

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**Wednesday, March 23, 2016**

**6:00 p.m.**

**Council Chambers**

**8000 South Redwood Road**

**West Jordan, Utah 84088**

---

**COUNCIL:** Mayor Kim V. Rolfe, and Council Members Dirk Burton, Jeff Haaga, Zach Jacob, Chris M. McConnehey, Chad Nichols, and Sophie Rice.

**STAFF:** Mark Palesh, City Manager; David Brickey, City Attorney; Melanie Briggs, City Clerk; David Oka, Economic and Community Development Director; Brian Clegg, Parks Director; Dave Zobell, City Treasurer; Dave Murphy, Engineering Manager for Capital Improvement Projects; Marc McElreath, Fire Chief; Kyle Shepard, Deputy Police Chief; Scott Langford, City Planner; and Nannette Larsen, Associate Planner.

***I. CALL TO ORDER***

Mayor Rolfe called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

***II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE***

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Isaac Burton of Troop 265.

***III. PRESENTATIONS***

**BADGE PINNING AND OATH OF OFFICE FOR FIRE FIGHTER BEN  
LYNCH**

Chief Marc McElreath read a brief biography on Firefighter Ben Lynch. His badge was pinned by his wife Brittany and the Oath of Office was administered by City Clerk Melanie Briggs.

**PRESENTATION FROM SUPERINTENDENT PATRICE JOHNSON OF  
JORDAN SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Dr. Patrice Johnson of the Jordan School District presented Deputy Chief Reed Scharman with a certificate of appreciation, explaining that he was a “tremendous resource to the Jordan School District.”

***IV. COMMUNICATIONS***

**CITY MANAGER COMMENTS/REPORTS**

Mark Palesh –

- Due to a recent legislative change, it was possible there would need to be a special RDA meeting in order to create a new Community Development Area.

Mayor Rolfe responded that the meeting would need to take place prior to April 1 and that at least four members of the Council would need to be present. It was decided that the meeting would take place at 5:00 p.m. the following Thursday, March 31, 2016.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS/REPORTS**

David Brickey-

- For the second time in as many weeks, the City Prosecutor earned a conviction in a jury trial. Mr. Brickey expressed his appreciation for Officer Vargas in the Police Department.

Brian Clegg-

- Bret Su'a had left employment with the City. His position would soon be advertised by Human Resources.

David Murphy-

- The City had obtained funding for two projects—For FY17-18, a new pedestrian bridge over Jordan River north of the existing bridge at 7800 South; and for FY21-22, \$2.4 million for 7800 South Mountain View Corridor to U-111.

#### **CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/REPORTS**

Councilmember Rice–

- Expressed appreciation to the public for attending the Caucus meetings the previous evening.

Councilmember Nichols–

- Reminded everyone to keep water conservation in mind throughout the year.

Councilmember Haaga-

- Expressed appreciation to the Fire Department for bringing the City's new ambulance to the meeting for all to see.

Councilmember Burton-

- Will be rescheduling the next Town Hall from April 13, 2016 to a date yet to be determined.
- Requested that the first business item on the agenda be addressed immediately following the citizen comments. The Council agreed.

#### **V. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Elaine Crane, West Jordan resident, invited the Council to attend a naming ceremony for the archway at the Wight's Fort Cemetery on May 21, 2016.

James Crane, West Jordan resident, invited the Council and audience to attend a ceremony at Wight's Fort Cemetery on April 16 at 10:00 a.m. A commemorative plaque would be replaced at that time.

There was no one else who wished to speak.

**BUSINESS ITEM 8\*\*\***

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING  
SUPPORT/SPONSORSHIP FOR JOYFUL WELCOME**

Councilmember Burton turned the time over to Kathy Edwards and Rachel Lewis who explained that Joyful Welcome was a nonprofit organization that worked to ensure that babies and mothers born in our community began their new life with something new, warm and filled with love by providing mothers in need with essential items, education and resources. Starting in 2015, Joyful Welcome held their first "Hocus Pocus 5k and Stroller Roll" to raise awareness and funds. The next event was planned for October 22, 2016. The organization was requesting support from the City for the event in the form of waiving approximately \$1460.00 in fees.

Staff had no recommended action. If the direction of the Council was to provide support which would require a public hearing, the recommendation would be to instruct staff to agendize the required public hearing.

Councilmember Burton indicated his desire to support this group and requested that a Public Hearing be scheduled for the next regularly scheduled City Council meeting.

Councilmember Haaga requested clarification as to why a Public Hearing was necessary.

David Brickey explained that a Public Hearing and public vote were required in this instance, including a minimum of ten days' notice.

Councilmember Haaga spoke in support of Joyful Welcome and the work they were involved in. He asked that the Council move on this as quickly as possible.

Councilmember McConnehey disclosed that his wife was on the board of Joyful Welcome although he did not feel there was a conflict of interest since she received no compensation. He wondered if the Healthy West Jordan Committee could partner with Joyful Welcome since they were no longer planning to hold their own 5K. If that were to take place, a Public Hearing would be unnecessary. However, his preference was to schedule the Public Hearing just in case and then see whether or not there could be a partnership with Healthy West Jordan.

It was determined that a Public Hearing on this item would be scheduled for the April 13, 2016 City Council meeting.

