

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEST JORDAN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD JUNE 18, 2013 IN THE WEST JORDAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Dan Lawes, David Pack, Ellen Smith, John Winn, Lesa Bridge, and Zach Jacob. Nathan Gedge was excused.

**STAFF:** Tom Burdett, Greg Mikolash, Ray McCandless, Mark Forsythe, Nathan Nelson, Paul Brockbank, Robert Thorup, Melanie Briggs

**OTHERS:** Christine Stang, Mike Winder, Win Rasband, Mark Klotovich, Brent Atkinson, Randy Bowler, Chayla, Lynn Heward, Patrick Tominey

\*\*\*\*\*

The briefing meeting was called to order by Dan Lawes.

The agenda was reviewed. There was a discussion regarding maintenance of remaining parcels for Item #3. The phrasing of condition #6 should be amended to read ‘the’ power lines instead of ‘any’. Staff has also made a recommendation that the park access be moved to the east side of lot 15. An email from Brent Atkinson was distributed to the commission in regards to Item #4. Ray McCandless explained staff’s recommendation for the number of pigs allowed would be based on the animal point system for the rural residential zone. The commission could also set a cap to the number or just set a flat number allowed. There was a discussion regarding the history of designating swine as a conditional use in the agricultural zone. The state only gets involved with the regulation of pigs as it regards sanitation or health.

\*\*\*\*\*

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

**1. Consent Calendar  
Approve Minutes from June 4, 2013**

**MOTION:** John Winn moved to approve the Consent Calendar the Minutes from June 4, 2013. The motion was seconded by Ellen Smith and passed 6-0 in favor. Nathan Gedge was absent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**2. Jordan Industrial Condominium; 4015 West Nike Drive; Preliminary Condominium Conversion Plat; M-1 Zone; Tominey Ent. Inc./Patrick K. Tominey (applicant) [#SDMI20130009; parcel 21-31-426-023]**

Ray McCandless gave an overview of the application. In conjunction with this application, an amended site plan request has been submitted for a building addition. There are three units proposed in the condominium plat.

Based on the findings set forth in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Condominium Plat and grant final approval authority of the plat to staff for the proposed Jordan Industrial Condominiums located at 4015 W. Nike Drive in an M-1 zone with the following conditions:

1. Review and approval of Report of Property Condition per Section 14-4-5 by the Building Department.
2. Address applicable Engineering Department Redlines.
3. The Condominium Conversion Plat, Condominium Declaration, Report of Property Condition, and By-Laws to be recorded with Salt Lake County upon final approval by the City of West Jordan.
4. All common areas shall be shown on the plat drawing and be consistent with the Condominium Declaration.
5. The final plat shall expire on June 18, 2015 unless the final plat is recorded or an extension is granted.

Patrick Tominey, applicant, 10118 South 1000 West, had nothing to add to the presentation.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

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

**MOTION: John Winn moved based on the findings set forth in the staff report and upon the evidence and explanations received today to approve the Preliminary Condominium Conversion Plat for Jordan Industrial Condominium; 4014 West Nike Drive; Tominey Enterprises (applicant) with the conditions 1 through 5 as listed in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ellen Smith and passed 6-0 in favor. Nathan Gedge was absent.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**3. Nottingham Park Subdivision; 6724 South 2200 West; Preliminary Subdivision Plat (16 lots on 5.29 acres) R-1-8D Zone; Neptune Strategies/Michael Winder (applicant) [#SDMA20130012; parcel 21-21-430-006]**

Greg Mikolash provided an overview of the application. A rezoning to the R-1-8D zone was recently approved in order to allow for flexibility in lot width and layout. He reviewed the conditions in the development agreement. Staff's comments to the applicant include flaring out the triangular lot in order to provide an area that is more easily maintained. Staff also recommended that the 10-foot trail corridor between lots 14 and 15 be moved to the east side of lot 15, which would better serve the openness of the trail.

