

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEST JORDAN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD FEBRUARY 21, 2007 IN THE WEST JORDAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PRESENT: David Beecher, Ellen Smith, James Dupaix, Justin Stoker, Nola Duncan, and Nate Hendricks. David McKinney was excused.

STAFF: Tom Burdett, Julie Davis, Richard Lewis, Chien Hwang, Michael Meldrum, Ryan Carter, and Reed Scharman.

OTHERS: Camille Hendricks and Karl Lies.

The briefing meeting was called to order by David Beecher.

The agenda was reviewed. The training session scheduled for February 28, 2007 was discussed, and the time was changed to 4:30 p.m.

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by David Beecher.

ITEM #1 CONSENT CALENDAR

A. APPROVE MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 7, 2007

B. 26-10-300-002 PRESSURE ZONE D SOUTH PUMP STATION; 6920 WEST OLD BINGHAM HIGHWAY; CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; A-20 ZONE; JORDAN VALLEY WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT/SHANE SWENSEN (APPLICANT) [#CUP20060043]

It was recommended that this item be continued to the March 7, 2007 Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant to provide updated plans and to allow staff adequate time to review them.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to continue Items #1B, #3, and #5 until March 7, 2007. The motion was seconded by James Dupaix and passed 6-0 in favor. David McKinney was absent.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to approve Item #1A, the minutes. The motion was seconded by James Dupaix and passed 6-0 in favor. David McKinney was absent.

ITEM #2: 26-02-100-019 COPPERFIELD SUBDIVISION PHASE 3; 6400 WEST 8500 SOUTH; PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT; R-1-12E (ZC) ZONE; D.R. HORTON, INC./MICAHA PETERS (APPLICANT) [#SDMA20060008]

Michael Meldrum gave the overview of the request for a preliminary subdivision plat. The original approval on February 2, 2005, had expired. There are two connections to 6400 West not including the intersection at 9000 South and 6400 West. Each subdivision is required to provide two points of access, but not on the same street. This subdivision will have a connecting road to Duck Creek Subdivision to the east. Three of the proposed lots do not meet the minimum lot size standard and will need to be amended. The wall condition should be amended to indicate it will be six feet in height in order to match the existing walls in the area. The trail along Barney's Wash is shown and will continue to the east in the Duck Creek Subdivision. This trail must meet the trail requirements established in the City's Master Transportation Plan. All open space parcels, including the detention basin must be maintained by a homeowners' association to be created by the developer, which is consistent with the City's open space maintenance policy.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission grant Preliminary Subdivision Plat approval for Copperfield Phase 3, located at approximately 6400 West 8500 South, with the conditions as set forth below. Planning Commission approvals do not include Fire, Building and Safety, or Engineering approval. Requirements by those departments must be met and site changes or additions may be required. Building permits will not be issued until all departments' requirements have been satisfied.

1. All lots must meet the requirements of §87-5-103 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

February 21, 2007

Page 2

2. Building envelopes must be shown on the Final Subdivision Plat.
3. The project will require six-foot high walls along 6400 West per §89-6-804(1)(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. Pillars are required at twenty-foot intervals per §89-6-803(g) of the Zoning Ordinance. Unless otherwise allowed by the Planning Commission the walls must be masonry per §89-6-803(g) of the Zoning Ordinance.
4. Meet all streetscape requirements for trees as described in §89-6-706(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.
5. A trail is required along Barney's Wash. The trail cross-section must be 10-feet of asphalt pavement with 2 feet of gravel on each side for a total trail width of 14 feet.
6. Provide a pedestrian bridge to cross Barney's Wash. The bridge must have an interior width of 6 feet.
7. A temporary irrigation system must be provided to establish the landscaping in the wash corridor. The temporary irrigation system must remain in place until the native landscaping is established (at least one full growing season).
8. A native seed mix as approved by the Planning Division and the Public Works Department is required in the Barney's Wash corridor.
9. All open space parcels, including the detention basin are to be maintained by a Home Owner's Association created by the developer. This requirement does not include the Barney's Wash parcel that is proposed to be dedicated to the City.
10. All plan sets must be consistent.
11. Meet all Engineering Department requirements contained in the memorandum dated February 15, 2007.

