

**SANTA CLARA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
2603 Santa Clara Drive  
Thursday, January 12, 2023**

**Present:** Mark Weston, Chair  
Ryan Anderson  
Logan Blake  
James Call  
Shelly Harris  
Curtis Whitehead

**Staff:** Jim McNulty, Planning and Economic Development Manager  
Selena Nez, Deputy City Recorder  
Cody Mitchell, Building Official  
Matt Ence, City Attorney

**Absent:** Mark Hendrickson

**1. Call to Order.**

Chair Mark Weston called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**2. Opening Ceremony.**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance: Ryan Anderson.**

**B. Opening Comments (Invocation): Ryan Anderson.**

**3. Communications and Appearances.**

There were no communications or appearances.

**4. Working Agenda.**

**A. Public Hearing.**

- i. Consider the 2022 Report on Actions Taken to Implement the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the General Plan Required by the State of Utah. This includes an Update to the General Plan. Santa Clara City, Applicant.**

Planning and Economic Development Manager, Jim McNulty, presented the Staff Report and stated that in 2019, the City of Santa Clara adopted an Affordable Housing Plan as required by SB-34. Utah Code requires cities to select at least three moderate-income housing strategies. In 2019, Santa Clara City selected four strategies, which are in the 2022 Implementation Plan. Since

Utah Code Annotated Section 10-9a-408 was revised in 2022 and took effect on July 1, 2022, cities are now required to provide Benchmarks and Timelines for each selected strategy. On December 13, 2022, the City received verification that the revised 2022 Report on Actions Taken by the City was accepted by the State Department of Workforce Services. The State of Utah is requiring cities to adopt an Implementation Plan as part of the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the General Plan by City Ordinance for 2022.

Mr. McNulty reviewed two of the four moderate-income housing strategies Santa Clara has chosen. Strategy A is to rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing. Mr. McNulty reported that one benchmark includes the Desert Village project. In 2019, the city approved an amended Planned Development Residential of 185 townhomes to provide moderate-income housing options near the heart of the city. Another project, Desert Edge, was approved in 2021 and includes affordable housing apartments as well as townhomes. Specifically, Desert Edge provides 120 moderate-income unit apartments at 50% of the Area Median Income (“AMI”), which is substantial. The timelines for each project were included.

Mr. McNulty reviewed another strategy, which is to allow for greater and reduced regulations related to internal or detached Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”) in residential zones. Mr. McNulty explained that the City adopted this ordinance in January 2020, which allows for detached ADUs. To meet the requirements of House Bill 82, in October 2021 Ordinance #2021-14, which allows for Internal Accessory Dwelling Units, IADUs was adopted by the city. The City believes this change will allow for more moderate-income housing options in the community. The process includes a streamlined administrative Permitted Use and Building Permit review. Beginning next year, the state wants to track every ADU, which includes a Business License that allows for the tracking of moderate-income units. The City will be prepared to report these numbers to the state beginning in 2023.

Mr. McNulty reported that staff has determined that all State Code requirements have been met with this application. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and forward a recommendation of approval on the adoption of an Implementation Plan for the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the General Plan to the City Council.

Chair Weston opened the public hearing.

*Dolly Stoner* gave her address as 1694 Rainbow Road and asked for clarification of ADUs and Internal Accessory Dwelling Units (“IADU”). Chair Weston explained that they are intended to provide an additional dwelling unit on a property. Mr. McNulty stated that if the property owner rents out the ADU, a Business License is required so that the state can track it. The ADU or IADU must be owner-occupied to be rented. He noted that communities that choose not to allow moderate-income housing may not receive federal money for road funds and other projects.

*Gary Allred* gave his address as 1983 North Rim View Drive and asked for clarification on how moderate-income housing is defined and if the proposed apartment units will be affordable housing. Mr. McNulty explained that generally moderate-income housing is for those earning 50 to 80 percent of the AMI. Mr. Allred asked if the Desert Edge Apartments, which rent for \$2,400 per month are considered affordable housing. Mr. McNulty was unsure because rental prices have

increased significantly recently. However, because the project was part of the original approval from 2019, a timeline and follow-up strategy were included. When the City updates it for 2023, that project will be removed. Mr. Allred commented that there was a lot of opposition to the Black Desert Community, which he believed was due to it not being affordable to most people.