Based on the findings set forth in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission grant preliminary subdivision approval for the proposed Nottingham Park Subdivision located at 6724 South 2200 West in an R-1-8D zoning district subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Install a 6-foot tall RhinoRock or similar architecturally consistent wall along the south side of the subdivision where the subdivision abuts Harvest Estates Park. The same wall shall continue along either side of the access path to the park between lots 14 and 15.
2. Indicate on the final plat drawings who will own and maintain the remnant sliver of land immediately north and adjacent to the South Jordan Canal.
3. Resolve any property line and claim issues with the South Jordan Canal Co. as it directly relates to the buildable aspects of proposed Lot 16. This shall be resolved prior to recording of a plat.
4. Adhere to the conditions of approval as established in the Nottingham Park Development Agreement.
5. All lots must comply with the applicable requirements of Title 13, Zoning Regulations and Title 14, Subdivision Regulations including, but not limited to lot area, width and frontage requirements.
6. Any power lines along 2200 West shall be undergrounded and poles removed.
7. An approved, unrecorded preliminary subdivision plat shall remain valid for one (1) year. One 6-month extension may be granted by the zoning administrator if, upon written request by the owner/developer, the zoning administrator finds that the extension will not adversely affect the public health, safety or welfare of the city. (City Code 14-3-8B).

David Pack asked how the area adjacent to lot 15 would be maintained.

Greg Mikolash said they will wait to see where the canal fits and determine if it could be incorporated into the canal, or they could create a small pocket park with a bench to be maintained by an HOA.

Michael Winder, applicant, and Win Rasband, builder, were in attendance. Mr. Winder said this will be a nice infill development for the area. He said staff had been great to work with and his company is open to their suggestions. He said they have been working closely with the title company and surveyors to address the canal location. If they recognize the canal company's claims it will take 332 square feet in one area and some more in

another, so they could just give the wider right-of-way to the canal. There is another possibility to purchase from the canal company some of the property they claim is still theirs. Either solution will allow them to meet the requirements of the development agreement.

David Pack asked if there would be maintenance to the property if it is included with canal.

Greg Mikolash didn't know if they could require maintenance from the canal company, but they should probably install a fence for liability purposes.

Mike Winder said they will work with staff at the final approval to make sure there is a good solution. Another option could be for a group mailbox and park bench that could tie in with the City's overall trail plan.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

Mark Klotovich, South Jordan Canal Company and West Jordan resident, said he had been involved with Jack Hailes and the property for almost 30 years. There are ownership issues with the canal, which he reviewed. He said Mr. Hailes had moved the canal from its original location. Mr. Klotovich said he would like to leave it the way it is, but he hadn't received direction from the canal president. They need to make a decision soon so the subdivision can move forward.

Dan Lawes called the time limit for speaking.

Greg Mikolash indicated that staff could meet with Mr. Klotovich to address the canal issues.

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

Lesa Bridge asked if maintenance of the trail property would be addressed in the development agreement or if they should make a condition of approval.

Greg Mikolash said the development agreement had already been approved. The issue with lot #2 can be worked out with staff.

**MOTION: John Winn moved based on the finding set forth in the staff report and upon the evidence and explanations received today to approve the Preliminary Subdivision Plat for Nottingham Park Subdivision; 6724 South 2200 West; Neptune Strategies (applicant) with the conditions of approval as listed in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Lesa Bridge.**

**AMENDED**

**MOTION: Dan Lawes moved to amend condition #6 as discussed in the pre-meeting to read:  
6. The power lines along 2200 West shall be undergrounded and poles removed.  
The amendment was accepted by Commissioners Winn and Bridge and the amended motion passed 6-0 in favor. Nathan Gedge was absent.**

John Winn left the meeting at 6:30 pm

\*\*\*\*\*

**4. Bowler Livestock Swine Permit; 7402 South 5490 West; Conditional Use Permit for Keeping Swine; A-1 Zone; Utah Natural Meat/Randy Bowler (applicant) [#CUP20130002; parcels 20-25-300-030, 001]**

Ray McCandless said the property was recently rezoned to an agricultural district, which allows the keeping of swine with a conditional use permit. During the rezoning hearings there were a number of people both in support of and against the rezoning. The conditional use process requires a review of certain criteria. Criteria #1 addresses protection of agricultural uses while also protecting existing neighboring uses. The nuisance code was also recently revised to protect agricultural areas. Salt Lake County Health Department doesn't regulate the number of animals on a property, but they get involved with sanitation issues. The issue before the commission is to determine whether or not keeping of swine should be allowed in this location, and if so, if there is a limit on the number of pigs that can be kept. Given the fact that the current adjacent properties are zoned rural residential, staff suggested that the animal point system be used for pigs as a medium-sized animal. In December 2012 staff did an inspection of the property and based on that inspection and the number of other animals on the property, they would be allowed to have between 15 and 21 pigs over one year of age. This method is easily enforceable. They may also want to place an overall limit to the number of pigs.