Nola Duncan noted that the staff report showed the minimum tree caliper of 1 ½" instead of 2". Michael Meldrum said they should be 2" per the ordinance requirement.

The secondary access was discussed and pointed out connecting to the Duck Creek Subdivision, which would eventually connect to 9000 South. The other access is proposed to be on 6400 West. The two access points on 6400 West meet the code for minimum spacing between access points. The secondary access will be for emergency use only.

Michael Meldrum explained where the trail would be along the wash and how it would connect to the east, which would then connect to the Ron Wood Memorial Park. The existing detention basin was built by the developer in order to facilitate Phase 1. It was indicated that the City is asking that it be maintained by an HOA. Michael Meldrum stated that there are four entryway parcels that would be managed by the HOA as well as the detention basin.

Micah Peters, D.R. Horton, 12351 South 350 West, Draper, stated that this request was for a re-approval of the preliminary plat. They are diligently working with staff to complete this plat. They are proud of Phase 1, which is very nice. Phase 3 will have the same quality that exists in Phase 1. He explained that the rezoning of Phase 2 was not an attempt to get more lots, but it allowed them to have 7 lots below the 12,000 square foot minimum in order to configure the property. The plan for the secondary access through Phase 2 should get concept approval from the Commission soon, and they will build it immediately.

Further public comment was closed at this point for this item.

Nate Hendricks was concerned with the requirement to form an HOA for a detention basin that will be connected to a City-maintained wash. He didn't think that the homeowners would want the responsibility for the maintenance, and he asked if the detention basin could be added to the maintenance of the wash.

Ellen Smith disagreed. Although it adds to their costs it also adds to their security, because they are in control of the maintenance. Those homeowners could actively monitor it. It was her understanding that the property will be landscaped.

James Dupaix said that the residents would be able to put amenities in the basin if it were maintained by an HOA. He gave the example of an Ivory development at 6400 West 8200 South.

Nate Hendricks remembered a previous application that required an HOA-maintained detention basin, but it could not be built upon.

Ryan Carter said they can't build structures that could be occupied because of the flooding risk. However, outdoor recreational equipment would be allowable. He referred to the recently clarified law under the Municipal Land Act that makes it clear that whenever any sort of a common open space area is included in a subdivision that all owners of record also have an undivided interest in the land the same as if it were a part of their own property. Referring to the question as to whether or not the City could absorb the cost of the maintenance, it might cost less than an isolated piece of property, but it still requires that the City maintain the weeds, etc. If homeowners are responsible for the property they may choose to improve it. If it were to be dedicated to the City the full use of the land might experience some degree of waste, because the public would not be allowed to make improvements.

MOTION: James Dupaix moved to have the applicant return to the stand to address the development of the detention basin. The motion was seconded by Nate Hendricks and passed 6-0 in favor. David McKinney was absent.

Micah Peters said the detention basin will be fenced. There are requirements for gravel covering and a natural seed mix. He wanted to be clear that in all of their subdivisions that they had recorded and built they had never, ever put a detention pond in an HOA, and the undivided interest of the owners that is implied by LUDMA is erased with the recordation of the plat.

Tom Burdett clarified that his comment was only speaking to the State of Utah.

Mr. Peters stated that it referred to Utah along the Wasatch Front. When Phase 1 was recorded they assumed that the detention pond built for Phase 1 would be dedicated to the City. He stated that they would rather not create the HOA, but they would if the City wants it. He said there are opportunities in some situations where the size and slope of the detention pond facilitates amenities, but because of the size he didn't think it was the case here. He acknowledged as well that as part of the large-lot subdivision they are dedicating a significant amount of ground to the City in the form of Barney's Wash at a significant cost to the developer.

