

NORTH OGDEN PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

June 21, 2017

The North Ogden Planning Commission convened in a regular meeting on June 21, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. in the North Ogden City Municipal Building, 505 E. 2600 N. North Ogden, Utah. Notice of time, place and agenda of the meeting was furnished to each member of the Planning Commission, posted on the bulletin board at the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on June 16, 2017. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 1, 2017.

COMMISSIONERS:

Don Waite	Chairman
Eric Thomas	Vice-Chairman
Brandon Mason	Commissioner
Steven Prisbrey	Commissioner
Nicole Nancarrow	Commissioner
Blake Cevering	Commissioner
Scott Barker	Commissioner

STAFF:

Rob Scott	City Planner
Brandon Bell	Planner 1
Monalisa Wald	Planning Assistant
Jon Call	Attorney

VISITORS:

Barbara Rowley	Richard Van Driel	Chaarie Van Driel	Lou Jean Findlay
Marilyn Griffin	Sharon Eva	B.J. Foster	Joanne Holmes
Ava Felt	Sherry Fritschle	Anna Chadwell	John Fritschle
Tracy Drollinger	David Wallace	Marlene Welling	McLane Felt
Anna Kennedy	Rick Magness	Elizabeth Hunt	Linda Webber

REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Waite called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. Vice-Chairman Thomas offered the invocation and Chairman Waite led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. ROLL CALL

Chairman Waite conducted roll call and indicated all Planning Commissioners were in attendance.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

Commissioner Nancarrow noted that the minutes indicate that City Administrator/City Attorney Call was not present during the meeting, but she believed he was actually in attendance and the minutes should be amended to reflect his presence. Mr. Call stated that he was in attendance for the Field Trip portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Mason moved to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2017 meeting as presented. Commissioner Nancarrow seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Vice-Chairman Thomas	yes
Commissioner Nancarrow	yes
Commissioner Cevering	yes
Commission Mason	yes

The motion carried.

3. OPENING MEETING STATEMENT

City Planner Scott read the open meeting statement as approved by the Planning Commission prior to commencing discussion of administrative and legislative items.

4. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS OR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST TO DISCLOSE

Chairman Waite asked if any member needs to declare a conflict of interest or disclose any ex parte communications in which they have engaged. He indicated that he was

contacted by Brian and Dennis Shupe who both indicated they could not attend the meeting this evening and asked for advice on how to communicate their concerns to the Planning Commission. He stated he advised them to provide their comments in written form to Planning Assistant Wald. All other Commissioners indicated they had no ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There were no public comments.

6. **Administrative Items:**

There were no administrative items listed on the agenda.

7. **Legislative Items:**

- a. **ZMA 2017-02 Public hearing to consider a legislative application for a rezone to property located at approximately 2550 North and Washington Blvd from Multi-Family Residential R-4 to Commercial C-2.**

A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained that when the Planning Commission is acting as a recommending body to the City Council, it is acting in a legislative capacity and has wide discretion. Examples of legislative actions are general plan, zoning map, and land use text amendments. Legislative actions require that the Planning Commission give a recommendation to the City Council. Typically the criteria for making a decision related to a legislative matter require compatibility with the general plan and existing codes.

The applicant submitted an application to rezone two properties at the southwest corner of 2550 North and Washington Boulevard from R-4 to C-2 in order to build a gas station / convenience store. A site plan and boundary line adjustment will be reviewed later. There are two homes on the two parcels. One of the homes has been used as a dental office.

Maverik sponsored an open house on June 13, 2017 to receive input from the Three Fountains Condominium residents.

The memo discussed the application's conformance with the General Plan; the General Plan map shows this area as: "Main Street Commercial. Commercial or mixed use commercial uses with a direct orientation to the street/sidewalk. These uses should have little or no setback from the public right of way." This rezone application is consistent with that designation.

The General Plan Zoning and Land Use Policy has the following applicable guidelines:

Zoning and Land-Use Policy

The following policy consists of general statements to be used as guidelines. Such guidelines may on occasion conflict, when several are compared. In such cases, the Planning Commission should prioritize the guidelines as they pertain to the specific parameters of the issue which is pending. All zoning requests should first be evaluated for their compliance with the General Plan.

