



A G E N D A

Town of Chino Valley
Planning & Zoning Commission

April 7, 2026



Commissioner's Regular Meeting Agenda
Planning & Zoning Commission
Chino Valley Town Hall
202 N. State Route 89
April 7, 2026, 6:00 p.m.

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- C. CONSENT CALENDAR – All items listed under the Consent Calendar will be approved by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless the Commission or a member of the audience wishes to speak about an item. In which case, the Chair will pull the item from the Consent Calendar to be heard.
 - C.1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 3, 2026 REGULAR MEETING
 - C.2. WITHDRAWALS BY APPLICANT – NONE
 - C.3. CONTINUANCES – ZC-2026-01 – BRUSSAT ZONE CHANGE CONTINUED TO MAY 5, 2026
 - C.4. APPROVALS – NONE
- D. PUBLIC HEARING – ONE
 - D.1 **ZC-2026-02** – This is a request by Permit Pushers, on behalf of CHM Homes, Inc., for a rezone of two parcels totaling approximately 3.06 acres of land from Commercial Light (CL) to Commercial Heavy (CH) to accommodate the continued use of an existing mobile home retail sales and storage operation. The properties are located at 3280 N State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.
- E. ACTION ITEMS - NONE
- F. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - F.1 Staff
 - F.2 Commission
 - F.3 Chairman
 - F.4 Public
- G. ADJOURN

As a part of the public hearing process, the Town Planning and Zoning Commission is authorized to consider appropriate alternate Zoning Districts, which are no more intensive in development activity than the requested Zoning District.

Zoom Instructions: Please use the link to join the webinar: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82610810673>, or by phone: 1 888 788-0099 (Toll Free) or 1 877 853-5247 (Toll Free); Webinar ID: 826 1081 0673

A copy of the agenda packet is available for viewing 12 days prior to the Planning Commission Public Hearing date, at the Marion Lassa/Chino Valley Library, 1020 W. Palomino Road, Chino Valley, Arizona.

The Town endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 72 hours advance notice, special assistance can also be provided for sight and/or hearing impaired persons at public meetings. Please call 636-2646 (voice) or use 711 (Telecommunications Arizona Relay Service) to request accommodation to participate in this meeting.

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

February 3, 2026

A regular meeting of the Town of Chino Valley Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, at the Town of Chino Valley Council Chambers, 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS present: Chair Chuck Merritt, Vice-Chair Gary Pasciak, Commissioner Michael Ditta, Commissioner Teena Meadors, Commissioner Joseph Morabito, Commissioner Steve Stotz, and Commissioner Richard Zamudio.

STAFF MEMBERS present: Laurie Lineberry, Development Services Director, Will Dingee, Assistant Director, Jessica Barragan, Senior Planner, Terri Denemy, Town Manager, Gerreann Froberg, Senior Processing Coordinator, and Nicholas Harwick, Audio/Video.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Merritt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was declared. Merritt recognized Steve Stotz, new Commissioner, and welcomed him. The Commission meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Chair Merritt.

Merritt asked the public to quiet their phones, stated disruptions would result in removal from the premises, and that signs or placards would not be tolerated and asked the public to lower their signs. He reiterated that the public had their chance to speak at the January 6, 2026, meeting and over 50 did, and if the public brought placards to the meeting to continue to have their voices heard, then they were breaking the rules of the Agenda. He asked that the public conduct themselves with decorum, maturity, and politeness.

ACTION ITEM #D1 - Continued from January 6, 2026 meeting – for deliberation and decision - **ZC-2025-03 & CUP-2025-05** – This is a request by Heidi Short on behalf of Perkins Ranch Inc for a rezone of approximately 390 acres of land from Single Family Residential, minimum 2-acres (SR-2) to Agricultural Residential, minimum 36-acres (AR-36) and a request for a conditional use permit for the construction of a privately owned and operated airfield and associated uses. Located east of the intersection of East Perkinsville Road and Forest Service Road 318a, Chino Valley Arizona 86323.

Chair Merritt asked if anyone on the Commission had a disclosure to declare regarding this item.

Pasciak stated that he had spoken with staff.

Ditta stated that he had spoken to neighbors, friends, and Councilman Holt.

Merritt stated that he had spoken to staff and Tom Perkins concerning education on flight, the definition of the flight operations, and various other terminologies.

Will Dingee, Assistant Director, shared that the Planning and Zoning Commission held the first public meeting on this project on January 6, 2026, with public comments, and that meeting was continued to today's meeting. Subsequently, on January 20, 2026, a joint Town Council and Planning and Zoning Commission Study Session was held. If the Commission forwards recommendation to Town Council, it would go to a public hearing on February 23, 2026, at Grace Church in Chino Valley, following with Council deliberation and discussion only on February 24, 2024, at Town Hall. Dingee stated that since the January 6, 2026, meeting, subsequent Study Session dialogue, and public input, staff had clarifications and refinements to the Staff Report. Staff transitioned to the terminology of "Touch and Go's", instead of operations, to make it easier for everyone to understand. Touch and Go's were defined as a single landing and takeoff, and staff recommended limits, with 40 per hour, 110 per day, and 40,150 annually. He showed a slide with clarification on the airspace flight pattern. He read the 2040 General Plan Vision Statement, and stated there were a lot of opinions on it. Staff felt that with the zoning, phasing, and conditions in place, the proposed project preserved open land, limited subdivision development, managed growth, and protected the community's character. The project allowed the

applicant to keep thousands of acres in long-term family ownership, in ranch and open land use. Development would be limited to the airfield and associated uses, while the majority of the property remained open and undeveloped. In staff's opinion, this directly supports the General Plan's vision for the Town of Chino Valley. **Dingee** showed slides comparing airports and airfields in Yavapai County, including Cottonwood, Bagdad, and Seligman. With 2-mile buffer distance from runway, Seligman had 404 buildings larger than 800 square feet, Bagdad had 706, and Cottonwood had 8089. The proposed airstrip had zero developed parcels at a 1-mile buffer from runway, with no buildings. At a 2-mile buffer from the proposed airstrip, there are 15 developed parcels, with 32 total buildings larger than 800 square feet. Within those developed parcels is the Sale Barn, (which is the only developed parcel within Town limits), the Garchin Buddhist Institute, two homesites in Haystack Ranch, and eight total homesites Northeast of the proposed airfield in Yavapai County. He went on to explain some refinements to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP): Condition #3, Phase 1, to include the airstrip length not to exceed 6,000 feet, with taxiway, and apron with tiedowns; Condition #12 to include construction for Phases 2, 3 or 4 shall commence within ten years of completion of Phase 1. In the Development Agreement, the recommendations included the following changes: g. Operations shall **generally** adhere to the following distribution; delete cc. (covered in hh.). Staff recommended the Commission hold discussion with staff and the applicant team, hold Commission deliberation, and put forth a Motion on the Rezone and a Motion on the Conditional Use Permit.