**VI. CONSENT ITEMS**

- a. Approve the minutes of February 24, 2016 and March 9, 2016 as presented**
- b. Approve Resolution 16-37, authorizing the Mayor to execute a Change Order with River Restoration for Big Bend Habitat Restoration project in an amount not to exceed \$36,774**
- c. Approve Resolution 16-38, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Salt Lake County for access road and parking facilities design at the Big Bend Habitat area, in an amount not to exceed \$59,000.00**
- d. Approve Resolution 16-39, declaring items from various City Departments that are no longer of any value or use as surplus property, and authorize the disposition**
- e. Approve Resolution 16-40, approving the corrected effective date for the Uniform Schedule of Fees and Service Charges for FY 2016**
- f. Approve Resolution 16-41, authorizing the Mayor to execute the Cooperative Agreement between the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and West Jordan City for new sidewalk construction on SR-209 from Prosperity Road to 6400 West, in an amount not to exceed \$32,000.00**
- g. Approve Resolution 16-42, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with Advanced Paving & Construction, LLC for the 7800 South Overlay Project, for an amount not to exceed \$568,720.00**
- h. Approve Resolution 16-43, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with Planned & Engineered Construction, Inc. for the 2015 West Jordan Sewer Rehabilitation Project, for an amount not to exceed \$125,000.00 00**
- i. Approve Resolution 16-44, authorizing the Mayor to execute an Agreement with Canyon Pipeline Construction for Milling and Sweeper services in an amount not-to-exceed \$69,160.00**
- j. Approve Resolution 16-45, authorizing the Mayor to execute contract with Western Paving, Inc. for the 2016 West Jordan Manhole Raising Project at various locations in West Jordan City, for an amount not to exceed \$150,552.00**
- k. Approve Resolution 16-46, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with Hydro Resources – Rocky Mountain, Inc. for the completion and**

**testing of Veteran’s Park Irrigation Well, for an amount not to exceed \$390,400.00**

- I. Approve Resolution 16-47, authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with England Construction for the Irrigation Modifications at 3100 West 7000 South project, for an amount not to exceed \$14,825.00**

**MOTION: Councilmember Nichols moved to approve Consent Items 6.a through 6.l. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnehey.**

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Haaga</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Nichols</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Rice</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Mayor Rolfe</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion passed 7-0.**

#### ***VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS***

**RECIEVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL ORDINANCE 16-14, REGARDING A REZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 4.2 ACRES FROM RR-.5C (RURAL RESIDENTIAL HALF-ACRE LOTS) AND R-1-10C (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTATIL 10,000 SQUARE FOOT LOTS ‘C’ HOME SIZE) ZONE TO R-1-10E (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL 10,000 SQUARE FOOT LOTS ‘E’ HOME SIZE) ZONE FOR LARSEN MEADOWS LOCATED AT 7953 SOUTH 2700 WEST, VP HOMES/TY VRANES, APPLICANT**

David Oka turned the time over to Nannette Larsen who explained that the subject property was presently vacant and was located at 7953 South 2700 West. The parcel which had been proposed to be amended contained 4.2 acres of property.

The property was setback from 2700 West. It was located to the immediate west of the Meadow Point and Garden Valley Subdivisions. South of the subject site the property was also vacant, while to the north were the Jordan River Apartments (multi-family residential).

A concept plan for the new development was attached to the report as “Exhibit C”. This concept plan showed single-family lots with at least 10,000 square feet of area. Access to the site would be provided on the east, west, and south. This would provide sufficient access to the site as well as provide connectivity to the adjacent established neighborhood

to the east. This concept plan, however, was not under review at this time. It might change when a full review by Staff was conducted once a Major Subdivision application was submitted.

The subject property's surrounding zoning and land uses are as follows:

	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	<b>Zoning</b>
<b>North</b>	Multi-Family	R-3-20
<b>South</b>	Single-Family	RR-.5C
<b>East</b>	Single-Family	R-1-10C
<b>West</b>	Single-Family/School	R-1-10A/ P-F

## II. FINDINGS OF FACT

### Section 13-7D-7(A): Amendments to the Zoning Map

Prior to making a positive recommendation to the City Council for an amendment to the Zoning Map, the Planning Commission shall make the following findings:

**Criteria 1:** *The proposed amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.*

**Discussion:** The subject property is located within the Medium Density Residential designation in the Future Land Use Map. The proposed rezone from R-1-10E is supported by the 2012 Comprehensive General Plan. The Medium Density Residential designation supports the rezone which allows for greater density in this neighborhood. The General Plan allows for, "Development providing for moderate intensity single-family add attached/detached units as well as twin and town homes", and areas, "that should be designated as medium density residential uses should be preferred for infill development that are well buffered from commercial and industrial uses".

Medium Density Residential supports development with 3.1 to 5.5 dwelling units per acre. An R-1-10 zone typically has a density of 4.3 dwelling units per acre, this density is well within the maximum standards of the existing Land Use designation.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.

**Criteria 2:** *The proposed amendment will result in compatible land use relationships and does not adversely affect adjacent properties.*

**Discussion:** The northern portion of the rezone is already zoned R-1-10; the application is petitioning to amend the Zoning Map by changing the minimum allowed house square footage from C housing size to E. As it is shown below, the E subzone has a greater

minimum house size for all house types.

Subzone	Dwelling Type	Minimum Living Space (In Sq. Ft.)	Zone to which the subzone applies
C	1 level dwelling (rambler or split entry)	2,400	R-1-8
	Split level dwelling	2,100	
	Multi-story dwelling (2 or more)	2,400	
E	1 level dwelling (rambler or split entry)	3,000	R-1-10
	Split level dwelling	2,400	
	Multi-story dwelling (2 or more)	3,000	

Further south is the rezone from RR-.5C to R-1-10E. Similar to the rezone request on the northern piece, the amendment includes a minimum house size, larger than its current standard.

Rezoning the property from its principal zone to R-1-10 is also compatible to the community. As it was stated before, properties to the north, east and further to the south are zoned R-1-10 which are comprised of single-family residential, 10,000 square foot lots or greater. The proposed development type is consistent with the developments of the surrounding neighborhoods. "Exhibit B" of this staff report shows the surrounding land uses of the neighboring properties.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment will result in compatible land use relationships and does not adversely affect adjacent properties.