Based on the positive findings set forth in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use Permit to allow keeping swine on the Bowler property located at 7402 South 5490 West, in an A-1 Zone, with the conditions of approval as listed below.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval:**

1. Planning Commission approvals do not include Public Safety, Fire, Building and Safety, or Engineering approval. The applicant shall comply with all applicable County Health Department, Building and Safety and Fire Department Regulations.
2. The proposed use must comply with all applicable State, Federal and Local permitting requirements.
3. Per Section 13-7E-10: A Conditional Use Permit may be revoked upon finding that the use is a nuisance or detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or the city in general; obtained by fraud; and or altered beyond the use described in this report.
4. Per section 15-5-3: Appeal may be made to the city council from any decision, determination or requirement of the planning commission or board of adjustment by filing a written notice of appeal, and payment of a fee as established by resolution of the city council, with the city clerk/recorder within fifteen (15) days from the date such decision, determination or requirement was made. Such notice shall set forth in detail the action and grounds upon which the owner/developer, or other interested persons, deems themselves aggrieved.
5. The number of swine allowed be based on the points system of the Rural Residential zoning district and that for purposes of this Conditional Use Permit, pigs be counted as a medium sized animal.

Lesa Bridge asked what would be the built-in mechanisms for the adjacent properties if the pigs become a nuisance.

Ray McCandless said the health department would be the avenue if the issue pertains to sanitation.

Lesa Bridge asked if the planning commission could set a limit to the number of pigs rather than to have it fluctuate depending upon how many other animals are on the property.

Ray McCandless said they could set a cap on the number of pigs and they could base that on the point system.

Robert Thorup said just because the city ordinance regarding nuisance is in place, it doesn't change the common law of the nuisance. So a person in this vicinity may not be able to get the code enforcement department to act on a nuisance, but a common law nuisance may allow that kind of a claim through the courts. Secondly, staff

isn't recommending that they adopt the point system for rural residential zones, but rather utilize it as a scratch pad calculation to come up with a number for permitted swine.

Ray McCandless said they received an email from the Atkinson family, which was distributed to the planning commission prior to the meeting.

Zach Jacob asked if that email could be inserted into the minutes to reflect the fact that it was received, which follows:

**From:** Atkinson Family [<mailto:wolf2423@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 18, 2013 1:51 PM  
**To:** Ray McCandless; Rick Davis  
**Cc:** Carol Herman  
**Subject:** Property Rights - Who Represents Me?  
**Importance:** High

**Please distribute to all Planning Commissioners to review prior to this evening's meeting.**

My name is Brent Atkinson and I am writing in hopes that you might be able to answer a question for me. My question is simple, who represents my interests as a property owner in the City of West Jordan? I represent a family trust that owns 5 acres of land located at 7482 South and 5490 West. Our property is directly adjacent, to the south, of a 10 acre parcel owned by Bowler Livestock LLC / Randy H. Bowler. On April 2, 2013, the West Jordan City Planning Commission voted to allow a rezoning of the Bowler property from Rural Residential to Agricultural. On May 8, 2013, the West Jordan City Council also voted to allow a rezoning of the Bowler property from Rural Residential to Agricultural. I attended both meetings and spoke against the rezoning. Here are the facts as I know them:

- Mr. Bowler raises chickens, cattle, sheep and pigs and sells the meat as an organic product. He has had a home occupation license to do so for just over two years. He was in violation of city codes and ordinances when he made application for the rezoning and was being investigated by city ordinance enforcement personnel. So basically, he was in violation of city codes and ordinances and you rewarded him with a rezoning.
- Although Mr. Bowler had many family members and friends write and speak on his behalf, what I believe was overlooked was the rights of the property owners adjacent to him. It is one thing to visit Bowler's property once a week to buy his organic meat products, it is quite another to have his business negatively impact your quality of life and property values. Why did having an "agricultural feel" and recognizing our "farming roots" outweigh the rights of land owners in West Jordan City? Mr. Bowler's neighbors to the North, South and East all spoke against this rezoning and our voices fell on deaf ears.
- Both the Planning Commission and the City Council went against their own staff recommendations on this issue. You ignored their cautions about bisecting the existing residential with a single agricultural plot; you ignored their concerns that agricultural zones are meant for properties that will remain that way for a long time, knowing that 5600 West and future development is imminent.