There were no further public comments. Chair Weston closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Harris asked Mr. McNulty if he expected the State Legislature to enact additional requirements. Mr. McNulty stated that the Housing Element will need to be updated annually to show progress. However, for this year's Legislative Session, more stipulations will likely be put in place some of which may have to be done sooner to meet any new requirements.

ii. **Consider a Proposed Code Amendment to the Santa Clara City Zoning Ordinance, Sections 17.44.110, Monument Signs, and 17.44.115, Menu Boards. This Includes General Clean-Up and Updating of the Ordinance. Santa Clara City, Applicant.**

Mr. McNulty reported that City Staff has been working on updates to Chapter 17.44.110 – Monument Signs, as well as the creation of Chapter 17.44.115 – Menu Boards. The proposed changes were discussed at the October 27, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. McNulty discussed it with the City Council on November 30, 2022. Both the Planning Commission and City Council were in favor of moving forward.

The draft ordinance updates for Chapter 17.44.110 – Monument Signs include:

- Section 17.44.110B, Where Allowed:  
Monument signs in a Planned Development Commercial (“PDC”) Zone will require Planning Commission approval.
- Section 17.44.110C – Maximum Allowed:
  - a. Will be changed from “The maximum height of a monument sign shall be ten feet (10’) including the base” to “The maximum height of a monument sign shall be eight feet (8’) including the sign base. The sign area of a monument sign shall not exceed seven feet (7’) in vertical height.”
  - b. Will be changed from “The square footage of the monument sign shall not exceed one hundred (100) square feet of actual advertisement area unless otherwise approved by the city staff or as may be referred to the planning commission for approval” to “shall not exceed eighty (80) square feet of actual advertisement area unless otherwise approved by the planning commission.”
  - c. Will be changed from “All monument signs be completed closed at the base” to “All monument signs shall be completed enclosed at the sign base. A minimum sign base height of one foot (1’) is required, utilizing materials

and colors to match the building. The sign base will be required to run the entire horizontal length of the sign and shall have no sign copy. The sign base shall be designed to blend in with any proposed berming or contouring of the property.”

The draft ordinance for Chapter 17.44.115, Menu Boards includes:

- Section 17.44.115, Menu Boards (all new text):
  - A. Definition: A sign located at a drive-in or drive-up window restaurant.
  - B. Maximum Allowed:
    - 1. Menu board signs in commercial zones:
      - a. Two (2) freestanding or wall-mounted menu board signs are allowed per business.
      - b. The maximum sign area shall be 24 square feet per sign.
      - c. The maximum sign height shall be eight feet (8’) for freestanding signs.
      - d. A menu board sign must be located on-site in a location to not impair traffic visibility.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and forward a recommendation of approval for the proposed Code Amendment (Chapters 17.44.110, Monument Signs, and 17.44.115, Menu Boards) to the City Council.

Chair Weston opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Weston closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Whitehead asked for clarification regarding allowing for only two menu boards per location. He asked if the car wash kiosks would be considered menu boards. Mr. McNulty stated that the requirement is generally intended to apply to restaurants.

- iii. **Consider a Proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application for Property located at approximately 2276 Arrowhead Trail (Parcels #SC-6-2-22-4148, SC-9-A-12, and SC-9-A-18, described as 1.47 acres). Split Rock Construction is Proposing a General Plan Amendment from Low-Density Residential (“LDR”) to Main Street Commercial (“MSC”). The Proposed Rezoning is from the R-1-10 Single-Family Residential Zone to the Planned Development Commercial, PDC Zone. Both the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning are Required to Accommodate a Proposed Mancave Project. Split Rock Construction, Applicant.**

Mr. McNulty presented the Staff Report and stated that the applicant, Split Rock Construction, is requesting a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning for property located at approximately 2276 Arrowhead Trail (Parcels #SC-6-2-22-4148, #SC-9-A-12, and #SC-9-A-18, described as 1.47 acres). The applicant is proposing a General Plan Amendment from Low-Density Residential (“LDR”) to Main Street Commercial (“MSC”) for a portion of the property along the frontage of Arrowhead Trail. The applicant is also proposing a rezone from R-1-10 Single-Family to the Planned Development Commercial, PDC Zone for a portion of the property along the frontage of Arrowhead Trail. The northern portion of the property without frontage along Arrowhead Trail is located within the PDC Zone.