**Criteria 3:** *The proposed amendment furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the city.*

**Discussion:** A section of the proposed rezone will only affect the allowed maximum density in the area. The requested rezone is similar to the adjacent subdivision's density in the vicinity of the subject property. Furthermore, a portion of the rezone will not change allowed the density of the property but will only affect the minimum allowed home sizes in the new development.

The proposed rezone will advance the general health, safety and welfare of the residents in the City by improving the degree of connectivity between new and existing neighborhoods, in addition to facilitating further development within West Jordan City to its best land use, and by increasing the amount of housing stock in the community.

At the time of subdivision review, which is a required review prior to any construction of the site, the plat will need to meet the requirements found in Title 13 and Title 14 of the 2009 City Code, which is the Zoning and Subdivision Titles respectively.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment furthers the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City.

**Criteria 4:** *The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.*

**Discussion:** The Engineering Department has reviewed the proposal to rezone the property and has determined the public facilities are adequate to service the proposed rezone. At the time of subdivision submittal further review will ensure engineering standards are met.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment will not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.

**Criteria 5:** *The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.*

**Discussion:** This subject site is not located within any overlay or accompanying Zoning District which has not already been discussed in this staff report.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.

The proposed Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the Larsen Meadows property to the R-1-10E zoning district is warranted and is not contrary to any current goals and policies in the General Plan or conflicting with Title 13 (Zoning Code) of the 2009 City Code.

There was no anticipated fiscal impact.

Based on the analysis and findings contained in the Staff Report, Staff recommended that the City Council rezone the property located at 7953 South 2700 West from R-1-10C (Single-Family Residential "C" sized homes) and RR-.5C (Rural Residential .5 acre lots with "C" sized homes) to R-1-10E (Single-Family Residential "E" sized homes).

Councilmember Haaga inquired why more of the area was not being rezoned.

Nannette Larsen explained that this particular rezone request came from an applicant—that it was not city-initiated. Therefore, the possible rezone pertained only to the property specified by the applicant.

Councilmember Nichols inquired about the status of a property deed that had been discussed by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Larsen explained that an updated deed had been provided by the applicant.

Mayor Rolfe opened the public hearing.

Alexandra Eframo, West Jordan resident, expressed concern regarding accessibility of emergency vehicles. She spoke in opposition to the rezone.

An unidentified woman spoke about an unknown topic unrelated to the subject currently up for discussion.

Robert Ealier, West Jordan resident, wondered if constructing the roads would spur future development and possibly alleviate concerns of some citizens in the area.

Ty Vranes of VP Homes, applicant, explained that the zone change was more than consistent with the requirements of the general plan.

There was no one else who wished to speak. Mayor Rolfe closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Burton asked a clarifying question pertaining to access.

**MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Ordinance 16-14, rezoning the property located at 7953 South 2700 West from R-1-10C (Single-Family Residential “C” sized homes) and RR-.5C (Rural Residential .5 acre lots with “C” sized homes) to R-1-10E (Single-Family Residential “E” sized homes). The motion was seconded by Councilmember Haaga.**

Councilmember Nichols wished to point out that he was confident that City fire personnel would ensure that the area complied with all requirements associated with access by emergency vehicles and that this item was before the Council only to consider the rezone. He spoke in favor of the motion.

Councilmember McConnehey was cautiously in favor of the motion, believing that the proposed zoning matched that of the property to the east. However, he made it clear that he was not in favor of the current preliminary plan and that he hoped that the stub-streets would be eliminated before the time came to approve the preliminary plan.

Mayor Rolfe made it clear that at this point, the Council was only addressing the rezone—not the overall concept or plan.

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Haaga</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Nichols</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Rice</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Mayor Rolfe</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion passed 7-0.**

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL  
ORDINANCE 16-15, AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL  
CODE, SECTION 13-8-23, ANNUAL CAP ON MULTI-FAMILY  
DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS; CITY-WIDE APPLICABILITY; CITY  
OF WEST JORDAN, APPLICANT**

David Oka turned the time over to City Planner Scott Langford. He explained that the Annual Cap on Multi-Family Development of the 2009 City Code, was what was referred to as the city’s “cap and grade” ordinance that set the maximum number of available multi-family residential units that could be developed in any given year throughout the City, in order to bring the ratio of single-family and multi-family dwellings more in line with the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan.

The cap and grade ordinance had been in place, in one form or another, since May 2014. The following was a summary of all the Planning Commission and City Council actions to date:

1. April 30, 2014 - Following discussion among the City Council and the Planning Commission at a joint meeting, City Staff was directed to notice and submit a proposal for a moratorium on multi-family development in the City pending further study of (a) ways to control that type of development and (b) ways to incentivize high quality single family residential development.
2. May 14, 2014 - the City Council adopted Ordinance 14-17, enacting a 6 month ‘Declaration of a Development Moratorium on Multi-Family Housing Projects’ as allowed by Utah State Code 10-9a-504.
3. October 7, 2014 – Planning Commission consideration of a proposed cap and grade ordinance.

4. October 22, 2014 - the City Council adopted Ord. 14-31, adopting the proposed cap and grade ordinance but adjusted the percentage goal. Exemptions in 13-8-23B included:

- a. Multi-family housing (2 or more housing units) in a Transit Station Overlay District (TSOD)
- b. Senior housing for age 55 and older.
- c. Owner occupied townhomes with an attached 2-car garage where all housing units shall be occupied by the building owners. This ownership arrangement must be recorded as part of the City-approved CC&R's.
- d. Owner occupied twin homes where at least one of the housing units shall be occupied by one or more of the building owners. This ownership arrangement must be recorded as part of the City-approved CC&R's.
- e. Multi-family housing for disabled persons
- f. Low and moderate income housing owned by non-profit or a local Housing Authority.

5. November 5, 2014 - the City Council revised section 13-8-23B removing all exemptions but exemption a. Multi-family housing (2 or more housing units) in a Transit Station Overlay District (TSOD) (Ord. 14-34).