Merritt asked the Commission if they had any questions for staff.

Ditta stated the amounts on the touch and goes changed to 40 per hour and asked if this was still an average, and can the word average be removed.

Dingee replied it was still a cumulative average, and Embry-Riddle could answer the question on whether the word could be removed.

Merritt stated that as part of the discussions in the January 3, 2026, meeting and subsequent Study Session, that Perkins Ranch would, upon approval of the Zone Change (ZC) and Conditional Use Permit (CUP), open negotiations with the Town that the water rights that were granted to the Perkins Ranch when the Town annexed them in, that those would be removed.

Dingee replied that if the Commission would like, staff could attach a condition to the CUP, which would need to be discussed beforehand with Mr. Perkins.

Merritt felt that for the proposed fire station, more than the building and equipment should be included, and that the cost of personnel that manned the fire station should not be borne by the airport alone but would provide coverage for everybody in the surrounding area as well. He wanted to make sure that the Planning and Zoning Commission would have the ability to review and comment on all Development Agreements before the Town Council, just to have an extra set of eyes on it. **Merritt** stated that when the businesses were developed on the site in future Phases, the owners of those businesses that have expressed an interest so far would travel to the site to view it by either plane or rotary wing aircraft, and there should be a provision for one flight per week, per year, to accommodate potential business owners. He asked to add a condition in the CUP, that for the first year, a monthly audit of flights would be provided to the Town staff with a contact person keeping track of complaints, and a Flight Operations Officer to make contact with the Town once a month, to check on any issues that may arise. After the first year, the frequency could be quarterly for the lifetime that Embry Riddle uses the airstrip.

Merritt asked the Commission if they had any questions for the applicant.

Thomas Duncan Perkins, applicant, introduced himself and thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak. He stated that he was the President of Perkins Ranch Incorporated and would be happy to answer any questions from the Commission.

Stotz stated that in trying to follow the maps provided, he understood there had been a slight tweak to the airstrip to mitigate the noise and asked if the current map reflected that.

Perkins replied, yes it did reflect that. He introduced the architect of the airfield, **Mark Paslick**, with Goodwyn Mills Cawood, and stated that he had moved the direction of landing of the airfield to help with noise mitigation.

Paslick stated that when they started the process, they had originally identified several different alignments. They talked with the tower at Prescott Regional Airport and came up with the current alignment which allows them to avoid noise and would be a better alignment for wind.

Perkins pointed out on the map the large blue circle which represented Prescott Regional Airport's Class D airspace, which was strictly controlled by the Prescott tower when it is open. All the space outside of the Class D airspace was called Class G airspace, which was uncontrolled, although Prescott has control of that airspace when entering and exiting their Class D airspace. Neither Embry-Riddle, the Town of Chino Valley, nor the State own that airspace, it is managed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Prescott Regional will use the Class G airspace to move aircraft for safety in and out of their patterns. Planes would enter the proposed airstrip mostly from the Southwest due to wind conditions. This proposed circuit is called the right circuit, and no more than four aircraft can be in that circuit at any time. For people to state that there would be twenty aircraft out there, that would be incorrect. Where the 40 touch-and-goes per hour maximum comes from, was each aircraft can do approximately one touch and go every six minutes, so in an hour one aircraft can do ten. So, with a maximum of four aircraft in the circuit, that equals a total 40 per hour average. It could be lower or higher based on spacing, but 40 is the average. If Prescott tower allows, after the training hour, the aircraft would be directly lined up to land into Prescott's runway 21, the dark blue corridor shown on the map. He reiterated that this flight path would mitigate noise and complaints from people who live in Yavapai County Unincorporated.

Merritt asked for clarification of the dark blue corridor on the map and stated it was also wanted to confirm it was used by commercial jets on a daily basis.

Perkins replied yes, it was called the "extended final" for landing at the Prescott Airport and was used daily.

Merritt asked for clarification of the light blue corridor shown on the map, heading north along Granite Creek. He reiterated that the proposed airstrip would be on vacant land, away from occupied ground space.

Perkins explained it was the proposed exit corridor out of Prescott Class D airspace, heading North, which would keep the aircraft from flying directly over Highway 89. He confirmed it was vacant land.

Perkins continued to explain that aviators have to think three-dimensionally so there was also height limits, and when flying near populated areas needed to be at least 1,000 feet above ground level (AGL) or higher, up to 2,000 AGL, to mitigate noise per the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR). He dispelled the notion (heard from public feedback) that aircraft could be booming around at 500 feet.

Merritt asked Mr. Perkins if he would, as the President of Perkins Ranch, agree to turn the water rights back to the Town that were given to his family when they were annexed into the Town.

Perkins responded that he would agree to a partnership with the Town to negotiate what was needed. He wanted to see the Town get back to being a water provider to protect the aquifer. He would not want to give up all the Perkins Ranch water rights.

Merritt clarified he did not intend for Perkins Ranch to give up their water rights as a rancher; it was the water rights that the Town gave the Perkins family when they were annexed into the Town.

Perkins replied that those water rights were tied to their land, they were given to the family in the Pre-Annexation Agreement, but the family could not use them unless Chino Valley was a water provider. Therefore, it would not do the Perkins family nor the Town any good for the family to continue to hold them. The proposed project and everything the family was doing, was to build a partnership with the Town of Chino Valley, to change the paradigm of Chino Valley for a bright future. Chino Valley does not have any industry, does not control their water, everyone takes their water. He felt that by working together, some of those things could be fixed, separate and apart, none of those could be fixed.