General Guidelines:

- A definite edge should be established between the types of uses to protect the integrity of each use, except where the mixing of uses is recommended in the General Plan.

Staff Comment: The area proposed to be rezoned is bordered on the west and south by the Three Fountains Condominium project and by 2550 North and Washington Boulevard on the north and east. The site plan will need to address an appropriate buffer to the Three Fountains Condominium.

- Zoning should reflect the existing use of property to the greatest extent possible, unless the area is in transition, or is in conflict with the General Plan.

Staff Comment: The properties along Washington Boulevard are transitioning to commercial and multi-family uses.

- Where possible, properties which face each other, across a local street, should be the same or a similar zone. Collector and arterial roads may be sufficient buffers to warrant different zones.

Staff Comment: Properties along Washington Boulevard are a combination of commercial and residential uses. The properties to the north and east are zoned commercial. The Three Fountains project is zoned residential.

- Zoning boundaries should not cut across individual lots or developments (i.e., placing the lot in two separate zones). Illogical boundaries should be redrawn to follow property or established geographical lines.

Staff Comment: The proposed zoning will not cross property lines once the needed boundary line adjustment is approved combining the two parcels.

- The primary frontage and land use should be considered when establishing zoning boundaries on corner lots.

Staff Comment: The proposal is on a corner lot. The primary frontage is on Washington Boulevard and is consistent with the zoning on the east side of Washington.

- The Planning Commission may choose to use mixed use, multiple family, or professional office zoning as a buffer between commercial and residential uses.

Staff Comment: The decision to allow this zoning should provide for an appropriate buffer to the Three Fountains project.

- Any non-residential zone abutting residential zones should be a mixed use, or planned zone (e.g., CP-2, MP- 1) to help minimize the impacts on residential zones. Transitions between uses should be carefully thought through.

Staff Comment: The request is for the C-2 zone; however, the same standards apply to the C-2 zone as the CP-2 zone.

Commercial Guidelines:

- Generally commercial zones should be located along Washington Blvd. and 2700 North streets, avoiding local streets which serve residential zones. Access to commercial zones should avoid local streets within residential zones.

Staff Comment: The proposed project fronts onto Washington Boulevard and 2550 North, a collector street.

- Adhere to the General Plan recommendations for the Downtown and Southtown.

Staff Comment: The proposed zoning is consistent with the Main Street Commercial designation.

- If compatible with the General Plan, existing businesses on collectors and arterials should be allowed to expand while providing an adequate buffer with adjacent residential zones.

Staff Comment: The proposed zoning will allow the transition to a commercial use; the site plan will provide a buffer to the Three Fountains project.

- Encourage commercial uses to be developed with a focus toward walkable streets, with buildings approaching the sidewalk, rather than as standard strip commercial with parking adjacent to the road.

Staff Comment: The proposed use is primarily an auto oriented use. This guideline will need to be balanced with the other guidelines.

- Consider development agreements to assure higher quality development.

Staff Comment: A development agreement is not proposed; however, the site plan review process will identify the site and building standards.

- Promote mixed use developments.

Staff Comment: The proposed zoning is for commercial only.

The memo summarized the following potential Planning Commission considerations:

- Is the proposal consistent with the General Plan?
- Does the proposal meet the North Ogden Zoning ordinance standards?
- How does the proposal relate to the Zoning and Land Use Policy guidelines?

The memo concluded staff feels the Planning Commission can find that the proposed rezone from R-4 to C-2 is consistent with the General Plan and recommend adoption by the City Council.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo. He noted that following publication of the packet for this meeting and his staff report, he has received comments from citizens who are concerned about traffic associated with the proposed use; he provided traffic statistics for the area in vicinity of the intersection of 2550 North and Washington Boulevard. 2550 North is a collector street and Washington Boulevard is an arterial street. There are currently over 20,000 trips per day on Washington Boulevard, with 2,855 trips per day on 2550 North. The capacity of 2550 North is 10,500 trips per day, so there is a considerable amount of capacity available on that street. Calculations available for this type of land use indicate it could generate approximately 1,640 trips per day. Staff believes that the majority of the increase in trips per day associated with the Maverik store will be associated with Washington Boulevard and not 2550 North. He reported the traffic data presented is taken from traffic manuals that calculate capacity for roads based upon their designation and width.