6. January 28, 2015 – the City Council placed a new moratorium on multi-family development to allow time to “re-examine the 2009 City Code provisions applicable to multi-family housing development projects with the intent of bringing such provisions and regulations into better consonance with the General Plan and encouraging better types of multi-family housing options” (Ord. 15-05).

7. March 28, 2015 – Planning Commission and City Council took a field trip to look at examples of owner occupied multi-family housing developments.

8. May 19, 2015 – Planning Commission recommended approval and made some minor changes to the staff recommended text including: a minimum size of a town home and twin home from 400 to 450 square feet, and changing the density from 7.5 to 8.0 du./ac, Exemptions in 13-8-23B included:

- a. Multi-family housing (2 or more housing units) in a Transit Station Overlay District (TSOD)
- b. Senior housing for age 55 and older.
- c. Residential developments in compliance with the General Plan with density lower than 8.0 du/ac that is owner occupied town homes, cluster (patio) homes or twin homes all with a minimum home size of 1,500 sq. ft., preferably on the main floor, and with an attached 2-car garage (minimum 450 sq. ft.) where all housing units shall be occupied by owners and recorded as part of City-approved CC&Rs.
- e. Multi-family housing for disabled persons

- f. Low and moderate income housing owned by non-profit or a local Housing Authority.
9. June 24, 2015 – City Council adopted Ordinance 15-15, which included the following Exemptions to (13-8-23):
- a. Multi-family housing (2 or more housing units) in a Transit Station Overlay District (TSOD).
  - b. Senior housing for age 55 and older.
  - c. Multi-family housing for disabled persons.
  - d. Low and moderate income housing owned by a non-profit or a local Housing Authority.

Owner occupied town homes and twin homes were excluded from the exemptions section.

10. February 16, 2016 – Planning Commission recommended approval of a text amendment that corrected a portion of the code that should have been removed during the June 24, 2015 amendment and also recommended the addition of an exemption for multi-family units in master planned communities (as presented in this report).

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION & ANALYSIS**

With the benefit of nearly two years observing the pros and cons of this ordinance, staff proposed a slight modification to the existing exemptions of this ordinance. The purpose of these proposed amendments were to provide enhanced incentive for developers to master plan larger areas into high quality developments that provided a balanced variety of housing and amenity options. This in turn would hopefully allow the City to avoid some of the potential negative repercussions of receiving a large influx of homogenous low quality housing stock.

Staff proposed that the following two portions of this ordinance be amended as follows:

#### *Proposed Amendment #1*

The 2009 City Code, Section 13-8-23 A currently read as follows:

- A. *Purpose: The comprehensive general plan supports a housing ratio of eighty three percent (83%) single-family residential to seventeen percent (17%) multi-family residential ("the general plan ratio"). Notwithstanding the general plan, the city establishes a ratio of seventy seven percent (77%) single-family residential to twenty three percent (23%) multi-family residential for the purpose of this section.*

*The city of West Jordan has adopted a cap and grade procedure specific to non-owner occupied multi-family residential development to ensure the orderly growth of the city and foster a housing mix that is consistent with the general plan.*

Staff had noticed an inconsistency in this section of the current ordinance that needed correction. Due to the multiple iterations of this ordinance since its original adoption, the statement that the cap and grade ordinance was “*specific to non-owner occupied multi-family residential development*” was not correct.

The current cap and grade ordinance regulations did not draw a distinction between owner occupied or for-rent product type; therefore, the following amendment to Section 13-8-23 A of the 2009 City Code was proposed:

- A. *Purpose: The comprehensive general plan supports a housing ratio of eighty-three percent (83%) single-family residential to seventeen percent (17%) multi-family residential ("the general plan ratio"). Notwithstanding the general plan, the city establishes a ratio of seventy-seven percent (77%) single-family residential to twenty three percent (23%) multi-family residential for the purpose of this section.*

*The city of West Jordan has adopted a cap and grade procedure ~~specific to nonowner occupied multi-family residential development~~ to ensure the orderly growth of the city and foster a housing mix that is consistent with the general plan.*

Proposed Amendment #2

On January 22, 2016, during the annual City Council retreat, staff presented information to the City Council regarding the current breakdown of the City’s housing types, available vacant land for continued residential development, and how this applied to the current requirements of the cap and grade ordinance.

The following table represented a summary of some of the information presented:

Table #1- Residential Development (A map depicting this info. is attached to this report)

Housing Type	# of Units	% of Total Units	Acres	Units / Acre
Single-family	25,233	75.9	7,849	3.21
Multi-family	8,008	24.1	603	13.28
+ Vested Multi-family	3,038	8	199	15.26
Adjusted Single-family	25,233	70	7,849	3.21
Adjusted Multi-family	11,046	30	802	13.77
<i>Total</i>	<i>36,279</i>	<i>100</i>		

The following table had information regarding nearby cities as a simple comparison:

City Name	Single-Family Detached Ratio	Multi-Family Ratio	Single-Family Detached Units	Multi-Family Units
Draper	71.5%	28.5%	Unknown	Unknown

Herriman	82.9%	17.1%	8,078	1,669
South Jordan	71.2%	28.8%	14,631	2,937
<b>Averages</b>	<b>75.2%</b>	<b>24.8%</b>		

There was approximately 2,900 acres of vacant land remaining that had been designated by the General Plan for residential development (Very Low Density to High Density).

After presenting information on the City’s current housing makeup at the City Council retreat, the discussion shifted to projected growth and what the City’s housing stock should look like at buildout.

The cap and grade ordinance did a good job at establishing a clear direction as to the target balance between single-family detached homes (77%) versus multi-family attached homes (23%). Staff continued to support this clear direction as the buildout of the City continued.