Merritt agreed that it was outside entities that have wells inside of Town limits that take out water, basically in the direction of south of Town.

Perkins replied that those big wells pump water out of the aquifer, and his ranch used to drill their wells at less than 100 feet, and now to hit water they must drill to 300 feet. He felt it was not right that the outside entities continue to take the Town's water and would like to work with the Town to make sure that does not happen anymore.

Merritt replied that that was a good goal.

Morabito stated he had a neighbor that flew remote-control planes, they flew probably two or three miles away from the proposed airstrip, and they were convinced that they would be shut down.

Perkins replied absolutely not, that the RC Flyers were not anywhere close to the planes. The proposed airstrip was not even close to where the model airplanes flew.

Merritt asked about the nearby shooting range near the police station, and if it would be impacted by the proposed airstrip.

Perkins responded that the shooting range would not be impacted at all by the proposed airstrip, no danger whatsoever at the altitudes that the airplanes fly, and the turning pattern was well away from where they were shooting.

Ditta asked if the dark blue area shown on the map was the existing corridor.

Perkins replied that Prescott Airport had two runways, and the dark blue on the map represented the corridor for final descent to land on the runway. It was also used by commercial aircraft which would be separated by speed, and with wind conditions could be in the opposite direction.

Ditta asked if the proposed airstrip would add to the congestion of that corridor.

Perkins replied he did not feel it would, that the aircraft currently come out of Prescott and when they're finished with their training at the proposed airfield, then they would have to be spaced to come back into Prescott to land. He did not feel that adding would be the right word, just rerouting to another location until they were ready to return home.

Ditta asked if Mr. Perkins would mind getting rid of the word average in relation to the 40 touch and goes per hour, he would like the word taken out.

Perkins responded that he supported the word average, that he went over the numbers with Chair Merritt and staff and offered to go back over the numbers again.

Merritt stated that it would help and asked Mr. Perkins to go over the numbers again.

Perkins first explained the terms. A "flight" was an aircraft leaving from its originating airport, in this case Prescott Airport, performing its training, returning back to that airfield, shutdown and post-flight debrief. An "operation" was a particular maneuver during a flight; landings and takeoffs were maneuvers. A "touch and go" was two maneuvers. The proposed airfield was designed for 90,000 operations (maneuvers) per year, but they were asking for 80,000 maneuvers per year. A touch and go is two maneuvers, which cuts the number in half to 40,000 per year. If you divide that by 365, that equals 109 plus change, rounded up to 110 per day. 110 per day still sounds like quite a bit until you factor in that four planes can fly in the circuit at the same time. With four planes flying in the circuit for one hour, there would be approximately 40 touch and goes, ten from each plane. So, in three hours, it would put the number over the 110 per day limit. When discussing averages for accountability, all the aircraft are equipped with Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) that report where each airplane had been, how many hours flown, and if the aircraft violated any rules. All the information is in the database, and when the planes come back to Prescott Airport, that information is downloaded into the mainframe and can be queried. Dr. Witcher would delegate responsibility to his Flight Section to coordinate with staff, monthly per the Chair's request, not only to find out if there's anything that could be tweaked to mitigate noise, but also to provide the numbers for accountability. For the first year that will happen every

month, in subsequent years quarterly, but staff could still call in monthly to see if there were any issues, anything that could be fixed that may be wrong. Embry-Riddle is asking for a one-year average of 80,000 operations on a three-year rolling average, so, for example, if in the first year they only were able to perform 70,000 operations, they could make it up in the next year. The average of three years of operations would be a rolling average, meaning it slides to the right on the calendar, and for accountability, would be checked to make sure it followed the CUP for what was allowed. Additionally, in Phases 2, 3, and 4, he would like to bring in potential business owners to visit the site by corporate helicopters or planes, to market the site.

Ditta circled back to the point that if they were down for two days because of weather, the next five days they could make them up, so there would be more planes in the air during that time.

Perkins replied yes, they would need to make up flights, that would be what paid the bills for the infrastructure that would be built. If they were not allowed to make up that time, then the students wouldn't get the training required. He stated that aircraft were the life blood of any airfield, and if the Town authorized an airfield, then aircraft needed to be able to come to that airfield. If you were to authorize a gas station along Route 89 but limited the number of cars that could go to the gas station, it would fail.

Merritt reiterated that if the word average were removed it would not make things successful, and although there may be days where there were more operations, there would also be days when there would be fewer, and if there was bad weather, there would be no aircraft in the air at all. So it would average out over the year to be no more than agreed upon.

Perkins stated that was correct.

Meadors stated she had heard concerns about lead from the exhaust contaminating the soil. She stated that at the Study Session it was mentioned that in four years unleaded fuel would be used instead.

Paslick responded that the FAA had a program called Eagle that is proposed to be implemented by 2030 to get lead out of fuel, and once instituted, Embry-Riddle would abide by FAA's regulations and use that type of fuel. The timeframe may be moved up earlier by the FAA, but the problem was distribution to fuel vendors. He stated that the FAA was looking at many different types of fuel being researched, but it's projected for 2030 to be completed out of lead.

Merritt clarified that all airplanes flying now burn leaded fuel, with the exception of aircraft using jet fuel. He stated that at the study session it became apparent that some rotary wing aircraft can be quite quiet, maybe even quieter than the Cessna 172, and would like to see that any other types of aircraft that may use the proposed airstrip would meet the same flight profile and noise profile as the two planes that were proposed in the CUP.

Perkins replied that all aircraft except those with turbine engines used leaded fuel. He stated that the nice thing about helicopters was they don't have to do the circuit, so if a helicopter flies in with a businessman, they can maneuver away from any built up areas. So, if a businessman came to meet with Town staff and wanted to present a business proposal for a site on the plat in Phase 3 and 4, they could come in and shut down immediately. He introduced Dennis Banks in the audience, a retired CW5 who flew with him in Afghanistan and would be the airfield Manager if the project gets approved. Corporate aircraft are much quieter than military aircraft.