Commissioner Covering asked if the entrances and exits to the store would be located on Washington Boulevard or 2550 North. Mr. Scott stated there would be one access point on each

street; the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) has granted approval for an access point on Washington Boulevard.

Commissioner Mason asked if an increase in traffic on 2550 North that would take the trips per day to 100 percent of capacity would be catastrophic or reasonable. Mr. Scott stated that traffic engineers use a system to rank roadways based upon functionality; they use a grading system containing the numbers A through F. The letter "A" indicates free flowing traffic and the letter "F" indicates gridlock. He stated that he has no indication of the rank that would be assigned to 2550 North if traffic were at capacity, but he reiterated that there is adequate capacity available to accommodate the traffic that would be associated with a Maverik store. He then noted the Washington Boulevard widening project is in the design phase and it includes reconfiguration of the intersection to the north of the subject property to accommodate increased traffic. Mr. Call added that a "C" rank in the scale referenced by Mr. Scott is the target level of service that municipalities typically strive to achieve. High level discussion among the Commission and staff centered on design standards that can be imposed on the development to address traffic issues, with a focus on the subject property's close proximity to nearby schools. Mr. Scott concluded the policy decision before the Commission should be based upon what is the appropriate zoning for the property and design and construction details will be considered at a future date.

Commissioner Nancarrow referenced the nearby dental office and asked if the property that houses that use is zoned commercial. Mr. Scott stated that property is zoned R-4, which allows for professional office land uses.

Elizabeth Hunt stated she is representing the applicant, Maverik, and noted she first wanted to express her gratitude to City staff and indicated they have been great to work with. She then stated that she believes that the zone change request is in compliance with the City's General Plan and is compatible with zoning of surrounding properties. She noted that since the subject property abuts residential property, Maverik would provide a defined edge between the two land uses. Last week representatives of Maverik met with the residents of the Three Fountains Condominium development and they heard their concerns regarding safety, traffic, and buffering between the commercial and residential properties. She stated that Maverik will continue to allow the residents to have input on the design of the project as it moves through the additional steps of the City's project application process.

Chairman Waite opened the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

Sharon Eva, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #7, stated that she and other residents would like to know if a traffic study has been completed and, if so, when that study was completed. She stated that if the study is done while school is out of session, the results are flawed. She added there is a great amount of traffic in the area related to the North Shore Aquatic Center as well. She noted the residents are very concerned about traffic safety in the neighborhood; when school is in session, the residents are 'held hostage' two times each day during peak traffic times. She stated the residents just have one way in and one way out of the Three Fountains development and if motorists are allowed to turn left out of Maverik onto 2550 N., that will be problematic and worsen the traffic conditions. She added she is also concerned about light pollution from the Maverik store into the Three Fountains units, which is a two-level development. She concluded

that Ms. Hunt referenced the buffer between the two properties, but she would like some assurance that any barrier installed will in fact be tall enough to mitigate negative impacts. She asked if the development would impact property taxes for the residents of Three Fountains and whether it could lead to further development to the west that would result in reduction of the size of the Three Fountains development.

Commissioner Mason asked if the one access point referenced by Ms. Eva is on Washington Boulevard or 2550 North. Ms. Eva stated that it is on 2550 North; there is a gated entrance on Washington Boulevard, but several years ago there was a bad traffic accident at that access point and the gate has remained locked since. Commissioner Mason then asked if traffic associated with the nearby school backs up to the point that it blocks the access point for Three Fountains. Ms. Eva answered yes and stated that the line of vehicles usually extends beyond the Three Fountains access point.

Anna Chadwell, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #14, stated that two years ago she was at the intersection near Three Fountains and a car coming from the north hit and totaled her car and sent her to the hospital with broken ribs and a broken clavicle. She stated that she has lived in her home for eight years and she has always expressed her concerns about traffic and dangerous activity at the intersection. She stated that as far as she is concerned, this is a bad situation.