Staff also supported the current exceptions to the established ratios; noting that it was imperative to defend not only protected classes, but also the need to support certain demographic needs (senior housing) as well as leveraging substantial regional investment in infrastructure (light rail).

The “grade” portion of the cap and grade ordinance provided criteria against which multi-family developments were graded against. The purpose of these criteria was to ensure that if multi-family developments were approved, they were of a higher quality.


With the benefit of nearly two years observing the pros and cons of this ordinance, staff was beginning to see a potentially significant negative impact of the cap and grade ordinance.

The majority of available land left to be developed as single-family homes was configured in large parcels on the west side of the City. Overall, this was a good thing when considering land planning because this configuration lent itself to large master planned communities, instead of small fragmented subdivisions.


The challenge that staff continued to see from potential developers on these larger tracts of land, was that since they could not get the unit counts up to a certain level with a balance of multi-family and single-family, they were bringing in development proposals with high levels of small lot single-family homes.

Not all small lot single-family neighborhoods were the same. If the homes in these neighborhoods were built with high quality materials and if there were high quality amenities, these developments could retain their value and be a strong component within the fabric of the community. However, these “if” questions loomed large, and could be adequately addressed or regulated through the use of standard zoning.

To illustrate this point, the following examples were provided at the January City Council Retreat. These two subdivisions (example A & B) were chosen because they were built at roughly the same time, both had approximately the same size lot and house square footage, both were alley loaded, and both were located in what many perceived as desirable cities to live.



Example A



Example B

The “Example A” development was built as a standard subdivision without architectural standards or significant open space with upgraded amenities. On the other hand, the “Example B” development was built as part of a large master planned community with strict architectural standards and enhanced open space with substantial amenities.

The difference between the two subdivisions was stark. A quick review of the homes for sale in these two communities revealed that home prices in neighborhood “B” were roughly 70 to 100 thousand more than the homes listed in neighborhood “A”.

The only avenue the City currently had in its zoning tool belt that could be used to legally require high grade architecture and upgraded amenity packages was the PC (Planned Community) zone and the PRD (Planned Residential Development) zone.

Therefore, in order to avoid the potential of a proliferation of low grade homogenous housing stock, staff proposed that the use of the PC and PRD zones be incentivized. The incentive would come in the form of the following amendment to the cap and grade ordinance:

**13-8-23: ANNUAL CAP ON MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS:**

B. Exemptions: The following types of two-family and multi-family housing were not subject to the annual cap or to the timing requirements of this section (The full legislative draft was attached as Exhibit B):

1. Residential housing developments in compliance with the general plan that are:
  - a. Multi-family housing (2 or more housing units) in a transit station overlay district (TSOD).
  - b. Senior housing for age fifty-five (55) and older.
  - c. Multi-family housing for disabled persons.
  - d. Low and moderate income housing owned by a nonprofit or a local housing authority.
  - e. Multi-family housing as part of a master planned community that meet the following provisions:
    - i. Master Plan shall be a minimum of 75 acres and be zoned PC or PRD.
    - ii. Two-family and multi-family housing not exempt by the provisions listed in parts “a thru d” above, shall comprise no greater than 17% of the total number of dwelling units in the approved master development plan.
    - iii. Two-family and multi-family housing units not exempt by the provisions listed in parts “a thru d” above, shall be individually owned as either condominiums or townhomes.

*Explanation of the Proposed Amendment #2:*

The proposed requirement of having a minimum 75 acres was chosen by looking at the remaining large tracts of land located on the west side of the city and also reviewing the average size of property needed to develop a “community” as opposed to just a large subdivision.

The proposed requirement listed in “E ii.” that did not allow more than 17% of non-exempt multi-family housing within an approved master plan, came directly from the ratio established in the City’s adopted General Plan.

In an effort to promote long-term investment into the community, staff had also included a requirement that non-exempt multi-family houses be individually owned as either condominiums or townhomes. Staff believed that owner occupancy added a level of

neighborhood stability and pride of ownership that was not generally as prevalent in a for-rent multi-family development. Furthermore, requiring higher grade finishes and larger units would contribute to a higher sale price that should discourage rental investment.

*Planning Commission Comments:*

The full minutes of the Planning Commission meeting were attached to the report; However, staff believed it was important to highlight one vein of questions that were asked regarding the implications of adopting the proposed amendment.

As a point of clarification, a couple of the commissioners asked variations of the following questions:

- **PC Question:** Would the proposed amendment *include* the currently exempt housing types (senior, HUD financed, TSOD, disabled) in the maximum allowance of 17% of the total units in a master planned community?
  - **Staff Answer:** No. The housing types that are currently exempt from the cap and grade were selected because of one of the following reasons:
    - They represent a protected class, or
    - They are needed serve a demographic shift (senior) and have less of an impact on traffic and schools, or
    - They are needed to maximize a significant regional investment in transit.
- **PC Question:** Does this mean there could be a potential development that could be requested with a large number of senior housing, *and* HUD financed units, *and* housing for disabled person, *and* then another 17% of standard townhomes or condominiums?
  - **Staff Answer:** Yes, but the City Council would not have to approve such a request if in their estimation they found that the request was not appropriate.

In the very remote chance that the city received such an application, the application would have to go through a rezone and development plan approval process. In reviewing such applications, the City Council had a large amount of legislative discretion as granted to them by Utah State Code:

Section 10-9a-502:

*“The municipal legislative body shall consider each proposed land use ordinance and zoning map recommended to it by the planning commission, and, after providing notice as required by Subsection 10-9a-205(1)(b) and holding a public meeting, the legislative body may adopt or reject the ordinance or map either as proposed by the planning commission or after making any revision the municipal legislative body considers appropriate.”*

Including these exempt housing types as part of the total cap of multi-family housing in a master planned community would be counterproductive to incentivizing developers to build under the higher standards of a PC or PRD zone.