Tom Burdett appreciated D.R. Horton's willingness to accept the maintenance by an HOA and realize that it is their least favorite choice, and it is probably the City's last choice as well. Storm water management used to be a matter of flood control only, but it is not true today. Today it is also about water quality. The Clean Water Act adopted standards that were put upon local governments to enforce without any compensation or funding sources available in order to enact the requirements. In turn, the City developed a storm water master plan that has the City maintaining the drainage corridors and larger regional ponds greater than 1-acre as part of the common good of the City. The smaller ponds that are associated with development are suggested to be mitigated closest to their point of origin. The City could certainly maintain them with a storm water utility fee or an enterprise fund if they were a guaranteed revenue source. However, the City Council does not want to adopt a storm water fee or a city-wide SID. Commercial developments also have the responsibility to maintain their storm water. He felt it is an equitable request, because there is no other financing available. The City could pay substantial fines from the Federal Government if they don't manage the storm water for water quality purposes. If the Commission has suggestions to forward to the City Council they can do that, but right now they have to designate an entity to maintain the property.

Nate Hendricks agreed with Commissioner Smith that there are good things that an HOA can do. He didn't believe an HOA is best serving the community when it is only a system of rules over a system of rules. The City

code already addresses most of the issues an HOA does. However, if the applicant wanted to provide a beautiful playground on the property, then he would say it is worthy of an HOA. Also, if this were in the middle of the development and not abutting a wash that will be maintained by the City it might be different. He wondered if they could allow the applicant to dedicate the property to the City.

Tom Burdett said the Planning Commission does not have the authority to authorize something that has financial consequences to the City, but they could forward it to the City Council to consider.

Ryan Carter said Barney's Wash has already been accepted as part of the Master Trailways Plan [Parks, Recreation & Trails Master Plan]. The developer of a subdivision is required to manage their storm water runoff in a manner that is acceptable to the City standards, and these basins are a manner that is acceptable. The Planning Commission can't make regulations that concern fiscal things that can't be met by the City Council. In this instance, the developer is able to comply with the code to manage the storm water runoff by keeping the flood control pond on the site and creating an HOA to manage it. That is a classic connect between what the developer needs to do to keep impact from occurring and a regulation designed to mitigate that impact.

Ellen Smith commented on the water quality issue and said that it is a good idea to have the basins right next to the development in order to prevent some of the problems that come when development introduces more chemicals, leads, heavy metals, and fertilizers into the area.

Justin Stoker said as an engineer he had dealt with this quite often. He felt that they would be setting a very dangerous precedent to start giving private detention and storm management to the City. Almost all of these systems drain to a public system, and these mechanisms are already in place and are common throughout the United States.

David Beecher asked if the determination that the development cannot discharge water directly into City property were applicable in this case.

Tom Burdett said there had been some cases where they were asked to take the storage of storm water generated from a project and allow it to occur on City-owned property. That might be desirable in some cases when creating a wetlands area, but it was not the case in that particular instance, and the developer was required to build the detention pond into the subdivision design.

James Dupaix said he loves the development process, and he knows the feelings of some regarding homeowners' associations in the community, but in this situation he saw the contaminants generated by the residents of the development as the primary issue of having the detention basin. In order to mitigate the effects of the contaminants on the drainage system overall it is appropriate that an HOA maintain it. He stated that this is even more important with the possibility of the using the runoff water as secondary water resources in the future.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plat for Copperfield Phase #3; approximately 6400 West 8500 South; D.R. Horton, Inc./Micah Peters (applicant) with the conditions listed in the Planning Commission report, modifying:

- 3. The project will require six-foot high walls along 6400 West per §89-6-804(1)(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. Pillars are required at twenty-foot intervals per §89-6-803(g) of the Zoning Ordinance. Unless otherwise allowed by the Planning Commission the walls must be masonry per §89-6-803(g) of the Zoning Ordinance. The motion was seconded by James Dupaix and passed 5-1 in favor with Nate Hendricks casting the negative vote.**

ITEM #3: 26-11-400-012 **OQUIRRH SUBSTATION EXPANSION; 5650 WEST OLD BINGHAM HIGHWAY; PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN, MINOR SUBDIVISION PLAT, AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; C-M ZONE; ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER/ROD FISHER (APPLICANT) [#CUP20060039, #SPI2006038, #SDMI20060012]**

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission continue this hearing to March 7, 2007, to provide additional time for staff to review the applications.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to continue the Preliminary Site Plan, Minor Subdivision Plat, and Conditional Use Permit for Oquirrh Substation Expansion; 5650 West Old Bingham Highway; Rocky Mountain Power/Rod Fisher (applicant) to March 7, 2007. The motion was seconded by James Dupaix and passed 6-0 in favor. David McKinney was absent.