Merritt added that he has seen a corporate helicopter fly right over his house everyday like clockwork from Prescott towards Flagstaff. He stated that there's aircraft flying all over our community on a daily basis, private as well as Embry-Riddle, that are burning leaded aircraft fuel.

Merritt thanked Mr. Perkins for all the information. He called for discussion and deliberation by the Commission.

Morabito asked if the Commission would vote on the Zone Change and CUP at the same time.

Merritt replied they would take two separate votes.

Meadors stated that if the Zone Change passed, it would replace the existing SR-2 zoning. If the Zone Change got approved, they could use their land for anything the AR-36 allowed.

Merritt stated that the vote on the Zone Change would come first, because the CUP could not happen without the Zone Change.

Pasciak clarified that the Zone Change request was for 390 acres, not for entire over 4000 acres, less than 9% of the Perkins' land, of which the balance is zoned SR-2, and would be kept as open vistas from what he understood.

Ditta added that people (the public) have threatened that Mr. Perkins could build 180 homes on that land, and he believed that Mr. Perkins said he did not want to do that.

Merritt asked staff to confirm that all the Perkins Ranch property was currently zoned SR-2.

Dingee replied that it was correct for all the property they owned within the Town limits.

Merritt stated that if the Perkins family wanted to sell his land tomorrow, they could build thousands of homes on that land.

Meadors clarified that she was stating that if the Zone Change was approved, it would restrict the Perkins family to building only one home on the 36 acres.

Perkins replied that he, nor their family, planned on building any houses on their land during his lifetime.

Motion was made by Pasciak, seconded by Morabito, to approve ZC-2025-03, as presented, subject to the staff report, and information provided during the hearing. A roll-call vote was taken and the motion passed with a 5-2 vote, with Ditta and Zamudio voting nay.

Motion was made by Pasciak, seconded by Morabito, to approve CUP-2025-05, as presented, subject to the staff report, and information provided during the hearing, and the conditions of approval in Attachment 1.

Merritt paused before the vote was taken to make a statement. *"I've been on this Commission for a fair amount of time. I've seen all kinds of stuff come before us over the years. Anything of any significant importance always has a group of people that don't want it. It doesn't matter what it is, where it's at, what side of Town it's on. People don't want to have change, which I get that, I'm not a big change person myself. But this is an opportunity for the Town, which has very minimal revenue, most of it collected from Safeway, and the lumberyard, and Chino Rentals in the form of sales tax to support itself. At this point, it's my understanding that the Town is pretty well at the max of their budget. So, if we go to push forward for a cost-of-living increase for the help next year, there may not be money to support that. This Town needs to have an outside source besides what the limited resources are now. And this airfield, if you look at that map right there on the screen, you could not pick a more remote location in the Town limits of the Town of Chino Valley. It's our job as the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Chino Valley to look out for the best interest of the Town and the community. This has an opportunity to do that, and it's not being done by thousands of acres of homes which is how people got to live close to the area that this proposed airport is at. That land was all ranch land and it was sold off because ranchers could not make a viable living and the only asset that they had was their property. So, anybody that's moved out to Coyote Springs or any other part of this Town, including where I live, was a dairy farm or ranch or a farm of some sort. That's all that was here. This has an opportunity to keep thousands of acres of land open so that people can still enjoy their views, of all people, even the people who are complaining that they're so adversely affected. This is a golden opportunity for this Town."*

Zamudio added that he felt Chair's statement was a personal perspective, and he did not agree. He believed in part of it, but felt there was more to it than what was said. He felt that the project was not in the best interest of the Town. Money was not everything to him, but for the Town of Chino Valley, he looks at it as a whole. He's lived here for 32 years. He felt the Chair's statement was his personal opinion. **Zamudio** felt that the Chair was putting people down that didn't want the project because they

had a different perspective. He stated that it was okay, we can be different, but he felt it was not right to criticize other opinions.

Merritt responded that he was not criticizing, he was making a statement and it was his opinion, which Zamudio also did. So, the Commission heard from opposite ends of the spectrum, which he appreciated. He respected what Zamudio said.

A roll-call vote was taken and the motion passed with a 5-2 vote, with Ditta and Zamudio voting nay.

Merritt asked the Commission to explain their vote, if they chose.

Meadors stated no comment.

Zamudio stated he voted based on what he already stated. He felt the Perkins family should do what they wanted to with their land, but felt this project encroached on someone else's land. That's where he draws the line. He stated he could not consciously agree to something where he didn't know where the so-called new business was going to come from. People may have interest, but he couldn't hang his hat on interest. He needed to have a commitment, and since there was no commitment from anybody, he could not approve the project.

Ditta stated he did not believe that the project went with the Town's Vision Statement. He also believed that the Town was the Town, all these people out there seem to have an opinion, and he felt he should listen to it. Money doesn't talk, people talk, and if they all want to not eat, well, so be it. That is who he represented on this Commission for the betterment of the Town, and those people were the Town. So, he voted no, and stated he did like Embry-Riddle, he thinks they are very good, and respects Tom Perkins. He had to vote with his own heart.

Stotz stated he believed that the benefit to the Town would come in the long term and hopefully bring jobs so that our children wouldn't have to leave the Town to go to work.

Morabito stated that he had grandchildren and great-grandchildren that he would love to see come to Chino Valley and hang out with grandpa and have job opportunities that this project could provide. He felt this project would be a great thing for the Town, and a great thing for everyone's kids and grandkids. It would not happen overnight, it's going to happen over a 10-year period, the Town needed to grow, and not just on Highway 89 where there's a lot next to Skilletts for sale. The Commission was responsible for future planning, and this project made perfect sense to him.

Pasciak stated he agreed. As Chair Merritt said, at one time this Town was farmland and everyone living here, right now where they were living, used to be farm. He stated this proposed project had four phases and you had to start with the airfield in Phase 1. The potential businesses that may come in at Phase 3 would need to see something on the ground before they would commit a lot of money and effort. He did a google search on "rural", and rural was in the year 1900, when the first Mr. Perkins got here. In 1900 Yavapai County had 13,800 people, and currently the Town of Chino Valley had more than that. He felt rural was a subjective term. He thought that this project was a minimal amount of acreage that would be developed versus what the Perkins family had in total, less than 9% of what they owned. It would be leased, so if it got to the point where the Perkins family didn't like it, they could not renew the lease.