- Finally, the Planning Commission Staff was concerned enough with your decision on April 2, 2013, that they asked for clarification of your motion to rezone the Bowler property. They did not feel that all of the positive criteria were met. The fix was to strike a sentence in the criteria??

I respectfully refer you to the meeting minutes of the May 7, 2013, Planning Commission Meeting that states: Chairman Gedge referred to the staff report on the second page in Criteria #2 and stated that after a brief discussion in the pre-meeting, he felt comfortable in striking the sentence that states, "Criteria 2 does not require the Planning Commission to contemplate "Future" development of adjacent properties in its decision making".

He felt that the criteria is still satisfied for the existing property uses and that it is a good fit for the foreseeable future with surrounding land uses." I believe that this decision and the negative repercussions that it has on adjacent and surrounding property owners is actionable.

So, I have to ask you to put yourself in my shoes. Based on the actions you have taken, we just lost out on a cash offer to purchase and develop our property because an adjacent parcel had been "down zoned" to allow a pig farm. (Please see the included e-mail below.) Does this sound like it is "good fit" for my family? Just maybe, the Planning Commission should have "contemplated the future development of adjacent properties in its decision making process." So back to my original question, who represents me as a property owner in West Jordan City?

Why is a developer, that has a contract to purchase our property, being told by West Jordan City that a pig farm is going in next door? Has the conditional use permit been issued? Why was he told that "neighborhood really wants to stay more rural?" Whom in the neighborhood did you ask? In 2007, most property owners had agreed to sell to allow a huge mixed-use development. Why would the developer be asked to prepare a concept plan for the entire area and not just for our piece of property that he was under contract to purchase?

I sincerely request that Mr. Bowler's application for a conditional use permit to allow him to raise swine on his property be denied. The standard that must be met to deny a permit is: "articulated reasons or facts." The fact is that my property value has and will be negatively impacted by having a pig farm next door. The adjacent neighbors have voiced legitimate concerns about smells, noise, dust, traffic, etc. As elected and appointed officials, you are supposed to represent **ALL** citizens. Please prove to me and the other property owners on the street that there is compromise. If the permit is denied, Mr. Bowler would still be able to sell his products, his customers would still be able to visit his farm, West Jordan could still count it as a "viable business", but his neighbors and land owners around him would not be stripped of their rights. Please show that you represent **ALL** of the taxpayers, neighbors and landowners by not ignoring our rights.

Thank you,  
Brent Atkinson (Gerald and Carol Atkinson Family Trust)  
7482 South 5490 West, West Jordan, Utah  
801-253-2423

---

**From:** Hctoombs [<mailto:hctoombs@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 17, 2013 5:06 PM

**To:** [ngeertsen@aol.com](mailto:ngeertsen@aol.com); [staco@qwestoffice.net](mailto:staco@qwestoffice.net)

**Subject:** Fwd: Cancellation addendum

Natalie,

Sorry, this land is not going to work as a single family home development like we we're hoping. I talked to planning and zoning today. They said the neighborhood really wants to stay more rural right now and that the city wouldn't rezone the property without us proposing and preparing a concept plan for the entire area. Even doing that, he felt like we wouldn't be able to do better than half acres. They recently down zoned a piece of property one parcel away into a pig farm. The planning commission tonight is meeting to determine how many pigs will be allowed on the property. They felt that when 5600 W is complete with the Smith's and Home Depot built, the residents may be more amenable to change. If things change in the future and you can obtain a more favorable zoning. please call me.

You've been great to work with.

Thanks,

Haroldpl

Randy Bowler, applicant, expressed his appreciation for the commission's time. He didn't have any additional information at this point.

David Pack asked how many pigs he currently has and if he had an optimum number.

Randy Bowler said they currently have about 20, but that fluctuates. He felt it is difficult and arbitrary to set number, but they would appreciate the latitude to allow for their operations without being too limited. He said their pigs are in an open area and are not confined. He didn't know that pigs were more of a nuisance than chickens or cows.

David Pack asked what he thought concerning his operations at the current level and if he is considering expanding the number.