ITEM #4: **TEXT AMENDMENT – AMEND THE WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE SECTIONS 89-1-203; 89-3-202; 89-3-302; AND 89-3-1105 REGARDING ACCESSORY LIVING QUARTERS; CITY OF WEST JORDAN (APPLICANT)**

Richard Lewis explained that the Planning Commission will be making a recommendation to the City Council regarding the issue of whether or not to amend the ordinance regarding guest houses. He gave the history of a previous request for a guest house and the text amendment that followed to remove the use altogether until such time that staff could bring back some suggestions. Staff felt that a more suitable term might be accessory living quarters, which could allow for more flexibility. He reviewed a table that indicates the policy of other cities regarding this type of use. Half of the cities surveyed do not allow them. Some of the biggest issues may be with enforcement of using the structure as an additional residence in the single-family zones.

If the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council amend Sections 89-3-1105; 89-1-203; 89-3-202; 89-3-302; and 89-6-119 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow Accessory Living Quarters, Staff recommended the following findings:

1. The text amendment clarifies and enhances the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The proposed zoning amendments are consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.
3. The proposed amendments are harmonious with the overall character of existing developments in the VLSFR, RE-40, RE-30, RE-20, RR-40, RR-30, RR-20, A-20, A-5, and A-1 zones.
4. The proposed amendments will not adversely affect adjacent properties so long as potential adverse impacts are mitigated via the Conditional Use Permit and proper use of the accessory living quarters.
5. The proposed amendments are consistent with the provisions of all applicable overlay zones, which may impose additional standards.
6. No direct detriment to public facilities and services will be created with the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Karl Lies, West Jordan resident, urged the Commission to vote in favor of the proposal and felt it was reasonable. At a Chamber meeting several comments were made regarding the lack of executive-type housing, which might be able to afford an accessory structure. This amendment could promote that level of housing within West Jordan. He thought it was a function of government to promote the general welfare of the public, but he felt that is often best promoted by allowing for the greatest extent of public liberty, within reasonable boundaries. Regarding the difficulty of regulating the use he asked the Commission to consider if it made sense to prohibit everyone from doing something with their own property on the basis of a perceived fear of the possibility that some small portion of the public might abuse it. He would rather take that chance than prohibit the entire public from the right to utilize their property in the way they choose. He felt the proposal was well thought out and balanced the public need and the private property rights.

Further public comment was closed at this point for this item.

Condition #6 was discussed. Ryan Carter said the City has to allow the ability to rent the property, so the suggestion is to allow it to be rented in its entirety. A sublease could not be allowed. He addressed the code enforcement issue. Generally speaking, people will abide by the code. Enforcement could take place through examination of the property and compiling enough evidence to prosecute a violator of the code. That process might take some time, but it is ultimately enforceable. Also, just making a presence in a neighborhood might help to curb illegal behavior.

There was a discussion about the possibility of attaching the conditional use permit to the property owners instead of the property, because oftentimes problems arise when the property is sold and the restrictions are not communicated to the new property owner. It was pointed out that even if it were attached to the owner it would still create a problem if the new owner might not know they need to get another conditional use permit. Also, the structure is already in place. A solution would be to require the recipient of the conditional use permit to record the grant of the permit with the County Recorder's Office. This would show up on the title when a legitimate search of the property is made. Ryan Carter said he didn't know what more they could do beyond recording it. Tom Burdett felt that the recordation serves as a secondary notification, and any buyer who wants to verify what the seller is saying can contact the City.

Nate Hendricks said his opinion regarding renting of the property would be to allow it if it would be to a family member, because it is his understanding that the current code doesn't allow renting portions of a house to those not considered part of the family or household. That means that the code already addresses the issue of renting. If the ALQ ordinance says it can't be rented that would exclude family members, which goes against the current code.