Morabito added that people should support the bypass project that would provide a way to get people in and out of the Town without Highway 89 and that would help with growth.

Merritt stated that everybody that had been to all of the meetings had experienced a real test of endurance, patience, and civility. And everybody that had participated in all of the meetings had done an exemplary job of acting like grown-ups, American citizens, and just straight up well-behaved people, and he thanked them for maintaining decorum.

Merritt paused the meeting for a break at 7:07 p.m.

Merritt continued the public meeting at 7:21 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING #E.1 – CUP-2025-06 – This is a request by Signs Plus, on behalf of Sheets Investments LLC, for the approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow for construction of a free-standing electronic message center sign for Ace Hardware Store, located at 1395 S State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

Chair Merritt asked if anyone on the Commission had a disclosure to declare regarding this item. There were none.

Jessica Barragan, Senior Planner, showed a slide of the site plan and vicinity, and stated that the request was for a freestanding double-side electronic message center (EMC). The Town's signage Code in the Unified Development Ordinance required a Conditional Use Permit for EMC signs. She explained the current zoning for the parcel was Commercial Heavy, with adjacent properties zoned Commercial Heavy, Commercial Light, and Multi-Family Residential. She shared images of the proposed sign with dimensions and stated the applicant was committed to dark sky efforts. **Barragan** shared that a Neighborhood Meeting was held on January 5, 2026, there were no attendees, and staff received no opposition to the project. She stated that the applicant was in attendance, had nothing further to add, and declined to speak. Staff recommended holding a public hearing and that the Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Town Council.

Merritt asked the Commission if they had any questions for staff. There were none.

Merritt asked the Commission if they had any questions for the applicant. There were none.

Merritt opened the meeting for public comments. There were no comments from the public.

Merritt closed the public portion of the meeting.

Motion was made by Pasciak, seconded by Ditta, to approve CUP-2025-06, as presented, subject to the staff report, and information provided during the hearing, and the conditions of approval in Attachment A. A vote was taken and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

PUBLIC HEARING #E.2 - TA-2025-09 – A request to amend the Town of Chino Valley Unified Development Ordinance, Chapter 154, Chapter 5, Subdivision to allow the administrative approval of subdivision plats.

Chair Merritt asked if anyone on the Commission had a disclosure to declare regarding this item.

Pasciak shared that he had spoken with staff.

Laurie Lineberry, Director, stated that the Text Amendment was a result of the State legislature, who felt towns, cities, and counties were not moving approval for subdivisions fast enough and wanted more housing built quicker. She explained that the State decided to take away the ability for towns, cities, and counties to process subdivisions, preliminary, and final plats through Planning Commission and Town Council for review. It was decided that staff would have the burden. Therefore, the Planning Commission would no longer see any more subdivisions, preliminary or final plats. Staff would continue to follow the set timeline and perform all the processes in order to vet any projects and make sure that they are conditioned properly, and that no outside agencies had any issues. At the end of the process, it would come before the zoning administrator for approval or denial. She stated that if an applicant did not agree with the conditions that the staff had approved, or the decision made, the appeals would come before the Commission and not before Town Council. Staff recommended that the Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Town Council for Text Amendment TA-2025-09 as presented in the staff report.

Merritt asked the Commission if they had any questions for staff.

Merritt asked for clarification that the Town Council would also not get to approve subdivisions.

Lineberry replied that that was correct, and that there was only one appeal body, and that was the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Pasciak stated that in Section of 2.7 in the Town Code, where it amends 5.2.4 B5 - a completion date for the construction of improvements – should “council” be struck out to be replaced with “zoning administrator”, to draw on the assurance described hereafter to complete the improvements.

Lineberry replied that only the Town Council had the ability to pull assurances, and the language was correct. She further explained that the Town Council still had a role if a developer hasn’t completed their improvements, the Town Council had the authority to pull their bonds and cash them in to have the improvements completed.

Pasciak stated it was hard to pull a bond, that a lot of paperwork had to be done, and he had only pulled one in 40 plus years.

Lineberry replied that she only seen it done once in 44 years.

Meadors stated that there used to be a limit to the timeframe for the start of a subdivision change, and the staff report had stated that each phase had to be done in three years.

Lineberry replied that the numbers had not changed, they are currently in the Town’s Subdivision Code, and that the only thing that had been changed was who had authority to review and approve.

Merritt asked that staff make sure the time limits were consistent with what had been done in the past.

Morabito asked if the State had already passed this, was the Commission just going to verify what they did, and if they voted against it, it would not make any difference.

Lineberry replied that the Town Code had to be changed to reflect what had been changed in State Law. She reiterated that it would not matter if the Commission approved the Text Amendment, staff had to follow State Statute.

Merritt opened the meeting for public comments. There were no comments from the public.

Merritt closed the public portion of the meeting.

Motion was made by Pasciak, seconded by Meadors, to approve TA-2025-09, as presented, subject to the staff report, and information provided during the hearing. A vote was taken and the motion passed with a 7-0 vote.

Lineberry introduced the new Alternate Commissioner, Mark Schuerman.

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM THE COMMISSIONERS: **Meadors** asked if staff could draft a Text Amendment to not have Conditional Use Permits for signs come before the Commission.

Lineberry replied that staff could make sure it was written into the new Zoning Code. If a sign met the UDO, it should not have to come before the Commission for approval.

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM THE CHAIR: **Merritt** – none

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM THE PUBLIC: none.

CONSENT CALENDAR – A motion was made by Commissioner **Meadors** to accept the consent agenda, minus the election of Officers. The motion was **seconded** by **Ditta** and passed unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

Lineberry explained that every year the Commission elected the Chair and Vice-Chair, and the elections were held in February because the Commission had two new members.

Merritt turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair **Pasciak**.