John Fritschle, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #16, stated that there is a real problem with the traffic coming out of the Smith's shopping center because there is no left hand turn arrow giving those motorists the right-of-way. Many motorists try to make left hand turns when pedestrians are in the crosswalk and there are many pedestrians that have nearly been hit and he himself has been clipped a few times but he was unable to get the license numbers of the cars. He stated that he avoids the area in the evening hours because cars travelling to the west are blinded by the sunset and the situation is very dangerous. He stated that without a left turn arrow regulating the traffic, someone will be killed. He stated that the Three Fountains development houses mostly residents over the age of 70 and many of them do not have driver's licenses; they walk to Smith's to get their groceries and they are taking their lives in their hands to do so.

Joanne Holmes, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #112, stated that if the property is rezoned, she would ask for a 20-foot concrete barrier between Three Fountains and whatever is built on the subject property.

Linda Webber, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #11, first expressed her gratitude for the new light poles and flower baskets on Washington Boulevard. She stated they are beautiful. She then stated that one of her concerns associated with this application relates to traffic; when traffic congestion worsens she wondered how the fire trucks will get out of the Fire Station and to the emergency they are responding to.

DJ Foster, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #110, stated that her biggest concern relates to the sidewalk accommodations on 2550 N.; there is currently a very small sidewalk on one side of the street. There are new condominiums being constructed in the area and more kids will be added to the area and when they are walking to school they do not pay close attention. She is very concerned about the safety of children walking to and from school.

Rick Magnus, 157 S. State Street, Suite 800, stated he represents Maverik and he wished to respond to concerns expressed regarding traffic. He stated he attended the meeting mentioned earlier by Ms. Hunt. He stated he also met with representatives of the Fire Department as well and they indicated they average 15 calls in a 24-hour period and they have experienced issues with traffic stacking from the school, but motorists always move when necessary to allow fire apparatus to exit the station. He stated that he understands the concern residents have about school traffic blocking their entrance and the fact that traffic from Maverik may exacerbate that situation, but he is not sure Maverik can address that because they propose to locate ingress and egress as far away from the corner where the safety concerns are centered. He stated that Maverik has been working with UDOT to address traffic issues at the corner and they will provide a deceleration lane on Washington Boulevard and additional measures will be considered to address traffic on 2550 North. Additionally, the project will result in decreased access points off of both Washington Boulevard and 2550 North; there will be just one controlled access point per roadway. He then noted that convenience stores capture existing traffic rather than generate new traffic. Maverik has constructed over 300 stores and they average a 65 percent capture rate while generating under 40 percent of the overall traffic capacity. For an infill project such as this one, Maverik must ensure the project is safe and convenient; if a store is not convenient, people will not visit it.

Commissioner Mason asked if Maverik has considered the accessibility of the site by large delivery and fuel trucks. Mr. Magnus answered yes; Maverik uses a tool known as a truck turning template and if a fuel truck can access a site, make its delivery, and exit the site safely, all other trucks can as well.

Commissioner Covering asked if the employees of the North View Fire Department were comfortable with the project proposal. Mr. Magnus clarified that he has visited with five of the Fire Fighters from the station and all of them were in favor of the project and look forward to the infill project. They did not have a concern about the access to the site.

Sherry Fritschle, 325 E. 2550 N., Unit #16, echoed the previous comments made about traffic; the underlying issue is that the residents are concerned that the project will impact their quality of life. Many of them walk and rely upon bus service and additional vehicles in the area will make that more difficult. Some residents may have lights shining in their windows all night long. The residents already put up with the noise and lights from the Aquatic Center during the summer months, which is so bad that other residents move out of their homes in the summer.

Jean Findlay, 325 E. 2550 N., stated that the one thing she asked Maverik about was the capacity of the underground tank they will use on their property. She was told that it was 25,000 gallons and she hopes it does not leak.

There were no additional persons appearing to be heard.

Vice Chair Thomas moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion.