Mr. McNulty reported that the applicant has submitted a Site Plan/Project Plan as required for the proposed PDC Zone. The Site Plan includes a total of 18 units located within six buildings to be used as mancaves on 1.47 acres. This equates to a project density of approximately 12 units/acre; however, no living area or apartment units are included. The proposed units range in size from 1,000 to 1,300 square feet. The intended use will allow for the personal storage of boats, cars, off-road vehicles, RVs, and other items. Each unit will be subdivided and sold separately to future owners. Required building setbacks include 20 feet of frontage and side or rear yard for units that are adjacent to Lava Flow Drive and Arrowhead Trail. Interior side or rear yard setbacks are a minimum of 10 feet. The primary access to the site would be off Lava Flow Drive, with an emergency-only gated access off Arrowhead Trail.

Mr. McNulty reported that a 10-foot landscape buffer, as required by City code, has been shown adjacent to both Lava Flow Drive and Arrowhead Trail. A solid six-foot CMU wall as required, with an additional 10-foot landscape buffer (inside of the wall) adjacent to the proposed buildings, has been included.

The building materials for the proposed mancave units include light and dark-colored stucco, architectural metal panels, and concrete tile roofing. Chapter 17.68.040 requires a minimum of two exterior building materials for all sides of a commercial building that are visible from any public street or adjacent residential zone. The proposed building height for each building is 23 feet 3 inches (23'-3") at the peak of the roof. The PDC Zone allows for a maximum height of 35 feet.

Mr. McNulty explained that outdoor lighting will include decorative wall pack-style lights on each building/unit. This lighting may not exceed 16 feet in height and must be shielded and directed downward to avoid light spill.

The Santa Clara City General Plan Map includes two land use designations for the property. This includes Low-Density Residential (“LDR”) along the frontage of Arrowhead Trail and Main Street Commercial (“MSC”) on the northern portion of the property without Arrowhead Trail frontage. The description for LDR (Section 3.4, Land Uses) states the following:

“A suburban type density allowing primarily single-family detached homes with a density range of two to four dwelling units per acre.”

The description for MSC (Section 3.4.2 Mixed-Use Land Uses) states the following:

“Predominantly commercial uses on the ground level, including uses such as stores, restaurants, and offices with residences and/or offices on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors.”

The Character Objectives for MSC state the following:

“MSC strives for continuous building frontage, with the ground floor being mostly storefront windows. This makes it pedestrian friendly as well as accessible by automobile. The overall development should include some of the following: plazas, wide and attractive sidewalks, and curb extensions at pedestrian crossings. A tree-lined interconnected street grid with sidewalks and shared parking is encouraged.”

The MSC Location states the following:

“Primarily in Santa Clara’s East Gateway along Santa Clara Drive and at the intersection of Rachel Drive and Pioneer Parkway.”

Section 2.5 of the General Plan includes “Appropriate Land Use Transitions” and states the following:

“The General Plan encourages gradual transitions in housing types and densities, especially near mixed-use, commercial developments, along arterials, and at major intersections, to ensure compatibility with adjacent existing development.”

Section 3.3.1 of the General Plan includes “Density Transitions” and states the following:

“In general, gradual higher densities are encouraged near mixed-use, commercial developments, along arterials, and at major intersections. Land uses and building types on both sides of a street should be similar; transitions between land use (size and type of buildings) should occur in the middle of the block rather than in the middle of a street.”

Section 4.3 of the General Plan includes the “East Gateway Subarea” and states the following:

“The East Gateway Subarea is a mix of commercial developments and single-family homes. With its quick accessibility to Santa Clara Drive and close proximity to schools, parks, and commercial development, several of the larger vacant and underutilized parcels in the Subarea can be developed to evolve the existing commercial area into a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use center.”

The East Gateway Objective in support of Section 4.3 states the following:

“Create a walkable, compact, mixed-use area with commercial, office, and residential uses, generous landscaping, and a unique identity.”