James Dupaix noted that Sandy City allows rental of the unit when there is a change in condition to enable citizens to maintain residency in their city without having to move out of the home.

Nola Duncan felt that rental property in this situation would open a can of worms. The code already states that it can be family members, and this condition would clarify it.

Ryan Carter said the current code allows for rental of rooms within family units. In this case there is an added concern that people won't use accessory living quarters correctly. The accessory living quarter really does threaten the integrity of the single family residential zone. If they allow them and then liberalize the ability for them to be rented to family members they could create exceptions that swallow the rule.

Nate Hendricks said his question is why do they need to state that the units cannot be leased or rented when it is already in the code, because that will just make it impossible for someone to do what they are already allowed to do.

Ryan Carter said the condition makes it that much clearer that people can't circumnavigate the single-family residential zoning. He thought that the City Council would want to see the rental limitations.

Nate Hendricks said that the job of the Planning Commission is to recommend what they think is best and not base their decision on what they think the City Council will say.

Tom Burdett said it is a matter of reflection upon the community, and the Commission develops what the reflection will be on a number of different sources such as what they want in their neighborhood, what other people tell them they want, etc. The Commission can recommend what they want to the City Council who will make the decision.

Ryan Carter clarified his statement that the two structures cannot be rented separately. They cannot have two lease instruments on one parcel of property with an accessory living quarter.

Reed Scharman said he could envision a flyer that would state the rules in a clear and concise way so they are all listed in one place.

David Beecher suggested that condition #3 also prohibit the use of separate addresses or mailboxes.

Nola Duncan asked if the sewer and water capacities for the main home are adequate enough for the addition of the accessory living quarters, and if that is why the 33% size limit is specified.

Tom Burdett said that is more a matter of fixtures and line size. The Building Department can easily review and advise the Planning Staff when conditional use permit applications are received.

James Dupaix said those issues would also be addressed with the submittal of the building permit.

Ryan Carter said these quarters are supposed to be temporary in duration. While someone could have a separate rental agreement for a family member within the primary structure, this code would not allow a separate rental instrument governing the occupancy of the accessory living quarters.

David Beecher asked if staff saw these structures as part of an entire development or mostly as additions to existing homes.

Richard Lewis thought they would be coming in individually, and he would be surprised to see an entire subdivision with them.

There was a brief discussion regarding the occupants of the structure. The definition implies for them to be for people and not as housing for animals.

MOTION: Nate Hendricks moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council amending the definition by removing 'which is not leased or rented', and changing condition #6 to read, "The property will be subject to Zoning Code 89-9-203 Section 101 that this must maintain the definition of a single family residence, which defines a family as: Two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, or foster children living together in a dwelling unit, or up to five unrelated individuals living together in and occupying a family dwelling unit." Strike condition #10 completely, and add to #3 'or by separate mailbox'.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Nola Duncan said her objection was with the concern of having up to five unrelated people.

Nate Hendricks said he didn't have a problem taking that part out of the motion.

Nola Duncan felt that the rental situation should be clearly stated in no uncertain terms, because it opens up doors to do otherwise if it isn't clear.

MOTION: Nola Duncan moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the West Jordan Municipal Code – Accessory Living Quarters as presented in the staff report, amending Condition #3 to state, "Shall not be served by separate metered utility services or mailboxes." The motion was seconded by Ellen Smith.

Nate Hendricks wanted the Commission to understand they are going above the code by making it impossible to rent the structure to anyone, including an agreement to a family member. He agreed that the reference to five unrelated people could be removed.

There was a discussion regarding whether or not the proposed wording is bypassing the code. Ryan Carter stated that he was not comfortable in taking a stand at this point. He didn't think that it altered the code. He agreed that by allowing the provisions it is a stricter standard for properties that have accessory living quarters. It is staff's position that it is necessary as a guard that the accessory living quarter could tear the fabric of the single-family residential zone system.

There was a brief discussion regarding the possibility of a separate recommendation to the City Council to reevaluate whether or not the five unrelated people is an acceptable number. Tom Burdett stated that the limit of five had been common in the cities where he had worked.