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Vice-Chairman Thomas	yes
Commissioner Nancarrow	yes
Commissioner Cevering	yes
Commission Mason	yes

The motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 7:28 p.m.

b. ZMA 2017-02 Consideration and action on a legislative application to consider a rezone to property located at approximately 2550 North and Washington Blvd from Multi-Family Residential R-4 to Commercial C-2.

Mr. Call stated it would be important to explain to those in attendance tonight exactly what the action before the Planning Commission is and what future steps and applications will be considered relative to this project. Chairman Waite explained that the Planning Commission is considering the zoning tonight; many of the issues that have been raised by the residents are the types of issues that would be dealt with at the site plan phase of the project. He stated that if the rezone is approved, the applicant will begin working on an engineered site plan. The comments made tonight will be included in the record of this meeting and the City Planner and other staff members will take those comments into consideration as they review subsequent applications related to the project. He stated that relative to the lighting issue, the City has adopted a dark sky initiative that requires lighting to be directed downwards to prevent light pollution. He then added that the Planning Commission is not the approval authority for this type of application and only has the authority to make a positive or negative recommendation to the City Council. City Council will have final approval of the zone change, but site plan approval can be considered by the Planning Commission. Additionally, there are at least four or five more steps in the application process before final approval could be granted for the project.

Commissioner Mason moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding application ZMA 2017-02, application for rezone of property located at approximately 2550 North and Washington Boulevard from Multi-Family Residential R-4 to Commercial C-2. Commissioner Nancarrow seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

Commissioner Mason visited the subject property today and sat in his vehicle for some time to observe traffic. He noted his first thought was that the property would be a good location for a convenience store, but then he wondered about the impact that the lights would have on the adjacent residential properties in the evening hours. He wondered if the rezone of the property would worsen the traffic problems in the area and he does not believe that it will make the situation fundamentally worse. He stated that if the zone were not changed and the property were to be developed with a land use permitted in the R-4 zone the problems would not be eliminated

and he thinks that is something the Planning Commission should consider as they determine the appropriate recommendation to forward to the City Council. He emphasized that the Planning Commission is simply considering zoning of the property tonight and not the final development product.

Commissioner Barker asked if the City may have any control over modifying the traffic signal and other lighting at the intersection. Mr. Call answered no and indicated that UDOT has total control over those issues as Washington Boulevard is a State road.

Commissioner Prisbrey asked if the Maverik will be open 24 hours per day. Ms. Hunt stated it is slated to be open 24 hours per day, seven days per week.

Commissioner Barker asked if Maverik has given any thought to the manner in which a buffer between the property and the residential development to the west will be designed. Vice-Chairman Thomas encouraged the Commission to focus on the zone change; the applicant is not prepared to answer site plan questions and the Planning Commission has not seen any conceptual plans for the project.

Commissioner Nancarrow stated that she feels for the residents of the Three Fountains development, but she seconded the motion because she is trying to consider the 'big picture' for the entire City. The General Plan has designated the property for main street commercial use in the future and this type of business is the type of business that was envisioned when the General Plan was established. She stated that it is unrealistic to think that any resident living near a property that could be developed for commercial use in the future would not be impacted in some way, but the zone change is ultimately in accordance with the City's General Plan.

Chairman Waite stated that development is driving the change in zoning, which is appropriate.

Commissioner Mason stated that the Commission received four letters regarding the application and he asked that the record reflect that he read the letters; he noted there were two letters in favor of the rezone and two letters in opposition and he briefly summarized the letters, indicating that those in opposition are reflective of the comments that were made during tonight's public hearing.

The Commission engaged in high level discussion regarding Commissioner Mason's motion, after which Chairman Waite called for a vote::

Voting on the motion:

Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Vice-Chairman Thomas	yes
Commissioner Nancarrow	yes
Commissioner Cevering	yes
Commission Mason	yes

The motion carried.

Commissioner Mason indicated that his motion was based on the finding that the application is consistent with the General Plan of the City, with the condition that an appropriate barrier be installed between the commercial and residential land uses, and that traffic issues continue to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Scott then informed the residents in attendance that the City Council will likely not consider the rezone application until later in the month of July.