After the Planning Commission meeting, staff explored how the proposed ordinance amendment would play out in a “real world” scenario. Staff selected the Jensen Property Development for this test because of its size, the mixture of unit types, and the general familiarity to most of the City Council of this proposed development.

The Jensen Property was a proposed 205-acre master planned community generally located just east of the Mountain View Corridor from 7800 South to 7000 South. As shown in the following table, the current application that the city was reviewing contained 907 dwelling units. The applicant was seeking to rezone the property to the PC (Planned Community) zone.

Also shown in the following table, under “Current Proposal” was the breakdown of the various types of housing proposed in this new community. Under “Change Required per Text Amendment” were the numbers that would have to be changed in order to comply with the text amendment as they were proposed in this report.

Effect of Proposed Amendment on Jensen Property:

Land Use	Current Proposal		Change Required Per Text Amendment	
	# of Units	Mix %	# of Units	Mix %
Preserve Lots	223	24.6%	254 (+31)**	28% (+3.4%)
Cottage Lots	295	32.5%	295	32.5%
Townhomes	185	20.4%	154 (-31)	17% (-3.4%)
Apartments*	204	22.5%	204	22.5%
<i>Total</i>	<i>907</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>907</i>	<i>100%</i>

\*The applicant had indicated that the proposed apartments would be age restricted senior housing.

\*\*Units shifted from the townhome units could be placed in either the “Preserve Lots” or the “Cottage Lots” or simply removed from the master plan; for the purposes of this review all of the reallocated units were placed in “Preserve Lot” category.

If the Cap and Grade Ordinance was amended in a way that capped *all* multi-family housing at 17% of the total number of dwelling units in an approved master planned community (including the currently exempt housing types), it would have the following impact on the proposed Jensen development.

Effect of Capping ALL Multi-Family Units within a PC zone at 17%

Land Use	Current Proposal		Change Required Per Text Amendment	
	# of Units	Mix %	# of Units	Mix %
Preserve Lots	223	24.6%	254 (+31)**	28% (+3.4%)
Cottage Lots	295	32.5%	499 (+204)**	55% (+22.5%)

Townhomes*	185	20.4%	154 (-31)	17% (-3.4%)
Apartments*	204	22.5%	0 (-204)	0% (-22.5%)
<i>Total</i>	<i>907</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>907</i>	<i>100%</i>

\*The applicant had indicated that the proposed apartments would be age restricted senior housing.

\*\*Units shifted from the townhome and apartment units could be placed in either the “Preserve Lots” or the “Cottage Lots” or simply removed from the master plan.

*Jensen Development Test Summary:* Without changing the current Cap and Grade Ordinance, the Jensen development would have to remove all of the individually owned townhome units. Approving the proposed amendment to the Cap and Grade Ordinance would require the removal of 31 townhomes. An amendment (which was not proposed) to the Cap and Grade Ordinance that caps *all* multi-family housing at 17% of the total number of dwelling units within a PC or PRD zone would require the removal of all of the proposed senior housing and likely the removal of individually owned townhomes.

**IV. FINDINGS OF FACT**

Section 13-7-D-7B, required that prior to making a positive recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment, the Planning Commission shall make the following findings:

**Criteria 1:** *The proposed amendment conforms to the general plan and is consistent with the adopted goals, objectives and policies described therein;*

**Discussion:** The General Plan supports a mix of housing types to accommodate different housing needs. Goal 2 of the Housing Element, for example, states “Provide a range of housing types, styles, sizes and price levels in all areas of the city” (page 70); however, it is also clear that the General Plan supports maintaining a balance between single-family and multi-family residential development (83% single family and 17% multi-family).

Multi-Family housing near transit stations is encouraged per Goal 4, Policy 3, of the Growth Management Section: “Encourage Transit Oriented Development (TOD) near light-rail transit stations, Mountain View Corridor and near existing major bus routes”. Implementation Measure 1 of the same section states “Give priority to proposed Transit Oriented Development near TRAX transit stations.” (page 170)

Goal 3 of the Housing section of the General Plan encourages both senior housing and housing for the disabled:

*“Provide housing that serves different life cycle stages, including the active seniors, elderly, disabled, and others requiring specialized facilities or locations.” (Page 69)*

Owner occupied housing is also supported as stated in Goal 1, Policy 1, Implementation Measure 1 of the Housing Section (Page 69) which states: “Provide opportunities for

*single-family detached and other owner-occupied housing.*” Owner occupied townhomes, owner occupied twin homes and owner occupied patio homes are consistent with this policy.

The proposed exemptions from Section 13-8-23 B were consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

**Finding:** The proposed amendments conform to the General Plan and are consistent with the adopted goals, objectives and policies described therein.

**Criteria 2:** *The proposed amendment is appropriate given the context of the request and there is sufficient justification for a modification to this title;*

**Discussion:** There is sufficient justification for a modification to the zoning code in order to support the proposed amendments as there is a need to support owner occupied housing and provide housing for the elderly and disabled, as well as owner occupied units, consistent with the General Plan.

Encouraging the development of master planned communities, with high grade architecture and enriched amenities, is a key component to maintaining and enhancing the property values and image of the City.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment is appropriate given the context of the request and there is sufficient justification for a modification to the appropriate Sections of the 2009 City Code.

**Criteria 3:** *The proposed amendment will not create a conflict with any other section or part of this title or the general plan; and*

**Discussion:** The proposed amendment will have a city-wide impact, with no particular area singled-out. The proposed amendments will not create a conflict with any other sections of the Municipal Code. Respect to the housing ratios stated in the General Plan was given by incorporating the same ratios within the context of the proposed ordinance.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment will not create a conflict with any other section or part of the Municipal Code or the General Plan.

