MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEST JORDAN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD FEBRUARY 4, 2014 IN THE WEST JORDAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PRESENT: Dan Lawes, Sophie Rice, Zach Jacob, Ellen Smith, and Bill Heiner. David Pack was excused. Lesa Bridge was absent.

STAFF: Tom Burdett, Robert Thorup, Greg Mikolash, Larry Gardner, Nathan Nelson, and Julie Davis

OTHERS: Clayton Haight, Justin Adderley, Rick Hellstrom, Mike Fossmo, June Christiansen, Lynn Rasband, Kelly Smith, Emily Backus, Warren Kirk, AJ Walkowski, Bill Barton, Susan Gould, Marian Furst, Karen Barton, Dale Walkowski, Connie Sedanto, and Katie Dolar.

****

The briefing meeting was called to order by Dan Lawes.

The agenda was reviewed, and clarifying questions were answered. There are water issues that have contributed to the development delay in Phase 4 of Siena Vista subdivision, which still exist. Resolving the park issue doesn't necessarily clear the way for completion of the phase.

****

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

1. Consent Calendar
Approve Minutes from January 21, 2014

MOTION: Zach Jacob moved to approve the Consent Calendar, the minutes from January 21, 2014. The motion was seconded by Bill Heiner and passed 5-0 in favor. David Pack and Lesa Bridge were absent.

****

2. General Plan Update – Update the 2012 City of West Jordan Comprehensive General Plan adding to the text a Vision Statement; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20140001]

Greg Mikolash stated that the General Plan was adopted in 2012. The proposal is to add a vision statement to the document.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission accept the findings contained in the staff report and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed General Plan Amendment as discussed in the report.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

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

MOTION: Zach Jacob moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to add the vision statement to the General Plan as stated in the packet with the

removal of one comma as discussed. The motion was seconded by Sophie Rice and passed 5-0 in favor. David Pack and Lesa Bridge were absent.

****

3. Siena Vista Amended Zoning Conditions; 7000 South 5715 West; Amend/Remove Zoning Condition #1 pertaining to Open Space Requirement; R-1-6 C&D (ZC) Zone; Peterson Development/Vic Barnes (applicant) [#ZC20130008; parcel 20-26-200-016]

Warren Kirk, representing the applicant, Peterson Development, gave a history of the development of Siena Vista, which began 13 years ago with preliminary approval for 71 acres with 10% required open space. The property was divided into 44 acres east of the power corridor and 26 acres west of the corridor. The 10% open space requirement was a zoning condition at that time, and since then the city has determined that they do not want to maintain pocket parks. Since the initial approval, the Jordan School District acquired 26 acres west of the corridor. The Planning Commission met on January 7th of this year to discuss options for the property. Staff listed eight options at that time, but the developer proposes two options 1) A park 0.57 acres in size and 23 home lots, and 2) Eliminate the internal pocket park and have 25 lots. The proposed lots would be larger than the minimum zoning requirement. He said there are currently 1.57 acres of open space, which is just less than 4% of the currently developed area. If they add 0.57 acres for a pocket park it will bring it to almost 5%. They understand they are not meeting the 10% requirement with their two options. A third option is to do nothing at all. He stated that they met with the residents, and Councilmember Southworth had as well. Mr. Kirk said he had personally attended two of the Open Land Committee meetings, and his impression at both of those was that there is not a vehicle or a way to maintain the park and the Open Land Committee would not make a recommendation for a pocket park or additional open space within this area. He described the current condition of the vacant field, which includes weeds, paint cans, mattresses, etc. They proposed to finish the development. They can't go back and change what happened in 2001 nor can they change the city's attitude toward maintenance. People in that area would love to have a park of any size in the area, but if it is going to cost them money the residents might not want the park. Some ways to provide maintenance may include an SID or HOA, which would not be popular with the residents. Some may argue that the power corridor is open space and their plan to finish the subdivision should not overcrowd the area. The property south of this is proposed as single-family lots. It is his understanding that Mantova Way has become a place for various activities and it is causing problems. He hoped that developing the lots on this property would help to reduce those concerns. There are five homes on Mantova Way who might say they don't want development to the west, because it would block their views. However, the rest of the development would probably hope to eliminate some of the suspicious activities in the area. As a property owner and developer they have tried to work well with the city in growing the area. Just south of Siena Vista they have helped to facilitate a 4-acre city park, which he knows doesn't meet the requirement from 2001, but he asked them to consider that they are trying to finish this development.