ACTION ITEMS: Election of Officers. Vice-Chair **Pasciak** opened up the nominations for the Planning and Zoning Commission Chair position. **Ditta** made a nomination of **Merritt** for Chair, with a second by **Zamudio** and **Stotz**. There were no other nominations for Chair. **Pasciak** asked for a vote and the vote passed with 6-0-1 (**Merritt** abstained) in favor of **Merritt** continuing as Chair. Chair **Merritt** accepted the nomination and stated that he appreciated the Commission's faith in him, that he has been doing it for a while, and tries to do the best job he can. **Merritt** resumed control of the meeting and called for a nomination for the Planning and Zoning Commission Vice-Chair position. **Meadors** made a nomination of **Pasciak** for Vice-Chair, with a second by **Morabito** and **Ditta**. There were no other nominations for Vice-Chair. **Merritt** asked for a vote and the vote passed with 6-0-1 (**Pasciak** abstained) in favor of **Pasciak** continuing as Vice-Chair.

INFORMATION ITEMS – FROM STAFF:

COUNCIL ACTION OF PRIOR P&Z CASES: **Dingee** updated the Commission about prior cases heard by Town Council. On December 9, 2025, CUP-2025-04 – Southwest Contracting contractors' yard, was approved by Town Council; ZC-2025-02 – Old Home Manor rezone from Business Park to Public Land, was approved by Town Council; TA-2025-06 - amending the Town of Chino Valley Unified Development Ordinance to remove the Business Park zoning district in its entirety, was approved by Town Council. On January 27, 2026, FP-2025-01 - Wineglass Lane Estates Final Plat, was approved by Town Council; TA-2025-07 – amending the Town of Chino Valley Unified Development Ordinance to remove the water and sewer connection exemptions for minor and rural subdivisions, was approved by Town Council.

Merritt asked for clarification on any subdivision approval, the subdivision would be required to connect to Town water and sewer. And if Town services were unavailable, it would be up to the developer to bring the services to their project.

Dingee replied that as a general rule yes, but as an alternative, the Town Engineer could approve an on-site package plant. He explained that if a developer wanted to do a 5-acre subdivision in the Town, they would need to connect to Town water and sewer. Staff anticipated that in the future, there may be some discussion with Town Council for clarification of the Ordinance. He further explained that a single-family home built on a single lot was not required to connect to Town water and sewer and could still have a well and septic. He stated that a lot split would require connection to Town water and sewer only if the connection was already there. In that case, a property owner would not be required to extend any connections to their property.

Meadors asked about the apartment complex behind Circle K, that they had a private septic system, and the Commission had approved a new apartment complex across the street from there on an empty lot. She wanted to know if the Commission had put a time limit on the project, and once the timeframe had passed, would the developer then need to connect to Town water and sewer.

Dingee replied that the new Palamino apartment complex project had a time limit, and that after approval by the Town Council, the developer asked Town staff if they could add more units. Staff told the developer no, and they walked away from the project. Once the timeframe had passed, if they wanted to develop the property, they would need to get approvals again and then extend Town water and sewer to the site.

ADJOURN – A motion was made by **Meadors** and seconded by **Pasciak** to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Charles Merritt - Chair

Prepared By: Gerreann Froberg



TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY
Planning Commission Staff Report
April 7, 2026
File Number ZC-2026-02
Rezone


PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a request by Permit Pushers, on behalf of CHM Homes, Inc., for a rezone of two parcels totaling approximately 3.06 acres of land from Commercial Light (CL) to Commercial Heavy (CH) to accommodate the continued use of an existing mobile home retail sales and storage operation. The properties are located at 3280 N State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

LOCATION DATA

	Existing Zoning	Use(s) on-site	General Plan Designation
Site	"CL" – Commercial Light	Mobile Home Sales	LI – Light Industrial
North	"CH" – Commercial Heavy	Drill Tech	LI – Light Industrial
South	"CL" – Commercial Light	Church	LI – Light Industrial
East	"CL" – Commercial Light	Auto Repair	LI – Light Industrial
West	"AR-5" - Agricultural/Residential	Vacant	LI – Light Industrial

LOCATION MAP




Zoning

The Current zoning is CL. Rezoning to CH allows the use by right, eliminating reliance on the expired 1998 CUP (Ordinance No. 349) and bringing the property into full compliance with the Unified Development Ordinance upon lot combination and site improvements. The proposed CH zoning is compatible with surrounding uses and the General Plan's Light Industrial designation.



General Plan

The 2040 General Plan designates the site Light Industrial (LI). The CH district aligns with the intent of the LI land use designation, which allows outdoor sales and storage of large goods for that is already being conducted by this business. The rezoning also supports Economic Development Goal ED-6 (SR 89 Corridor enhancement) through planned site improvements. Staff therefore finds the request consistent with the General Plan.



PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED: None

EXTERNAL AGENCY COMMENTS: See Attachment B

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING COMMENTS: See Attachment C

**PROPOSED CONDITIONS DELIVERED (3/23/26)
TO APPLICANT ON:**

- Applicant agreed with all of the conditions of approval on (3/23/26)
- Applicant did not agree with the following conditions of approval: (list #'s)
- If the Planner is unable to make contact with the applicant – describe the situation and attempts to contact.

ATTACHMENTS:

A	B	C	D	E
Conditions of Approval	External Agency Comments	Neighborhood Meeting Comments	Site Plan & Exhibits	Staff Research

PREPARED BY:

DATE:

JESSICA BARRAGAN – SENIOR PLANNER
JBARRAGAN@CHINOAZ.NET
928-636-9472

3/23/2026

APPROVED BY:

LAURIE LINEBERRY, AICP
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR

ATTACHMENT A
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The following conditions have been found to have a reasonable nexus and are roughly proportionate to the impact of the proposed rezone for the site:

Development Services Comments: Laurie Lineberry, Director, 928-636-3471

1. The Applicant shall comply with all conditions listed below, along with all applicable State, County, and Town codes, rules, fees, and regulations that are applicable to this action.
2. The Applicant shall sign a Waiver of Claims form, which the Town will provide and record with the Yavapai County Recorder's Office, prior to the public hearing and final decision of this item by the Town Council.