**Criteria 4:** *The proposed amendment does not relieve a particular hardship, nor does it confer any special privileges to a single property owner or cause, and it is only necessary to make a modification to this title in light of corrections or changes in public policy.*

**Discussion:** The proposed amendment will have city-wide implication and does not relieve any particular hardship or confer any special privileges to a single property owner or cause. The proposed amendment is deemed desirable given the scope and scale of new

developments in the City, and the fact that the Comprehensive General Plan has goals and policies which support the amendment.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment does not relieve a particular hardship, nor does it confer any special privileges to a single property owner or cause, and it is only necessary to make a modification to this title(s) in light of corrections or changes in public policy.

The proposed text amendment was warranted and not contrary to any current goals and policies in the General Plan or conflicting with Title 13 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Municipal Code.

Mayor Rolfe explained that he had asked City Attorney David Brickey to respond and identify the Council's end goals regarding limits on multi-family housing.

David Brickey stated that the proposals were designed to work towards high-quality multi-family housing projects which supported the West Jordan development code, while also allowing for the recognition of individual property rights.

Councilmember Jacob wished to clarify a potential consequence of the amendment—that by removing the language “specific to non-owner-occupied multi-family residential development,” the code would then include non-owner-occupied *and* owner-occupied multi-family residential development.

Scott Langford stated that was correct.

Councilmember McConnehey inquired about the 75-acre minimum size and why that particular number had been chosen.

Scott Langford explained that the majority of requests that had been submitted to the City had been roughly that size.

Mayor Rolfe appreciated the 75-acre minimum.

Mayor Rolfe opened the public hearing.

Alexandra Eframo, West Jordan resident, asked that the City begin incorporating landscaping requirements in the earliest phases of planning, specifically focusing on xeriscaping in order to conserve water.

An unidentified resident asked the City to look into ownership of property in the area.

There was no one else who wished to speak. Mayor Rolfe closed the public hearing.

Councilmember McConnehey made three points. First, he wished for further clarification in the code specifying that the 75-acre minimum referred to the parcel itself—that

surrounding properties would not be included within the 75-acre allowance. Second, regarding 13-8-23(B)(1)(e)(iii), he felt that excluding apartments from this section might defeat the intended purpose. Apartments often had on-site management which could oversee things more closely than could individual landlords of a multitude of condominiums or townhomes. Finally, he wished to ensure that the City Council had final approval of plans going forward—not merely the opportunity to ratify the Planning Commission’s approval.

Councilmember Rice spoke in favor of the ordinance and also was in concurrence with Councilmember McConnehey first and third points.

Mayor Rolfe was in agreement that some verbiage should be added to clarify the 75-acre minimum.

Scott Langford pointed out that the amended ordinance would incentivize upgraded architecture and higher-end projects.

Councilmember Haaga indicated that he was under the impression that the Council already had final approval authority in cases such as this.

Councilmember McConnehey explained that an ambiguity had previously come to light wherein it was unclear if the Council could approve a final plan, or whether they could merely ratify the Planning Commission’s approval.

David Brickey stated that Utah case law was very clear that the Planning Commission may provide an advisory opinion only and that the City Council had final approval.

Councilmember McConnehey stated that he was not yet ready to move to approve the current issue without also ensuring that the Council would have final approval which, it had been determined, would need to happen separately.

**MOTION: Councilmember McConnehey moved to direct staff to bring back the revisions that had been discussed, to clarify that the master plan be a minimum of 75 undeveloped acres, and to bring back any necessary changes to the code to clarify that the authority for final PC or PRD approvals resided with the Council. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Nichols.**

Mayor Rolfe stated that although he liked where the motion was heading, he was still going to speak against it, explaining that he wished to reexamine the issue.

Councilmember Haaga spoke in support of the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Haaga</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Nichols</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Rice</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Mayor Rolfe</b>	<b>No</b>

**The motion passed 6-1.**

**VIII. BUSINESS ITEMS (continued)**

**DISCUSSION PRESENTATION FROM BEAU HUNTER REGARDING THE PROPOSED BRIDGES CONSTRUCTED BY UDOT**

Dave Murphy introduced Beau Hunter, Brian Atkinson and Marwan Farah from UDOT's Bangerter Highway bridge team. He explained that they had recently held two neighborhood meetings for those who would be directly and indirectly impacted by the 7000 South bridge project. A public hearing was also scheduled for March 31 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at West Jordan Elementary. There were some concerns regarding utilities and meter boxes near Dixie Drive which would need to be relocated.

Councilmember McConnehey explained the concerns of a homeowner to the west who reported to him that drivers exiting Bangerter were already taking the corner too fast and not quite making the turn. She was hoping for a complete road closure there in order to protect her property. Additionally, he wondered if there might be an opportunity to recycle the pedestrian bridge that would be removed, making use of it at an alternate location in the city.

Councilmember Haaga wondered about widening the roadway near Jordan Landing Boulevard. He stated that he would be attending the public hearing scheduled for later in the month.

Mayor Rolfe inquired about the reasoning behind moving the pedestrian bridge to the north. Beau Hunter explained that it was a matter of safety for students walking to and from Oquirrh Elementary School. Mayor Rolfe was not convinced that students would be willing to walk northward in order to get south.

Regarding the 9000 S Bangerter Highway bridge, a neighborhood meeting would be held at Terra Linda Elementary on March 29, 2016 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. A public hearing would be held at the same location on April 13, 2016 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Rolfe expressed his concern about line of sight for northbound traffic. Beau Hunter explained that there were several challenges in this area and that they were looking at various options although he did point out that all standards had been met at this point.

Councilmember Burton was concerned about traffic control if work would be conducted simultaneously at 5400 South, 7000 South, 9000 South and 11400 South on Bangerter Highway. It was explained that the construction schedule had not yet been set but that the bridge team would work with City staff closely as the scheduling progressed. There were also budgeting concerns that might cause one area of the project to move forward prior to others.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RESOLUTION 16-48, CONFIRMING THE CITY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS TO THE CDBG /HOME COMMITTEE**

David Oka explained that West Jordan Municipal Code authorized the City Council to approve citizens to serve on the various committees established by the City Council, which included the CDBG/HOME Committee.