Zach Jacob asked for clarification that the existing 1.57 acres of open space is the corner property on 7000 South and 5600 West, and it would require 2.89 acres of additional open space to fulfill the original condition.

Warren Kirk said yes.

Bill Heiner asked if open space could have been provided along the way as the other phases were being developed. It seems that they waited until the end to provide the open space even though Peterson Development knew it was required from the beginning. He asked how it got to this point.

Warren Kirk said in the past they submitted multiple attempts to see what the area on both sides of the power corridor would look like. They couldn't anticipate that the school would want 26 acres, but it made sense for them to purchase the property to plan for their growth. They always assumed they would have the open space in the end, but over that time period it seems that the city's appetite for maintenance and the budget had changed enough that it kept getting pushed aside and never developed. Up until 2008 there was a lot of growth in the area, but the challenge was how to maintain the open space. From 2001 to 2005 they developed the subdivision and then they stalled not knowing what maintenance vehicle would be used for the open space. So it was pushed to the back end with questions from both parties.

Dan Lawes asked if having an HOA or SID for a pocket park was feasible with only 23 homes.

Warren Kirk said they had made several proposals including a funding mechanism from the developer on the front end for a two or three year period and to be determined by the residents on the back end. But that would require the residents to police what they would consider to be a private park, and it would be difficult. It would be unfair for all of the current residents of Siena Vista to be assessed for a pocket park. He thought that some of the residents will express that they just want something done with the property and others will want it left open.

Larry Gardner gave an overview of the subject property and surrounding area. The original zoning condition on the R-1-6 property included 10% open space. The phasing map from 2004 showed the applicant intended the open area to be on both sides of the power corridor. He showed the existing parks and open areas within a quarter-, half-, and one-mile radius. He showed the two options from the developer. He said this is difficult situation. Peterson Development had never stated that they don't want to install the open space, but the city isn't interested in taking any more open space. Despite that, staff hadn't heard any compelling argument to remove the condition. He noted that the condition didn't specify 'park' but it said '10% open area', which was in exchange for a smaller lot zoning. It could be looked at that it gives the developer more product to sell in exchange for 10% open space, so staff recommended that the planning commission forward a negative recommendation for the request. The commission will hear from the residents of the area and staff is willing to look at any other options to make a workable situation. Everyone wants to see the development ultimately finished with everything that the residents counted on.

There was a discussion regarding the map of open space and whether or not school property is counted as open space. Staff was just listing anything that had lawn that could be used as open space. One argument is that school grounds are used as open space, so why not count them. It was pointed out that school property may or may not be used by the public due to district policies, school sessions, and/or development.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

AJ Walkowski, West Jordan resident, said they always understood that homes would be built in front of their home, but they also understood that a park was part of the plan. He felt the developer is trying

to benefit from the extra property. He said the garbage collects in the field because it is undeveloped. If it becomes a nice park then that would probably change. He said they had a meeting last week and it was his understanding that the city is willing and has the money to install and maintain a park, and he asked the commission to vote in favor of the residents.

Bill Barton, West Jordan resident, supported Mr. Walkowski's comments and he asked the commission to support and reflect the feelings of the people who have invested money in their homes in this area. They had only been in the neighborhood for a couple of years, and they were told that there would be a fairly good-sized park in the area. He was sure that everyone who bought there was told by the realtor that there would be a park. He understood that the city had the park in the plans several years ago, and if they back out of it now it is a slap in the face to those residents, so the city should keep their commitment to have the park and maintain it.

June Christiansen, West Jordan resident, said it seems that over the years the open space is getting chopped up into smaller and smaller bits. She thought that the low density for the area should be more like 12,000 square foot lots. She wondered if it were ethical that the developer got smaller lots with the open space and now they are asking that the open space be removed. Open space is a premium and a benefit to the residents. Once you give it up you can't get it back, so they need to preserve it in some way. If they can't develop it as a park it could be community gardens or something else. Maybe the residents had ideas on how it could be maintained as a park. As a school teacher she sees that children spend way too much time indoors because there is no place to play. Space is needed for a healthy and happier environment. Overdevelopment contributes to crowded schools, road congestion, noise level, and pollution, and then they don't end up with the same vision they wanted when they moved here.

