciated Mr. Breen's comments but spoke from the point of view of a developer and former lawyer. In his view, the plat review process was — and should remain — administrative. He described a frustrating experience in another locality where Planning Commission and City Council approval were required for plats, which delayed development needlessly. In his opinion, if a plan met all zoning and code requirements, it should be approved without delay. Requiring unnecessary review steps only served to delay housing production, which he found counterproductive. While the public could still access plats at the courthouse, the decision to approve them was, in practice, a matter of compliance — not policy. He praised the updated state law for streamlining this process and stated that, from a practical perspective, it was a beneficial change. He thanked the Planning Commission for its consideration.

Mrs. Reinhart reappeared stating that during both the work session and the hearing, it had been stated that the approval process was simply administrative and based on whether requirements were met. However, she had reviewed the applicable legislation and found that there were, in fact, some circumstances under which a plat or site plan could be denied — even if zoning requirements were met. She urged the Commission to explore those exceptions and consider whether they allowed for additional scrutiny or discretion. While she acknowledged the expertise of the Commission, she offered this information as a helpful contribution to the discussion.

Chair King thanked Ms. Reinhart and asked if anyone else wished to speak. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Chair King then asked Mr. Guynn to confirm whether state law superseded the City's charter.

Mr. Guynn confirmed that it did.

Chair King clarified that even if the City's zoning ordinance or charter contained specific requirements, state law took precedence. She reiterated that unless the state code specifically allowed for additional items to be considered in plan denial, the City could not arbitrarily introduce other conditions. She asked if there were any additional comments.

Vice-Chair Garst asked for clarification, noting that while the Planning Commission would no longer review site plans, it would still review significant development proposals such as Steelton Mills.

Mr. Guynn responded that the Commission would not review the site plan but confirmed the overall development would require Commission involvement in certain cases.

Chair King asked Ms. Wines to elaborate.

Ms. Wines explained that projects requesting a Cluster Housing Overlay, rezoning, or Planned Unit Development (PUD) would still come before both the Planning Commission and City Council. Only administrative plan approvals were removed from the Commission's role.

Vice-Chair Garst asked if prior cases like Newman Drive, Simms Farm, and Hope Tree had come before the Commission because they were rezonings or PUDs.

Ms. Wines confirmed that they had.

Vice-Chair Garst concluded that, under the changes, nothing significant that the Commission had reviewed in the past two years would change, apart from the final procedural approval of plats.

Ms. Wines confirmed his understanding.

Chair King asked if there were any more questions or comments. Hearing none, she

entertained a motion.

On motion made by Commissioner Routt, seconded by Commissioner Henrickson, and duly carried, the Planning Commission of the City of Salem hereby recommends to City Council that the amendments to the City Code, Chapter 78, Subdivisions, be adopted as presented.

Roll call vote.

Mr. Routt – Aye  
Mr. Henrickson – Aye  
Mr. Beamer – Aye  
Vice-Chair Garst – Aye  
Chair King – Aye

Chair King announced that city code change will go on to City Council for adoption.

### C. Chapter 106 – Zoning

Consider amending Chapter 106 – Zoning Article II – District Regulations, Section 106 – 232 pertaining to Industrial park overlay district, Article III – Use and design standards, Section 106 – 318 pertaining to Urban agriculture, Article IV – Development standards, Section 106 – 400 pertaining to site plans, 402 pertaining to nonconforming uses and sites, 406 pertaining to plot plans, Article V – Administration, Section 106-520 pertaining to amendments to ordinance, 524 pertaining to special exception permits and use not provided for permits, Article VI – Definitions and Use Types, Section 106 – 600 pertaining to site plans, of the CODE OF THE CITY OF SALEM, VIRGINIA.

Chair King began by asking if any staff member would like to present the next item.

Ms. Wines, addressed the Commission to discuss updates to the city’s zoning ordinance. She began by explaining that the ordinance was originally adopted in 2005, and it requires regular updates to remain effective. A comprehensive rewrite is planned for the future, but in the meantime, she introduced a few targeted changes intended to ensure continued functionality and alignment with sound planning practices and zoning law. She explained that Section 106-232, the Industrial Park Overlay District, currently only applies to Salem Industrial Drive south of the railroad tracks. It provides flexibility for industrial development—particularly in areas like parking and landscaping—though it does not alter stormwater management requirements. She stated that the proposal is to expand this overlay to additional industrial areas, including Salem Industrial Drive, Cook Drive, Midland, and Intervale.