Section 8.1.1 of the General Plan includes “Santa Clara Street Classification” and states the following:

“The Santa Clara Street system is made up of four street types based on function and capacity. The four street types include Arterial, Major Collector, Collector, and Local.”

Both Lava Flow Drive and Arrowhead Trail are identified as “Local” streets. Table 7 within the General Plan indicates that the use of a local street includes access to neighborhoods and low-traffic demand land uses.

Policy 8.1 of the General Plan states the following:

“Mixed-use commercial areas should be located on either a major collector or collector streets.”

Mr. McNulty reported that in discussing the proposed application, City staff and legal counsel identified the following concerns:

1. The General Plan description for Low-Density Residential (“LDR”) indicates that this designation is primarily for single-family detached homes with a density range of two to four dwelling units per acre.
2. The General Plan description for Main Street Commercial (“MSC”) indicates that this designation is for commercial uses on the ground level, including uses such as stores, restaurants, and offices with residences or offices above.
3. Section 2.5 of the General Plan discusses gradual transitions in housing types and densities, especially near mixed-use, commercial development, along arterials, and at major intersections. The proposed project does not meet these criteria.
4. Section 3.3.1 of the General Plan discusses density transitions to ensure that new development is compatible with existing neighborhoods. Land uses and building types on both sides of a street should be similar; transitions between land use (size and type of buildings) should occur in the middle of the block rather than in the middle of a street. The proposed project does not meet these criteria.

5. Section 4.3 of the General Plan discusses the East Gateway Subarea where the subject property is located. The East Gateway Objective supports walkable, compact, mixed-use with commercial, office, and residential uses. The proposed project does not meet these criteria.
6. Section 8.1.1 of the General Plan discusses Santa Clara Street Classifications. Policy 8.1 of the General Plan indicates that Mixed-Use commercial areas should be located on either a major collector or collector street. Both Lava Flow Drive and Arrowhead Trail are local streets.
7. Chapter 17.18.090 of City Code provides standards of review for a zoning map amendment (Rezoning) for the City. The proposed property Rezoning does not meet these criteria.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend denial of the proposed General Plan Amendment and rezone to the City Council for property located at approximately 2276 Arrowhead Trail (Parcels #SC-6-2-22-4148, #SC -9-A-12, and #SC-9-A-18, described as 1.47 acres), subject to the following findings:

1. That the proposed General Plan Amendment does not comply with Section 2.5 of the General Plan (Appropriate Land Use Transitions).
2. That the proposed General Plan Amendment does not comply with Section 3.3.1 of the General Plan (Density Transitions).
3. That the proposed General Plan Amendment does not comply with Section 4.3 of the General Plan (East Gateway Subarea), or the East Gateway Objective that supports this section.
4. That the proposed General Plan Amendment does not comply with Section 8.1.1 of the General Plan (Santa Clara Street Classification System) or with Policy 8.1 that supports this section.
5. That the proposed property Rezoning does not comply with Chapter 17.18.090 items:
  - a. The proposed use is not suitable in view of the zoning and development of the adjacent and nearby property.
  - b. The proposed use will adversely affect the existing use or suitability of the adjacent or nearby property.
  - c. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot or should not be used as currently zoned.

- d. Not applicable, because this project would not have more of an impact on services or systems such as streets, schools, water, utilities, police, or fire services than a single-family home would, and it might be less.
- e. The proposed use is not compatible with the purpose and intent of the General Plan.
- f. The proposed use may or may not be consistent with the purpose and intent of the proposed zoning district. A conditional use permit would be required for the proposed use.
- g. The proposed use is not supported by new or changing conditions anticipated by the General Plan.
- h. The proposed use does not reflect a reasonable balance between the promotion of public health, safety, morality, or general welfare and the right to the unrestricted use of property.