The purpose of the committee was to review proposals received from public service agencies and proposed City uses of the annual allocation of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program funds. The committee prepared and submitted recommendations for funding to the West Jordan City Council for their review and approval.

An additional requirement of the CDBG/HOME Committee was to review and assist in the continued update of the FY2015-2019 Five-Year Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Work Program for the CDBG Program.

There was no anticipated fiscal impact.

Staff recommended approval of the resolution appointing members to serve on the West Jordan CDBG/HOME Committee.

David Oka pointed out one change to the information provided in the agenda packet. Instead of Kelvin Green, Judy Hansen from the Planning Commission would serve on the committee.

Councilmember Nichols suggested that Councilmember Rice continue to represent the Council on this committee if she was willing.

**MOTION: Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Resolution 16-48, adding Councilmember Rice with Councilmember Burton as an alternate, confirming the City Council appointments to the West Jordan CDBG/HOME Committee. The motion was seconded by Jacob.**

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Haaga</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Nichols</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Rice</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Mayor Rolfe</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion passed 7-0.**

Councilmember McConnehey left the meeting at 8:11 p.m.

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ORDINANCE 16-11, AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 4, ‘BUSINESS AND LICENSE REGULATIONS,’ SECTION 4-1A-2, REGARDING TOBACCO SPECIALTY BUSINESS**

David Brickey explained that in March of 2013, the City Council adopted a regulatory program over tobacco specialty businesses, including the definition of a tobacco specialty business. The definition provided for gross sales from tobacco products to meet a certain level, measured annually, in order to trigger tobacco specialty business regulation. During the intervening three years, one or more businesses had openly claimed to be opening a convenience store but when the store opened, the name and display space were clearly aimed at selling tobacco products. But the City’s definition called for an annual report after a year, thus a business would have a year to flaunt the City and make money from tobacco sales, and also raise the ire of existing and regulated tobacco specialty businesses. The proposed text amendments not only compressed the gross sales test to “two successive calendar quarters”, but also elevated the name of the business and the amount of display space devoted to tobacco products as the key badges of a tobacco specialty business.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** Section 13-7D-7(B) provide findings for the amendment of Title 13. Because of the affinity of the regulatory purposes of ‘Title 4, Business Licensing, to the regulatory purposes of Title 13, the same findings are suggested to support the amendment to Title 4, Business Licensing.

**Criteria 1:** *The proposed amendment conforms to the general plan and is consistent with the adopted goals, objectives and policies described therein.*

**Discussion:** One of the goas of the General Plan is to “promote the public interest, the interest of the community at large, rather than the interest of individuals or special interest groups with the community”. Another goal is to “inject long range considerations into the determination of short range actions”. The proposed amendments are clearly intended to meet both of these goals by focusing the efforts of the City on the citizens’ health, safety and welfare.

**Finding:** The proposed amendments conform to the general plan and are consistent with the adopted goals, objectives and policies described therein.

**Criteria 2:** *The proposed amendment is appropriate given the context of the request and there is sufficient justification for a modification to these titles.*

**Discussion:** State law mandates separation of retail tobacco specialty businesses from various public facilities, such as schools through the adoption of City regulatory provisions. The proposed licensing regimen preserves opportunities that may exist for these businesses consistent with the spatial separation requirements of state law, and thus it is appropriate given the legitimate public demand for these services and products.

**Finding:** The proposed amendments are appropriate given the context and there is sufficient justification for a modification of these titles.

**Criteria 3:** **The proposed amendment will not create a conflict with any other section or part of this title or the general plan.**

**Discussion:** These amendments implement the General Plan and the goal of separating tobacco specialty businesses from schools, etc. A tobacco specialty business now masquerading as a convenience store will be caught up in appropriate regulation and separation. The new provisions are consistent in tone and scope with other special business license provisions, and the proposed amendments to Title 4 do not adversely affect business licensing, planning or zoning powers currently in the 2009 City Code.

**Finding:** The proposed amendments will not create a conflict with any other section or part of this title of the general plan.

**Criteria 4:** *The proposed amendment does not relieve a particular hardship nor does it confer any special privileges to a single property owner or cause, and it is only necessary to make a modification to this title in light of corrections or changes in public policy.*

**Discussion:** These amendments are part of a continuing City effort to implement a State mandate for regulation of retail tobacco specialty businesses. These provisions will have city-wide application and reflect important public policy clarifications.

**Finding:** The proposed amendments do not relieve a particular hardship nor does it confer any special privileges to a single property owner or cause, and the proposed amendments make necessary modifications to these titles in the light of correction of public policy.

**CONCLUSION:** The proposed amendments made valuable, important and required improvements to Title 4 of the 2009 City Code.

There was no anticipated material adverse impact on the budget or assets of the City.

Staff recommended approval and adoption of the proposed amendments.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Ordinance 16-11, changing the last sentence of paragraph C from “For every 100 square feet of display and storage space, 40 square feet or more is devoted to the offer, display and/or storage of tobacco products,” to ‘40% or more is devoted to the offer, display and/or storage of tobacco products.’ The motion was seconded by Councilmember Burton.

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Haaga</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Councilmember Nichols</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Rice</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Mayor Rolfe</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion passed 6-0.**

***VIII. REMARKS***

There were no additional remarks.

***IX. ADJOURN***

**MOTION:** Councilmember Rice moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Jacob and passed 6-0 in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

**KIM V ROLFE**  
**Mayor**

**ATTEST:**

**MELANIE BRIGGS, MMC**

**City Clerk**

Approved this 27<sup>th</sup> day of April 2016