AMENDED:

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to amend the motion to modify the definition to read, "Accessory Living Quarters means an area detached from the principal dwelling unit provided for guests, relatives, or domestic employees of the occupants of the principle dwelling unit, which may include cooking, sleeping, and sanitary facilities and which is not leased or rented, except to family members related by blood, marriage, or adoption. The term shall not include apartment or dwelling unit." And modify condition #6 to state, "Shall not be leased or rented separately from the principle dwelling unit, except to family members related by blood, marriage, or adoption."

Ryan Carter said under the definition of single family you can have up to five unrelated people living in the primary residence and still meet the definition of a single family, and then a blood relative of any one of those five people could then permanently occupy the accessory living quarters with some sort of a lease.

Nola Duncan stated that this amendment would also go against what the current code allowed.

Ryan Carter asked that the Commission rule on the motion on the table. It was to the discretion of the motion maker as to whether or not they wanted to accept the amendment to the motion. The amendment can state things that are unique, but they are on the same general topic.

Nola Duncan did not accept the amendment.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION:

Commissioner Stoker - no
Commissioner Dupaix - no
Commissioner Duncan - yes
Commissioner Beecher - yes
Commissioner Hendricks - no
Commissioner Smith - no
Commissioner McKinney - absent

The motion failed 2-4.

**MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to forward a positive recommendation to City Council amending Sections 89-3-1105, 89-1-203, and 89-3-202, 89-3-302, and 89-6-119 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow Accessory Living Quarters, modifying:
The definition of Accessory Living Quarters to say, "Accessory Living Quarters means an area detached from the principal dwelling unit provided for guests, relatives, or domestic**

employees of the occupants of the principal dwelling, which may include cooking, sleeping and sanitary facilities, and which is not leased or rented, except to family members related by blood, marriage or adoption. The term shall not include "apartment" or "dwelling unit".

Condition #3 to say, "Shall not be served by separate metered utility services or by separate mailboxes."

Condition #6 to say, "Shall not be leased or rented separately from the principle dwelling unit, except to family members related by blood, marriage, or adoption."

The motion was seconded by James Dupaix.

AMENDED

MOTION: Nate Hendricks moved to amend the motion to modify Condition #10 to say, "Shall require an affidavit from property owner stating the accessory living structure is not leased or rented separately from the primary dwelling, except to family related by blood, marriage, or adoption. The amendment was accepted by Justin Stoker and James Dupaix.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Commissioner Beecher – yes
Commissioner Hendricks – yes
Commissioner Smith – yes
Commissioner Duncan – no
Commissioner Dupaix – yes
Commissioner Stoker – yes
Commissioner McKinney – absent

The motion passed 5-1 in favor.

Tom Burdett addressed the question of whether or not the definition of family or household needs to be amended and stated that he would not recommend changing the definition, because it is standard. The enforcement potential would grow when it drops below four.

Justin Stoker said he understood the concerns regarding five unrelated people, but when the conditional use permits come before them it will be evident to the Commission as to the intended use.

ITEM #5: TEXT AMENDMENT – AMEND THE WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 89-1-202(d) REGARDING INTERPRETATION OF ZONING BOUNDARIES – STREET ABANDONMENT AND SECTION 89-1-203 DEFINITIONS; CITY OF WEST JORDAN (APPLICANT) {QUASI-LEGISLATIVE ACTION}

It is necessary to postpone this item in order to complete the review of the proposed amendments. Staff recommended that this item be postponed to the March 7, 2007 Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to continue the Text Amendment to 89-1-202(d) and 89-1-203 of the West Jordan Municipal Code to March 7, 2007. The motion was seconded by James Dupaix and passed 6-0 in favor. David McKinney was absent.

Planning Commission training is scheduled for February 28, 2007 at 4:30 p.m.

MOTION: James Dupaix moved to adjourn. The motion passed 6-0 in favor. David McKinney was absent.

The meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

David L. Beecher
Chair

ATTEST:

JULIE DAVIS
Executive Assistant
Community Development

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2007