Planning: Jessica Barragan, Senior Planner, 928-636-3473

3. The applicant shall agree that the rezone classification to Commercial Heavy (CH) is contingent upon the adequate recordation of the parcel combination/lot line consolidation and any required right-of-way dedication within one year of rezone approval. If evidence of compliance is not provided, the Town Council may revert the zoning per A.R.S. §9-462.01(E).
4. The applicant shall make the necessary site improvements and shall submit landscaping, fencing, lighting, and signage plans for Site Plan review and approval by the Development Services Department.
5. The sales office shall ultimately be site-built (per SR 89 corridor policy). The modular office is approved only as temporary, final building plans must reflect site-built construction.

Public Works/Engineering: Stephen Sullivan, Town Engineer, 928-636-3402

6. UDO §4.22.4(B)(2): New construction and conversion of a residence to a commercial use: subject to the provisions contained in this subsection B., all required parking and loading spaces, maneuvering areas, driveways, and fire lanes shall be paved with asphaltic concrete over an A.B. base, concrete or masonry to a thickness and structure that will support the type and intensity of vehicular traffic generated by the proposed use. As the requirements may vary the paving cross section will require approval by the Town Engineer. The Town Engineer may also approve alternative surfacing such as "chip seal".
7. UDO § 4.22.2(A) For all uses except single-family residential uses, vehicular parking for a standard vehicle shall be in the form of a rectangle not less than ten (10) feet by twenty (20) feet, excluding driveways or aisles, with access to a public thoroughfare. Drive aisles/backup areas shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet. All such spaces shall be connected with a public or private street by an improved driveway not less than twenty (20) feet in length.
8. UDO § 4.22.8 (M) Handicapped Parking Space(s) dimensions: 11' x 20' with a 5' aisle.
9. The Town of Chino Valley Area Drainage Master Plan shows the potential for flooding on the east side of the property.
10. The applicant shall provide grading plans and a drainage report by an Arizona Registered Civil Engineer in accordance with Town code and all other applicable rules and regulations. The project shall detain to historic rates and discharge at the same location. Off-site flows on-site need to be accommodated.

Any questions or comments regarding the Conditions of Approval as stated above should be directed to the staff member who provided the comment. Name and phone numbers are provided.

ATTACHMENT B
EXTERNAL AGENCY COMMENTS

DATE:	3/11/2026	NAME:	RICHARD PEREZ	TITLE:	NORTHWEST DISTRICT PERMITS SUPERVISOR
AGENCY:	ADOT – ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		EMAIL:	NORTHWESTPERMIT@AZDOT.GOV	

1. Please label and show ADOT ROW on the updated Site Plan
2. No advertising of any kind are permitted in the ADOT Right of Way. Signs, banners, sandwich boards etc. are prohibited in the ADOT Right of Way. Advertising within the ADOT Right of Way will be immediately removed by ADOT forces.
3. No Landscaping of any kind is permitted in the ADOT Right of Way.
4. ADOT respectfully request that the Town of Chino Valley Development Services keep ADOT included in all reviews and any other future meetings moving forward with this development.

ATTACHMENT C
NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING COMMENTS

DATE MEETING HELD: MARCH 5, 2026

LOCATION: 3280 N STATE ROUTE 89

ATTENDEES:

- **PROPERTY TENANTS/(OAKWOOD HOMES REPS): JOSEPH ROE (OPERATIONS MANAGER) AND STEPHANIE COOK (SALES PROCESSOR)**
- **TOWN STAFF: JESSICA BARRAGAN (SENIOR PLANNER)**
- **NUMBER NEIGHBORS IN ATTENDANCE – 0 ATTENDEES –**

SUMMARY OF MEETING OUTCOMES AND ATTENDEE(S)' COMMENTS RELATED TO THE PROJECT:

This neighborhood meeting was held on-site March 5, 2026, 1:00 p.m. No members of the public attended. Staff met with Mr. Roe and Ms. Cook on site. They shared the newly proposed site-built sales office design concept. No phone calls or correspondence regarding the request were received.

ATTACHMENT D SITE PLAN AND EXHIBITS

CONCEPT SITE PLAN :



Oakwood Homes of Chino Valley
 306-04-028
 ZONING: CH
 USES: DRILLING/PUMP CO.



Oakwood Homes #1046
 Chino Valley, Arizona
 APN: 306-04-002K & 030A
 Chino Valley Zoning: CL
 Parcel Area: 3.06 Acres
 FEMA Flood Zone: N/A

Ownership:
 CMH Homes, Inc.
 5000 Clayton Rd
 Maryville, TN 37804-5550



1" = 40' @ 10x24

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
 NEW SALES OFFICE AND SITE UPGRADES

**PERMIT
PUSHERS**

Drawing is for Permit Purposes Only
 and is not a Contract or Agreement

This drawing is for permit purposes only and is not a contract or agreement. It is subject to change without notice. The user of this drawing is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the appropriate authorities. The user of this drawing is also responsible for obtaining all necessary approvals from the appropriate authorities. The user of this drawing is also responsible for obtaining all necessary approvals from the appropriate authorities.

ATTACHMENT D
SITE PLAN AND EXHIBITS

CONCEPT ELEVATION RENDERING (FUTURE SITE BUILT SALES OFFICE DESIGN):



ATTACHMENT D
SITE PLAN AND EXHIBITS

Copy of Ordinance 349, expired (for reference only):

ORDINANCE NO. 349

AN ORDINANCE OF THE MAYOR AND COMMON COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY, COUNTY OF YAVAPAI, ARIZONA, REGARDING THE GRANTING OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR APN 306-04-002K AND 306-04-030A TO PERMIT THE STORAGE AND SALES OF MOBILE HOMES IN THE C-1 (COMMERCIAL) DISTRICT AS PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 508.C.7 IN THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY ZONING CODE.