Mr. Call asked that the record reflect that the residents from the Three Fountains group have been very professional and respectful; he has been so impressed by the love they have for their community and for the manner in which they have been able to organize themselves and work with the City and Maverik as the applicant in a civil manner. Several Planning Commissioners echoed Mr. Call's comments and assured the residents of Three Fountains that the Planning Commission has heard their concerns and understands the difficulties associated with growth.

****The meeting recessed briefly to provide for the opportunity to capture a photograph of the Planning Commission as a body. The meeting reconvened at 8:00 p.m.****

c. Discussion regarding Large Accessory Buildings.

City Planner Bell provided a brief overview of the history of the Planning Commission's discussions regarding City regulations for large accessory buildings, culminating with a field trip to visit the sites of large accessory buildings in the City. He used the aid of a document containing nine questions for which he would like a response from the Commission in order to inform the process staff will follow to develop a proposed ordinance for the Planning Commission to consider at a future date. The nine questions were:

Discussion Questions For Consideration Regarding Accessory Buildings Setbacks

1) Should there be a different standard for setbacks for accessory buildings, on a double-fronted lot, when across from institutional uses or commercial uses instead of residential uses?

2) Should there be two separate standards for maximum height; one for maximum wall height and one for maximum roof height (as opposed to just one for overall height?)

- In other words, does the wall height of a building have a significant enough impact on a neighbor, since it is vertical and closer to the property line than a roof (which slopes away from the property line), that it deserves it's own standard for maximum height?

3) Should surrounding topography / elevation matter?

- Should topography be factored into the maximum height, (i.e. as an example... the tallest height be no greater than 25' above the average/median elevation of the curb, road adjacent to

the rear property line, or rear property line), which would allow extra height for yards which are lower in elevation in portions of the yards other than near the rear or side property line?

4) Should vehicular access from the rear property line be allowed to an accessory building unit?

5) What drawbacks for a property owner exist due to being required to put the building close to the center of their yard (as currently required by our setbacks for accessory buildings), due to our existing setback standards?

- Does this suggest there should be an adjustment or exception to the required vegetative area requirement?

6) How can we balance the rights and interests of the property owner who wants to put the accessory building on their property with the impacts to the adjacent property owners?

7) Should there be different setbacks for different heights or numbers of stories?

(There currently are 2 different setback standards depending on the height of the building, but should these be adjusted?)

8) How much do high-quality aesthetics minimize the impacts of wall height or an accessory building being closer to an adjacent property line?

- Can more stringent aesthetic requirements compensate for an accessory building being allowed to be closer to the property line? In other words, if aesthetic requirements are written more stringently should the side or rear setback be allowed to be lessened?

9) Similarly, should accessory buildings that meet higher/additional aesthetic standards, (such as certain materials such as brick or stucco) be able to be closer to the side setback, than other buildings??

Mr. Bell, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Call then facilitated a discussion among the Commission to solicit answers to the questions. Mr. Bell summarized the feedback provided by the body and indicated Planning staff will use the feedback received to begin working on an ordinance that would change the regulations for large accessory buildings.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments.

9. REMARKS FROM PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Mason commented on the popularity of the pickleball courts in Pleasant View City.

10. **REPORT OF THE CITY PLANNER**

Mr. Bell provided the Planning Commission with a status report on the form based code project, and, specifically, the Council's interest in the project as expressed during the joint meeting between the City Council and Planning Commission that was held June 20. He indicated he would like to schedule three to four meetings over the course of the next several months to review sections of the form based code document before it is presented to the City Council for consideration.

11. **REMARKS FROM CITY ATTORNEY**

There were no additional comments from the City Attorney.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Mason moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice-Chairman Thomas seconded the motion. All voted in favor.


Voting on the motion:

Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Prisbrey	yes
Vice-Chairman Thomas	yes
Commissioner Nancarrow	yes
Commissioner Cevering	yes
Commission Mason	yes


The motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm



Planning Commission Chair



Monalisa Wald
Planning Assistant



Date approved