Bart Smith from Split Rock Construction reported that he has lived at 3089 Somerset Lane in Santa Clara for 20 years. He lived elsewhere in Santa Clara for ten years prior to that. The subject property was originally comprised of a home that had been abandoned and there was a lot of debris on the property. Mr. Smith acquired the property, razed the building, and did a major cleanup of the debris. The property currently has two zonings, MSC and LDR, and is divided down the middle. Mr. Smith explained that they want to do a project that will have minimal impact on streets and usage but will still be in harmony with the residential field on Arrowhead Trail. He noted that Arrowhead Trail and Lava Flow are residential streets. A mancave is not a commercial use or residential use. Clients will pay between \$350,000 and \$500,000 per unit as a shell and would likely spend an additional \$200,000 to \$300,000 on improvements. Clients use mancaves to watch movies or sporting events but most of the time it sits idle. Mr. Smith stated that they have a list of about 15 people who would like to purchase them at that price. He remarked that they went to great efforts to make the streetscape feel more residential and look like a home from the street view.

Commissioner Blake asked about bathroom facilities in the mancaves. Mr. Smith explained that there is space for a bathroom in the back of each unit that clients would install themselves after the units are sold. He reiterated that the units are sold as a shell.

Commissioner Anderson asked for clarification on parking. Mr. Smith stated that there are no driveways or markings because they do not want to encourage people to stay there.

Chair Weston opened the public hearing.

*Gary Allred* gave his address at 1983 North Rim View Drive in Santa Clara and stated that the proposed development reminds him of the Silverton on Pioneer Parkway, which also had a lot of opposition. He expected the opposition to be even greater in this instance because the project detracts from the nature of the neighborhood. Mr. Allred thought the project was intended to get

the maximum amount of profit out of the property rather than make the best use of it. He commented that based on the size and maneuverability of the vehicles of the anticipated users, there will be a significant impact on traffic.

*Wes Whitehead* gave his address as 2190 Arrowhead Trail and asked for clarification on how wide the street will be between his home and the proposed gutter on the opposite side. Mr. McNulty responded that Arrowhead Trail and the area further down past the intersection is a local street with a width of 50 feet. There is a collector street above that is slightly wider at 66 feet. Mr. Whitehead was concerned that with the new neighborhood off the corner, there will be excessive traffic coming in and out. He asked how wide the driveway going into the project will be. Mr. McNulty's understanding was that the driveway into the project will be 30 feet. Mr. Whitehead expressed concern that someone towing an RV trailer will naturally swing wide and come out in the center lane. He noted that the intersection has a lot of traffic. He also expressed concern that on Arrowhead Trail, there will have to be a considerable raise in the grade to get a vehicle down and straightened out. This could cause a hole at the intersection, which could cause a major problem when there is flooding. The drain system would have to be very extensive.

*Jeri Larson* gave her address as 2279 Arrowhead Trail and reported that she has lived on Arrowhead Trail for over 47 years. She agreed with Mr. Whitehead's concerns about the potential for flooding. She would much prefer to have the commercial area developed as residential there. She did not support turning the residential area into commercial.

*Clark Ence* gave his address as 2424 Vineyard Drive and reported that he also owns the rental unit at 2271 Arrowhead Trail. He thought the income to the City as a tax base would be better as a commercial unit than residential. For that reason, it would be advisable for the City to approve it. He stated, however, that he shared Mr. Whitehead's concerns. He pointed out that when the new subdivision goes in on Country Lane, regardless of whether it goes onto Santa Clara Drive or terminates on Arrowhead, there will be a significant increase in traffic. He also agreed with Mr. Whitehead that if drivers bring a fifth wheel or a three-axle trailer in, anything over 30 feet in length will be a major problem in terms of accessing the site. He thought the project was a good idea and provides a good transition from residential to commercial. If the access and increased traffic can be adjusted, he suggested that the City approve it. He expressed concern about access and the potential for flooding.

There were no additional public comments. Chair Weston closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Call commented on the renderings and stated that the view from the street looks beautiful. He remarked that Mr. Smith has a quality Business Plan. He did not, however, think it was a good idea to change the General Plan and the zoning without significant support from the neighboring property owners.

Commissioner Anderson asked for clarification regarding the tax base and whether it will differ from a residential home. Mr. McNulty stated that it will not make much of a difference. A mancave is similar to a home but it does not create an additional tax base like a commercial use would.