Randy Bowler said sometimes pigs are purchased that are harvest-ready so they are there very temporarily. They like to keep some pigs as part of their farm exposure to their customers. It is not their plan or intention at any point in time to have a large number of pigs.

Zach Jacob said in the current point system for rural residential zones, medium-sized animals are not counted until they are 12 months of age. He asked how they know when they are no longer piglets.

Randy Bowler said they do not run a purebred registered herd so they don't have that kind of data, but they know by size and weight.

Zach Jacob said at the 2012 inspection there were 30 piglets and nine sows, so he asked if some of those piglets have become pigs in the time since then.

Randy Bowler said yes, and there are currently no sows.

Lesia Bridge asked him if he were asked to give a number for a permit today what would it be.

Randy Bowler said that is hard, but if the planning commission wanted a cap they could probably operate in the range of 30 adult pigs.

Dan Lawes asked if they are at 20 pigs now due to harvesting.

Randy Bowler said that would be a more consistent number for adult animals. He said the pigs are kept more toward the west and south sides of the property.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

Brent Atkinson, West Jordan property owner, said he felt the property rights of the owners to the east, south, and north of the Bowler property have been ignored. He explained that a developer recently withdrew from developing his property because they said planning and zoning told him the adjacent property had been down zoned for a pig farm. The chances for his family's property to be sold and developed have been greatly diminished. He respectfully requested that the conditional use permit be denied. Mr. Bowler had stated tonight that they have other properties where they can keep pigs and Mr. Bowler can continue to raise the other animals and run his business. He felt it was time to consider the residents and property owners in the area.

Lynn Heward, representing property owner Craig Debry, stated that this step continues the process of an illegal spot zoning, and he distributed references to that issue. He said when Craig Debry moved to the area it was a gated rural residential community. After Bowlers moved in the agricultural use had been intensified. A slaughter house was built, and now there is a full-blown business, which changed the character of the entire area. The Bowlers began to put pigs on the lots when they knew it wasn't legal.

Christine Stang, West Jordan property owner in the area, stated that she and her husband don't object to agricultural uses, but they cannot tolerate pigs or swine. She said it will affect the value of their property. She said a 12-month old pig is not a piglet. Her concern is that pigs have an even stronger odor than the other animals and she requested that the conditional use permit be denied.

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

Randy Bowler said there had been a portrayal that this is a 'pig farm' and it is not. There are other animals on the site and he felt that the pigs are no more intrusive than the other animals. The rural residential zone allows animals, and there are signs of agriculture along that road including farming, farm equipment, and animals. In his operation he did not see a difference between having pigs together with other animal versus not having them at all.

Zach Jacob asked Mr. Bowler when swine were first introduced to the property.

Randy Bowler wasn't sure, but probably two to three years ago.

Zach Jacob asked how it would affect his business if swine were not allowed on the property.

Randy Bowler said they like to have some on the property for people to view as it gives a variety of farm animals. Also, this location is the point where they prepare animals for harvesting and it is a convenient location at their home where the animals can be watched, which is important.

Zach Jacob asked what is involved with preparing an animal for harvesting.

Randy Bower said proper feed and making sure it is within the correct weight and size. They can do this daily if they are right there.

David Pack asked where his other properties are.

Randy Bowler said they have a ranch in Sanpete County and a farm operation in Delta, so they are some distance away.

**MOTION: David Pack moved to suspend the rules in order to get some clarifying information from those who have testified against the application. The motion was seconded by Zach Jacob and passed 5-0 in favor. Nathan Gedge and John Winn were absent.**

David Pack asked Mr. Atkinson if he lives in the subdivision.

Brent Atkinson said he represents a family trust of a vacant five-acre parcel that was purchased by his parents in 1982. He does not live in the subdivision, but the land is for sale.

David Pack asked if he was aware of any farm operations on the property prior to Mr. Bowler's farm.

Brent Atkinson said there had always been farming operations, which he is not opposed to. He is just opposed to having his property values negatively impacted by a pig farm.

Zach Jacob asked Mr. Atkinson if the rezoning had not been approved and the property were still rural residential with all animals except for swine, would that zoning have been compatible.

Mr. Atkinson said the Bowler property had been rezoned to agricultural when his property went under contract.

David Pack asked for clarification that Mr. Debry moved in before Mr. Bowler but after farming operations where on the property.