Susan Gould, West Jordan resident, said her lot would be across from the park, which was a main selling-point. They were just starting a family at that time. A few years later they went to a meeting with Councilman Southworth and Mayor Johnson and how they were going to get Peterson Development to start working on the park. Every year since then it seems there is a new meeting. They finally had a meeting with Peterson who said they were ready to do a park, but now the city had decided not to maintain parks smaller than 10 acres in size. She had been very active in trying to get this park and they keep getting shut down for something they were promised from the beginning. She appreciated Peterson Development meeting with them, and she would like to see something happen. The property is currently unmaintained weeds, which is why people use it as a dump. She and her family often clean it up. She felt their situation should be grandfathered because it was approved before the new stipulations for parks were established.

Mike Fassmo, West Jordan resident, echoed Ms. Gould's comments. He was also told 7-8 years ago that there would be open space/park. Their neighborhood had met on multiple occasions as well as with the city council members and with Peterson Development. It sounds to him like Peterson is offering some open space and that they are willing and able to facilitate the park, but the hang-up is with the acreage of the park and what the city will maintain. Their neighborhood had tried to come up with possibilities on how they could assist with maintenance, but as a whole the neighborhood had become a little rundown with some of the rentals and 7000 South isn't maintained well along with the roundabout, and the field is an eyesore. The dead end road has become a haven for drug use, vandalism, and dumping. He would like to see the development finished by Peterson. He understood that the lots and homes will be equal or greater value than the existing homes. Because they have offered to complete the park, which is what was promised, he preferred that proposal.

Marian Furst, West Jordan resident, said the nearby school doesn't provide usable open space where kids can play or for her workouts. She said there isn't much in the way of park space in this area for children, so there is a need. If Peterson got permission from the city to build a development with designated lots sizes with a stipulation that there be a park, then it isn't right for Peterson to wait a few years and then want to change the arrangement.

Clayton Haight, West Jordan resident, said the area needs to be finished one way or the other. It is a fire hazard. The city needs to make the decision and get it done and then maintain it. The roundabout in that area isn't maintained well, and in the summer the sprinklers run all summer with water running down Como Lane. His vote would be for an open area that is trimmed up and maintained.

Emily Backus, West Jordan resident, said they have a field in back of their property and the subject field to the west and the dead end road. There have been a lot of undesirable activities such as loitering, people driving trucks there, partying, shady characters, graffiti, etc. The area seems to draw these types of activities. It seems that no one is concerned about it since it isn't finished off. The city helped to get a street light and 'road closed' sign in 2012, which has helped a bit. She would love to see a park there. They've had regular meetings Councilman Southworth and Mayor Johnson and most recently with Peterson. In the beginning it was the city saying that Peterson wasn't going to build the park, and then it was Peterson saying that the city won't maintain it. But it is the residents who suffer. She would rather see something rather than nothing so it will be less of a draw for the bad activities. Her concern is if they don't get the park and it stays a field, will the city change its mind in fifteen years and allow for duplexes or something else?

Karen Barton, West Jordan resident, said they had only lived in their home for two years, but they were told at that time that there would be a lovely 3-acre park. They have a small yard, but they thought that would be okay since the park would be nearby for the grandkids. She had heard that the lots were originally going to be 8,000 square feet, but then it was approved for smaller lots with the understanding that there would be a park. The city approved this at the onset, so that should be honored despite the change in park maintenance policy.

Justin Adderley, West Jordan resident, said the main reasons they moved here in 2005 was that it was centrally located for his family and that there was going to be a park. They were also looking in South Jordan at that time, which had a lot of parks in their neighborhoods, but this lot had a better location for him. It has been nine years and there is still no park or open space, but the developer wants to make more money and give them less space. He never would have moved to West Jordan if he had known this would happen. The city should make sure that the realtors and developers live up to what they promise.