Commissioner Whitehead asked if the zoning was changed if someone could purchase one of the units and operate a business from it. He also asked if the project has been reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”). Mr. McNulty stated that a business cannot be run from any of the units. He also confirmed that the project has been reviewed by the TRC. The feeling was that although it is a good design and it could be viable, the consensus was to deny the request based on the concerns listed in the staff report. The applicant has done a good job with the design but this may not be the right location. However, Mr. McNulty emphasized that the Planning Commission can make its own decision and does not necessarily have to agree with the TRC.

Commissioner Blake asked for clarification on why the project was being designated as Main Street Commercial. He asked if there is a General Plan designation that is more appropriate for hobby garages/mancaves. Mr. McNulty stated that the land use designations are broad and that is where it would fit.

**5. General Business.**

**A. Recommendation to City Council.**

- i. **Recommendation to the City Council to Consider the 2022 Report on Actions Taken to Implement the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the General Plan Required by the State of Utah. Santa Clara City, Applicant.**

Commissioner Call moved to recommend that the City Council CONSIDER the 2022 Report on actions taken to implement the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the General Plan. Commissioner Whitehead seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- ii. **Recommendation to the City Council to Consider a Proposed Code Amendment to the Santa Clara City Zoning Ordinance, Sections 17.44.110, Monument Signs, and 17.44.115, Menu Boards. Santa Clara City, Applicant.**

Commissioner Blake moved to recommend that the City Council CONSIDER the Proposed Code Amendment to Santa Clara City's Zoning Ordinances, Sections 17.44.110, Monument Signs, and 17.44.115, Menu Boards. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- iii. **Recommendation to the City Council to Consider a Proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezoning Application for Property located at approximately 2276 Arrowhead Trail (Parcels #SC-6-2-22-4148, SC-9-A-12, and SC-9-A-18, described as 1.47 acres). Split Rock Construction is Proposing a General Plan Amendment from Low-Density Residential (“LDR”) to Main Street Commercial (“MSC”). The Proposed Rezoning is from the R-1-10 Single-Family Residential Zone to the Planned Development Commercial (“PDC”) Zone.**

**Commissioner Whitehead moved to recommend that the City Council deny the proposed General Plan Amendment and rezoning for property located at 2276 Arrowhead Trail. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Chair Weston-Aye; Commissioner Anderson-Aye; Commissioner Blake-Nay; Commissioner Call-Aye; Commissioner Harris-Aye; Commissioner Whitehead-Aye. The motion passed 5-to-1.**

**iv. Election of Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair for 2023.**

**Chair Weston nominated Commissioner Whitehead to serve as Chair for 2023.**

**Commissioner Whitehead nominated Commissioner Hendrickson to serve as Chair for 2023.**

He commented that Commissioner Hendrickson has a lot of knowledge, rarely misses meetings, and is always well-prepared.

Commissioner Call's preference was to nominate Chair Weston and Commissioner Whitehead to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair again. However, he thought Mr. McNulty made a good point that it might be best to rotate the roles.

**Commissioner Call nominated Commissioner Whitehead to serve as Chair and Commissioner Harris as Vice-Chair for 2023.**

Commissioner Blake expressed support for Mark Hendrickson as Chair and Commissioner Harris as Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Harris expressed support for Chair Weston to continue to serve as Chair and Vice-Chair Whitehead to continue as Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Whitehead pointed out that it can be difficult at times for him to attend Planning Commission Meetings during football season. He was happy to serve but felt there were better options due to his lack of availability in the fall.

**Commissioner Whitehead moved to APPOINT Mark Hendrickson to serve as Planning Commission Chair for 2023. Commissioner Call seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**Commissioner Harris nominated Commissioner Blake to serve as Vice-Chair.**

Commissioner Whitehead agreed that Commissioner Blake has extensive knowledge and because of his background, he brings up points in meetings that other Commissioners may not think about.

**Commissioner Call moved to APPOINT Logan Blake as Planning Commission Vice-Chair for 2023. Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

6. **Discussion Items.**

A. **None.**

7. **Approval of Minutes.**

A. **Request Approval of the Special Meeting Minutes – December 15, 2022.**

Commissioner Blake moved to APPROVE the minutes of the December 15, 2022, Santa Clara Planning Commission Special Meeting. Commissioner Harris seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

8. **Adjournment.**

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

*Jim McNulty*

---

Jim McNulty  
Planning Manager

Approved: February 9, 2023