Commissioner Beamer asked if Southside would be included in the expansion.

Ms. Wines confirmed that it would. She also mentioned that several of these industrial areas front major roads like Apperson, Riverside, and Electric Road. To maintain the visual character of these corridors, lots along those streets would be required to include

a substantial evergreen buffer. She continued that the next section of amendments would be Section 106-318, the chicken-keeping regulations, noting that there were no changes to the rules themselves. However, responsibility for inspections would shift from the Police Department to the Community Development team in order to reduce the burden on law enforcement. Next, she discussed proposed revisions to Section 106-400, which addresses site plan requirements. She clarified that the actual process and requirements were not changing—instead, the language would be revised for clarity, making it easier to determine when a site plan is required and what type is applicable. She outlined three types of site plans: a plot plan, typically a certified plat for minor additions or parking space changes; a minor site plan, used for improvements like parking or landscaping that do not involve utilities or stormwater; and a major site plan, which encompasses all aspects including stormwater and utility work. Ms. Wines continued with Section 106-402 pertaining to nonconforming uses. She stated the current rule for legal non-conforming sites is that if interior renovations exceed 25% of a building's fair market value, the property owner must also upgrade parking and landscaping—even if the exterior remains untouched. She stated that this requirement has placed a strain on small businesses. To address this, the proposed change would increase the threshold to 50% of the fair market value before such upgrades would be triggered. Continuing, Ms. Wines explained that also in Section 106-400 was the matter of zoning violations and the timeline for addressing them. Currently, there is no deadline for completing required improvements when a site plan is triggered by a violation. The proposal would establish a 90-day construction deadline, with flexibility to grant extensions when weather or other factors—such as the inability to plant trees in winter—interfere with compliance. She continued that in Section 106-520 and 524 the code states that under current rules, if a lot does not meet minimum frontage or width requirements, even if it is legally buildable, the owner must first obtain a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals before applying for a rezoning or special exception. Ms. Wines described this as an unnecessary extra step and proposed eliminating that requirement, especially since rezoning and special exception applications are already subject to public hearings. Lastly, Ms. Wines noted that clear definitions for the three site plan types plot, minor, and major—would be added to Section 106-600 to ensure better understanding.

Chair King thanked Ms. Wines for her presentation and asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, she opened the public hearing.

Stella Reinhart of 213 N. Broad Street was the first to speak. She began by questioning a previous assertion regarding state law superseding local charters. After briefly researching the matter on her phone, she indicated that the Virginia Code does not generally override a city charter unless specifically stated, suggesting it might be worth further review. She then shifted her attention to the industrial overlay proposal and asked whether it would apply to both light and heavy manufacturing. Wines responded that it would. Reinhart sought further clarification, pointing out that the city previously had only one industrial park overlay and was now expanding it to areas that were not originally designated as such but already had some industrial use. Chair King confirmed that interpretation, and Vice-Chair Garst added that the areas in question shared the same character, despite not being previously designated. Reinhart shared her observations from biking along the Greenway near Cook Drive, noting the industrial buildings present in the area. She encouraged the Commission to consider more intentional planning for

the future of these spaces. Referencing examples from Roanoke and elsewhere, she highlighted successful conversions of industrial buildings into public spaces like breweries, climbing gyms, and art centers. She suggested that creative reuse, including elements like murals, lighting, seating, and sculptures, could help better integrate these areas into the community and enhance their public appeal. She emphasized that shaping the character of development was as important as permitting it and noted that even small enhancements, such as trees and public art, could make a meaningful difference. Before stepping down, she expressed her trust in the Commission's judgment.

Chair King thanked her and acknowledged the merit of her suggestions, while clarifying that the proposal at hand was limited to applying existing overlay standards to more locations and did not directly address elements like murals or public art.

Ms. Wines added that murals are in fact permitted in industrial areas, along with trees and sculptures.

Chair King asked if there was anyone else here tonight to speak about this matter, seeing none, she closed the meeting to the public.

On motion made by Commissioner Henrickson, seconded by Vice-Chair Garst, and duly carried, the Planning Commission of the City of Salem hereby recommends to City Council that the amendments to the City Code, Chapter 106, Zoning, be adopted as presented.

Roll call vote.

Mr. Routt – Aye  
Mr. Henrickson – Aye  
Mr. Beamer – Aye  
Vice-Chair Garst – Aye  
Chair King – Aye

#### 4. Adjournment

Chair King stated there was no additional business for the Planning Commission and the meeting was adjourned at 7:31p.m.