Dale Walkowski, West Jordan resident, said when they bought their home it wasn't quite finished and they knew the city had certain requirements such as installing lawn and trees, which they did. She said we need to hold people accountable for what we say we need them to do. Peterson needs to follow through with the park and do what they said they were doing to do. She is sad to see the open space develop, because she enjoys the view, but if it means putting homes in as well as the park then … she said they need the park.

Kelly Smith, West Jordan resident, said she started meeting with Ben Southworth almost seven years ago when she was expecting her first son, and now he is going to be 7 years old and they are still talking about a park. She asked them to think about their own family and where the time goes. They often wonder if they will be living here going on 15 years still be talking about the park. By then their children will be teenagers. They are the original owners of their home and they take great pride in the neighborhood. She asked them to drive the area and look at one of the main entrances, which is scattered with weeds and is an eyesore and a mess. If the commissioners lived in the neighborhood she thought they would want to see it finished and taken care of. They appreciated Peterson and the commission hearing them out. The subdivision isn't finished, and they would appreciate a nice area to enter their neighborhood. She understood that the city doesn't want to maintain a park, but in this day and age there is xeriscaping or other options. They would hope for fields of green grass, but it doesn't have to be that. The residents of the neighborhood would take pride in it and help to keep it clean. She didn't think the people in the area would agree to an HOA, but the city should look at grandfathering the original idea.

Connie Sedanto, West Jordan resident, said she didn't know why the residents had to fight for years to get a park. These residents are taxpayers. When she worked for Home Depot they volunteered to build parks because they know the benefits that a good park can provide to the residents. It is awful that they have to spend so much time debating the issue. The area is getting crowded, cars are parked on the unfinished road, and it is beginning to be an eyesore. She knows that the city wants to provide a healthy environment to their residents, so why can't these taxpayers get a little piece of park space.

Katie Dolar, West Jordan resident, applauded her neighbors for their actions over time. She desired the open space for the families in their neighborhood. She has three children who want for open space to play in when they are off track, and from time to time they play in the field, which isn't safe. Her only option now is to drive them to a larger park.

Dan Lawes closed the public hearing.

Warren Kirk, Peterson Development, applauded the residents for their passion in their community. He was there when the project broke ground and 13 years of his life have passed. He didn't think it was an option for the staff to recommend denial. The commission has the responsibility to make this go forward, because the third option that they don't discuss is to let it go back to where it is. America is a great land that provides the forum to express their feelings. He didn't agree with everything that has been said, because there is finger-pointing at the developer saying that they just want money. There is not a vehicle that has been shown where that much acreage can be maintained. If there is a way for the larger park they will do it. He wasn't here to argue whether or not the school space is open space. He was here to say let's take quality versus quantity. They have offered a park that requires minimal upkeep and maintenance. It is proven and evident that there isn't enough time, interest, or money from the city to maintain a roundabout. The city doesn't have an appetite to maintain certain sized parks. He didn't have a problem with either of their two options. The residents want open space whether that is littered continually with mattresses, paint cans, pallets, etc., that is an option for 13 more years. The developer has offered two options to finish the project; this is not about money to them.

Zach Jacob asked if it were possible for the city to find funds to maintain a two- to three-acre park in place of the two southern cul-de-sacs as it was shown on the original concept plan, would Peterson be willing to install and dedicate that space per the original concept.

Warren Kirk said that is purely hypothetical because he went to two Open Lands Committee meetings. One of their proposals was to put money in the coffers for development and maintenance for three to five years until it could get in the Capital Improvement Plan. That didn't get a lot of support, so he wasn't optimistic. Secondly, he said they should be careful what they wish for, because the quality may go down with the larger park. He felt that the proposal is one where the passion shown from the residents would love to see it finished. If the city can't quite step up, hopefully they will start doing more with the roundabout and with the smaller park. But when it grows to 2.89 acres they are opening up some concerns. But the city is welcome to come to them with that option and they are open to it.

Zach Jacob understood the dilemma that the city had put the developer and the residents in. The burden to this problem is on the city.

Dan Lawes said there is a history where the city had imposed obligations on the developer, so he asked if that imposes obligations on the city as well.

