

determining the definition of temporary signs was brought up numerous times during the course of discussion. Mayor McDonald asked for the Planning Commission to look at the temporary sign definition and build off of that.

Mark Smedley addressed time limits on political signs. He indicated that political signs need to be treated the same as you would temporary signs. You can't put a duration time on political signs unless you do so on all temporary signs. There are three different categories:

1. Private property; it is very difficult to tell a politician or a private property owner that they have to take a sign down during a certain period of time.
2. Public property; you are able to restrict a little more.
3. Commercial Property; limitation on number of signs, location, and size may be allowed. You can't regulate content and any private person who wants to put a sign up can do so for as long as they want to.

Mark Smedley was to look into size restrictions on private property because there are size restrictions on commercial signs.

Other discussion and comments were:

- There may be a conflict with putting temporary signs in the same category with political signs;
- Removal of signs. Define: Pre-event, during event, after event; one of the main problems for political signs is the time period between the primary and the general election.
- For political signs the option of having the politician file a voluntary good candidate statement;

Anthony Kohler indicated he and Mark Smedley could put together an ordinance and bring it to the Planning Commission for review. Electronic readerboards were also discussed briefly. There was a decision to tackle this in depth at another time. Discussion points:

- Grandfathering is a problem with those who don't qualify;
- Amortize and then discrepancies no longer exist;
- The ordinance needs to be cleaned up; a universal ordinance will keep everyone on track.

Anthony Kohler then reviewed with the Council the topics the Planning Commission had recently been discussing at their meetings. Parking for the downtown area and using a redevelopment district to building parking lots downtown was mentioned. A suggestion was made to hold a joint meeting to discuss this further. Other topics discussed briefly were the possibility of an administrative law judge for zoning issues and working on a vision statement. Varying opinions were expressed when it came to the topic of open space and transfer of development rights (TDRs). A suggestion was made to talk about this, particularly the topic of TDRs as opposed to a transfer fee, with Wasatch County at the Interlocal meeting on April 15th.

Item 2 **Discuss proposed amendment to Section 18.68.601 through 606 regarding Residential Facilities for Handicapped Persons.**

Anthony Kohler indicated that Craig Chambers and Mark Smedley had put together an ordinance relating to residential facilities for disabled persons. Recent case law at the federal and state levels has changed and the City needs to change the ordinance to make the ordinance legal. Danny Warner who owns Chateau Recovery spoke on this topic and explained his program. Warner indicated there is a legal status of disability. He expressed that there does need to be some way for the City to control a facility and make sure it is being run properly.

The City Council was dismissed at this time, approximately 8:26 p.m.

The following points were discussed:

- The International Building Code dictates some of the requirements relating to square footage; limiting to 16 people.
- State Statute has redefined the definition of family; the City needs to review the city ordinance to make sure the definition of family contained in the ordinance does not conflict;
- Conditional uses can not be applied to group homes;
- Regulation is needed; the following points were mentioned:
 - How can we ensure proper operators?
 - Ensure we don't have problems such as 16 renters in a house;
 - Participants are in recovery and not currently addicted - and are being tested;
 - Undue concentration of police response indicates a problem; the City needs to have the ability to close down a facility if there are problems.
 - Option to require a business license but waive the fee;
 - The program has a requirement for Vocational Rehab;
 - What control do we legally have? How can we make the business owner be responsible to have the people at the facility who are supposed to be at the facility? Have Mark Smedley conduct research and determine what regulation can be done through business licensing needs to be looked at as well.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

The amended annual meeting schedule was reviewed. There was brief discussion on a downtown redevelopment district. Commissioner Zane mentioned other items for possible discussion at future meetings:

- Rental garages;
- Kennels and dogs;
- Building height;
- Landscaping and trees; particularly for large parking lots, including church parking lots.

Commissioner Webb motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:08 p.m.