Mr. Heward said there were no farm operations on the property. The prior occupants had some horses, but the Bowers made it an intensive livestock operation.

Zach Jacob stated that this is the United States of America and we are governed by the people. In this type of situation there are the property rights of Mr. Bowler, but those rights end where 'my property rights' begin. But does that end at the property line or does it have a more esoteric connotation. That is why people are appointed and elected to represent them to make decisions. The planning commission is acting as judges, as it were. They have to compare both sides and then make a ruling. He didn't want anyone to feel that they are not represented or underrepresented if the ruling doesn't go the way either side wants it to go. That is why they have this process.

Ellen Smith stated that this is not a zoning request, but a conditional use permit. The planning commission is looking at a particular use to see if it fits in with the area and if they can mitigate any potential impacts on surrounding residents. So far the only tool of mitigation they have talked about is limiting the number of swine. At some point in time somebody decided that swine were not a permitted use in the agricultural zoning district. So she is not sure what they are mitigating. Should they just limit the numbers, or do they need to specify fencing, or some other options to take care of the factors. She doesn't have any solid facts to say what number would be best or at what number the impact cannot be mitigated. She had done research on the internet and had found nothing that indicates how much space each pig should get.

Dan Lawes asked staff if there was any concrete information to guide their decision.

Ray McCandless said he spent some time looking at other codes and some have a point system or they don't allow them at all in urbanized areas. Farming communities would be different.

Dan Lawes asked if it were the interpretation that they can't meet criteria #6.

Ellen Smith said that would be her position.

David Pack agreed with Commissioner Smith that it is hard to approve something when they don't exactly know the impact, but that doesn't mean it should be denied. It is more of an unknown. He would like a little more information, but there is not a lot of information out there. They found one resource saying 22, but why that number? He would hate to make a judgment call on something that he doesn't know much about without getting additional information.

Dan Lawes asked if there was any other information they could get to guide the decision making process.

Greg Mikolash said they could continue to do research.

Zach Jacob said in the absence of additional information, the closest person we have as an animal expert tonight would be Mr. Bowler. The closest thing we have to what impact there is to the neighbors is the neighbors that have spoken. Neither are impartial sources. He felt in the interest of fairness maybe they should get a third party with knowledge to provide additional information as to swine kept in these specific conditions, or until other information can be found by research. He felt that the statement in the email of it being a pig farm had been mischaracterized.

Robert Thorup stated that Betty Naylor is heavily involved with the Utah Farm Bureau, which may have people who could comment on the issue.

David Pack said there are probably some great resources with Utah State University as well, and he will be in that area and could do some research. This is such a sensitive issue, so he would rather wait awhile longer to have additional information.

Timeframes were discussed for postponement.

**MOTION: Dan Lawes moved to table the Conditional Use Permit for Bowler Livestock; 7402 South 5490 West; Utah Natural Meat (applicant) to a date at least 30 days from today to allow staff to do additional research and gather additional information and perhaps obtain some resources to provide additional testimony at the subsequent meeting.**

Lesa Bridge recommended that they consider why the property was rezoned in the first place, which was to protect him from the nuisance buffering his property and understanding that the rural residential didn't allow swine, which is why he came back to allow swine. It does not have to be permitted. He just came back so he could be protected against the nuisance clause.

**The motion was seconded by Zach Jacob.**

**AMENDED**

**MOTION: Zach Jacob moved to amend the motion to set the date to August 6, 2013. The motion was accepted by Commissioners Lawes and Jacob.**

More specifically David Pack wants to know what the difference is with a pig and why were they excluded in the first place, and how much room does a free-range pig require. He said that they could interview experts.

Greg Mikolash didn't know if our history would be documented, since it could have been 40 years ago.

Zach Jacob requested in the absence of conclusions that they have individuals to provide expert testimony in an unbiased third-party way to provide the commission with direction.

**VOTE: The amended motion passed 5-0 in favor. Nathan Gedge and John Winn were absent.**

\*\*\*\*\*

Tom Burdett gave an update on recent city council actions.

Zach Jacob appreciated those who took time to come to the meeting to express their opinions.

**MOTION: Lesa Bridge moved to adjourn.**

The meeting adjourned at: 7:29 p.m.

NATHAN GEDGE  
Chair

ATTEST:

JULIE DAVIS  
Executive Assistant  
Development Department

Approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013