Tom Burdett said he wasn't here at the time, but it was fairly common when the city reserved open space that the city did so with the intention of providing maintenance. That is what the city did for other developments that were approved at the same time. Regarding this development, he always thought that the map on page 29 that showed parks in both phases was something the city was going to pursue. It was only when the school district bought the property that they started heading in a different direction. The city council will have a challenging decision on this same application regarding how many acres they are willing to maintain. It is more expensive for the public works department to maintain smaller pieces of property, but acquisition by the school district has changed the dynamics and that could be good grounds for maintaining a smaller-sized park.

Zach Jacob asked if there were any other subdivisions that are in the same situation.

Greg Mikolash said this is a special circumstance with the zoning conditions.

Tom Burdett said it is unique, because it is a traditional zoning district rather than a planned zoning district. In a planned zoning district the open space is set by code and implementation goes well. With each subdivision the planning staff and the developer have an understanding of who will provide the maintenance.

Ellen Smith asked if this situation could happen with amenities other than parks.

Tom Burdett said he didn't know of any other conditions or precedents.

Robert Thorup said they are talking about a multi-phased project that leaves the large public facility burden to the end. They have recently tried to address that with development agreements that require a certain amount of the improvements be completed with each phase so it isn't all put to the end.

Zach Jacob asked if the number of homes or lots was specified when the subdivision was approved and if they would be allowed to build 15 more lots if the open space condition is removed.

Tom Burdett said they would adjust the phasing plan, and a development agreement is a great tool that acknowledges what everyone is willing to do.

Zach Jacob thanked the 13 people who spoke on the issue. Each one of those who spoke said they would like the large park that was promised. Just because the city policy has changed it didn't seem to him that the residents should have the burden of dealing with it. This subdivision was allowed to have smaller lots with the requirement that the extra space would be used as a park. If the park is reduced or taken away that is removing the extra space that the residents were counting on.

Sophie Rice liked Option C with the idea that the park is grandfathered and making the city pay for maintenance. This should have been considered when the city decided to change policy.

Dan Lawes said this is a unique situation that won't be applied to every development in the future, so given that uniqueness they need to step out of the black and white and look at some unique approaches.

Ellen Smith agreed. At some point, when the city required the park they must have considered the maintenance, whether or not that is still the plan. She didn't like all of the finger pointing with the city and the developer. She thought there were miscommunications on both sides. She thought that Option C was the best and that the city council will need to answer some questions and make the decisions that the planning commission cannot make. She wanted this issue to be taken care of and then maintained. She asked who is responsible for the current maintenance of the field and if there had been complaints issued.

Tom Burdett said the owner is responsible, and there have been complaints regarding debris.

Ellen Smith said there are two issues. First is the application regarding the park and its maintenance and second is getting help with the issues that plague the field today.

Bill Heiner asked how quickly the residents would get a park if it moves forward.

Dan Lawes said that's not a question they can answer.

Zach Jacob said they hear a lot about how the city doesn't want the smaller parks and their maintenance, which he understood. The park in his neighborhood is not well-maintained. It is matter of public record during the last budget discussions that the city had too much money in the general fund reserves, which is limited to 25% so he felt that the funding for maintenance is almost a non-issue. West Jordan's economy has rebounded nicely. The city planned on this park in 2001 and it must have been budgeted for at one time or another. He didn't think it was too big a burden to find the money to maintain it. He recommended that the citizens call code enforcement regarding the current maintenance for the roundabout and field.

MOTION: **Ellen Smith moved based on the findings set forth in the staff report and the evidence received at the public hearing to recommend to the City Council that they deny Siena Vista Amended Zoning Conditions; 7000 South 5715 West; Peterson Development (applicant) to remove the zoning condition #1 in Ordinance #01-28. The motion was seconded by Zach Jacob and passed 5-0 in favor. David Pack and Lesa Bridge were absent.**

Dan Lawes encouraged the residents to attend the city council meeting for this item that will be held in the future.