WHEREAS, all requirements for notice and public hearing before the Planning & Zoning Commission have been met; and

WHEREAS, the Planning & Zoning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of this Conditional Use Permit on December 18, 1997;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND COMMON COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY, COUNTY OF YAVAPAI, ARIZONA:

SECTION 1: A Conditional Use permit is hereby granted to Assessor's Parcel No. 306-04-002K and 306-04-030A to permit the storage and sales of mobile homes in the C-1 (Commercial) District with the following conditions:

1. Units on the site not to exceed 25.
2. Any used units taken in on trade may be stored on the lot for a maximum of 90 days and shall be included in the total number of units allowed on the site.
3. Applicant to comply with all building, zoning and fire codes applicable to this use.
4. Applicant shall meet all requirements of ADOT pertaining to Highway 89 access.
5. Lot surfacing shall be of dust free material as per Section 404.3.C of the Town of Chino Valley Zoning Code.
6. Applicant shall initiate renewal in five (5) years.

Section 2: That if any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this ordinance of any part of the code adopted herein by reference is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions thereof.

Ordinance #349
Page 2


PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Mayor and Common Council of the Town of Chino Valley, Arizona, this 13th day of January, 1998.


Kate Nelson, Mayor

ATTEST:


Delores Sliger, Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


William E. Farrell, Town Attorney

**ATTACHMENT E
STAFF RESEARCH**



STAFF RESEARCH –ZC-2026-02
Oakwood Homes Rezone

CASE #: ZC-2026-02
CASE PLANNER: JESSICA BARRAGAN

PROJECT NARRATIVE: This is a request by Permit Pushers, on behalf of CHM Homes, Inc., for a rezone of two parcels totaling approximately 3.06 acres of land from Commercial Light (CL) to Commercial Heavy (CH) to accommodate the continued use of an existing mobile home retail sales and storage operation. The properties are located at 3280 N State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

I. PROJECT DATA

Project Location:	3280 N State Route 89			
Parcel Number(s):	306-04-030A & 306-04-002K			
Parcel Size(s):	133,293 sf			
Total Acreage:	3.06			
Proposed Dwelling Units:	0			
Address:	3280 N State Route 89			
Applicant:	CMH Homes, Inc.			
Applicant's Agent:	Shannon Metzger w/Permit Pushers			
Conforms to G.P. Land Use Conformity Matrix:	Yes		No	X Rezoning for conformity
Zoning Overlay	PAD	N/A		
Within ½ Mile of SR89?	Yes	X	No	If yes, Property is restricted – site-built only

	Existing Zoning	Use(s) on-site	General Plan Designation
Site	"CL" – Commercial Light	Mobile Home Sales	LI – Light Industrial
North	"CH" – Commercial Heavy	Drill Tech	LI – Light Industrial
South	"CL" – Commercial Light	Church	LI – Light Industrial
East	"CL" – Commercial Light	Auto Repair	LI – Light Industrial
West	"AR-5" - Agricultural/Residential	Vacant	LI – Light Industrial

Prior Cases or Related Actions:	PA-2025-31, Ord 349			
Type				Cases, Actions or Agreements
Pre-Annexation Agreement	Yes	No	x	
Annexation	Yes	x No		Original Town 9/21/1970
General Plan Amendment	Yes	No	x	
Development Agreement	Yes	No	x	
Rezone	Yes	x No		ZC-2026-01 (Current Request)
Subdivision	Yes	No	x	
Conditional Use Permit	Yes	x No		Ordinance 349 (CUP Expired 2003)
Pre-Application Meeting	Yes	x No		PA-2023-31,
Enforcement Actions	Yes	No	x	

**ATTACHMENT E
STAFF RESEARCH**

Land Division Status:	Yes	No	x
Irrigation District:	None		

II. TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY GENERAL PLAN

Land Use Element:					
Land Use Designation:	LI – Light Industrial				
Is Project larger than 25 AC or 50 d.u.?	L.U. Policy 2.1	n/a	PRN Policy 2.8	n/a	
Issues:	None				
Circulation Element:					
Road Classification	State Highway	Existing Row	Y	Required Row	N
Issues:	None				
Parks, Recreation, and Natural Resources Element:					
Closest Park:	Community Center Park				
Within 1 mile of the Peavine Trail?	No				
Flooding?	FEMA Flood Plain Designation	No	Town Flood Map	No	
Issues:	None				
Community Services and Facilities Element:					
Water Source:	Town	Well	x	Prescott	Private System:
Sewer:	Town	Septic	x		
Issues:	None				
Economic Development Element:					
SR-89 Corridor?	Yes	Enhancement: Goal ED-6	Yes - ED-6.2		
Old Home Manor?	No	Goal ED-2	n/a		
Issues:	None				

NOTIFICATION

- **Legal Ad Published:** (3/10/2026)
- **(500') Vicinity Mailing:** (02/17/2026)
- **Reviewing Agencies Noticed:** (02/18/2026)
- **Neighborhood Meeting:** (3/5/2026)
- **Hearing Dates:** (P&Z 04/07/2026 - TC 04/28/2026)
- **Comments Due:** (3/9/2026)

<i>External List (Comments)</i>	Response Received	Date Received	"No Comment"	Written Comments	Comments Attached
Colleen Boge – APS	x	3/12/26	x		
Richard Perez - A.D.O.T.	x	3/11/26		x	x
Ralph Baker – C.V.I.D.	x	3/10/26	x		
Kevin O’Neil - CAFMA	x	3/12/26	x		
Suzanne Ehrlich – YC ENV					
Monica Kriner – YC Health					
SparkLight Cable					
LUMEN (Previously Centurylink)					

**ATTACHMENT E
STAFF RESEARCH**

<i>External List (Comments)</i>	Response Received	Date Received	"No Comment"	Written Comments	Comments Attached
Unisource Gas	x	3/16/26	x		
CVUSD					
United States Postal Service					
Mark Holmes – Water Advisor	x	3/16/26	x		
<i>Town of Chino Valley Internal List (Conditions)</i>	Response Received	Date Received	"No Conditions"	Written Conditions	Comments Attached
Jessica Barragan – Senior Planner – Development Services	x	3/16/26		x	x
Will Dingee – Assistant Director – Development Services					
Laurie Lineberry – Director – Development Services	x	3/16/26		x	x
–Director – Public Works					
Steve Sullivan – Town Engineer – Public Works	x	3/18/26		x	x
Dan Trout – Chief Building Official – Development Services					
Glenn Dalley – Code Enforcement – Development Services					
Joshua McIntire– Chief of Police -Police	x	3/12/26	x		