****

4. Text Amendment - Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code adding Section 13-15-4 Development Standards of the Zoning Code and 14-5-2 Design and Development Standards for Lots in the Subdivision Code; Questar Gas Company/Rick Hellstrom (applicant) [#TA20140003]

Rick Hellstrom, Questar Gas, 1140 West 200 South, appreciated staff working with them on this issue and for Chapter 15 of the Municipal Code that gives some latitude with siting public utilities. Their text amendment deals with frontage versus access easements into a property. Many times when they site small utility facilities they are able to find property at the rear of a lot, so it doesn't have the required frontage, but they can get an access easement. In their current case there is 25-foot wide by 1-mile long strip of land owned by Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District that precludes them from gaining the necessary frontage. However, they have granted an easement for the entire 100-foot width of the property they propose to subdivide. He could think of two other cases in West Jordan over the last 12-15 years where they purchased property without frontage. This amendment allows them to locate the facility in a place that is suitable for the utility needs and doesn't intrude too much on the property owners' interest and future development. He felt that the amendment would help to clarify the ordinance.

Dan Lawes asked if they had encountered this obstacle in other Utah municipalities.

Rick Hellstrom said every municipality is different, but they have had some unique circumstances.

Larry Gardner read the proposed text to be located in 13-15-4 and 14-5-2. Although this amendment may appear to only benefit Questar, it will benefit all utilities in the future.

Based on the findings set forth in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission discuss and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed text amendment amending Title 13, chapter 15 and Title 14, Chapter 5 as provided in Exhibits B and C attached to the staff report.

Robert Thorup pointed out that the legislative draft in Section 14-5-2G references 13-5-4 but it should be 13-15-4.

Zach Jacob asked if the easement remains even if Jordan Valley Water Conservancy were to sell the property.

Robert Thorup said the easement is an interest in property owned by Questar in this case.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

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

MOTION: Dan Lawes moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the Text Amendment to Section 13-15-4 Development Standards of the Zoning Code and 14-5-2 Design and Development Standards for Lots in the Subdivision Code as addressed in the staff report with the one correction on page 12 of the staff report changing from 13-5-4 to 13-15-4 as noted by Robert Thorup. The motion was seconded by Ellen Smith and passed 5-0 in favor. David Pack and Lesa Bridge were absent.

****

5. Text Amendment – Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code Title 13 to allow for renewable energy systems, adding definitions, and amending the use charts in all districts to remove accessory uses and creating a new accessory use chart; City-wide applicability; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20120006]

Larry Gardner gave a history of the text amendment. The planning commission recommended approval in 2012, but the city council wanted some issues worked out. A joint meeting between the two bodies was held to address those issues. The amendment incorporates those changes and it also removes accessory uses from each zoning table and creates a combined table and ordinance to govern all uses that are accessory to the primary use. One of the changes was to remove wind facilities from residential zones, because they may not be appropriate. However, solar energy systems will be allowed according to the building code.

Based on the findings set forth in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission discuss and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed text amendment Section 13-8-21 Renewable Energy Systems; Section 13-8-3 Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures and all amendments to the use tables for each zone district as presented with the staff report.

Greg Mikolash said there haven't been any requests for permits during this amendment process.

Dan Lawes opened the public hearing.

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

MOTION: Bill Heiner moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed Text Amendment to Section 13-8-21 Renewable Energy Systems, Section 13-8-3 Accessory Uses, Buildings, and Structures, and all amendments to the Use Tables for each zoning district as presented in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Sophie Rice and passed 5-0 in favor. David Pack and Lesa Bridge were absent.

****

David Pack was nominated to represent the planning commission on the CDBG/HOME committee with Zach Jacob as an alternate.

Tom Burdett gave an update on recent city council actions. He also informed the commission that he and Mayor Rolfe had met in an informational setting with the neighbors surrounding The Station at

Gardner Mill and distributed a fact sheet so the residents are better informed when they attend the city council meeting on February 26th.

There was some discussion regarding the procedure for dealing with questions from the public during the hearing. Dan Lawes will try to clarify in the preamble that questions presented during the public testimony will try to be answered by staff or the applicant after the public hearing has been closed.

Ellen Smith suggested and Tom Burdett indicated staff would research wording in the notices that clarifies the approval criteria of the item at hand.

MOTION: Zach Jacob moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at: 7:46 p.m.

DAN LAWES
Chair

ATTEST:

JULIE DAVIS
Executive Assistant
Development Department

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2014