MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2023, IN THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PARTICIPATING: Lisa Fowler, Vice-Chair
Commission Member Gary Ogden
Alternate Commission Member Laura Fidler

EXCUSED: Andrew Adams, Chair
Commission Member Kendra Shirey
Commission Member Susan Nixon
Commission Member Mary Squire
Alternate Commission Member Shivam Shah

STAFF PRESENT: Jennifer Jastremsky, Community Development Director
Todd Draper, Planning Manager
Todd Taylor, Planner III
Mike Barker, City Attorney
Spence DuShane, Assistant City Attorney
Brien Maxfield, Senior Engineering Manager
Amie Salazar, Office Manager

6:30 PM Business Meeting

In the absence of Chair Andrew Adams, Vice-Chair Lisa Fowler assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order.

1. Items for Commission Consideration.

A. Action Item: Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for October 26, 2023. (Administrative Action).

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for October 26, 2023.

Second: Commissioner Fidler.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

B. Action Item: Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for November 9, 2023. (Administrative Action).

Motion: Commissioner Fidler moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for November 9, 2023.

Second: Commissioner Ogden.

DRAFT

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

C. Action Item: Vote for the 2024 Chair and Vice-Chair.

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to ELECT Andrew Adams as Chairman of the Draper City Planning Commission for the Year 2024.

Second: Commissioner Fidler.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to RE-ELECT Lisa Fowler as Vice-Chair of the Draper City Planning Commission for the Year 2024.

Second: Commissioner Fidler.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

D. Public Hearing: City-Initiated Public Works Accessory Building Site Plan Amendment and Deviations Request (Administrative Action)
On the request of Draper City, Request for Approval of a Site Plan Amendment and Deviation in the M1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone Regarding the Construction of an Accessory Building on Approximately 10.56 Acres, located at 72 East Sivogah Court. Known as Application 2023-4627-SP, 2023-4631-VAR. Staff Contact: Todd Taylor, 801576-6510, todd.taylor@draperutah.gov.

Planner III, Todd Taylor presented the Staff Report and stated that the request is for a Site Plan Amendment and Deviations Request. The site is located at 72 East Sivogah, which is north of 14600 South and east of I-15. An aerial map of the site was displayed showing the main Public Works Building. The Land Use Map was displayed to show that the site is designated as Community Commercial. The Zoning Map showed the site zoning as M1 Light Industrial. The Site Plan was displayed to show the proposed location of the accessory building to the west of the main building along the west property line as well as the revised landscaped and parking areas. The deviations requested were to three of the requirements. The first was to the requirement for three colors. Two were proposed. Deviations were also requested to the materials. The Code requires two primary materials while one is proposed. A deviation was also requested to the building orientation. The building is not facing the street but the main Public Works Building. Mr. Taylor clarified that the Site Plan is being amended to include the accessory building, the landscaped area, and the parking area.

Senior Engineering Manager, Brien Maxfield, reported that the City has outgrown the site and is actively pursuing other opportunities to either construct a new operations facility or expand the existing one. The deviations were proposed so that the building would match the other existing buildings and because it is less costly to construct it that way. He noted that there are no temporary facilities within the Code so it is being constructed with an eye that the future Public Works Operations Building may not need this accessory building depending on how the site is laid out.

Vice-Chair Fowler opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Ogden had no objections to the proposal as it is back off the road and deep within the footprint of the property. He thought it made sense to have the proposed structure face the existing building rather than the road.

Commissioner Fidler asked how it compares to the other two buildings that it will be next to. Mr. Maxfield stated that the other two buildings are garage and storage areas where pipe and construction materials are stored. The proposed building will be nicer than the two that currently exist on the site. The proposed building was not expected to be used longer than a few years at the most. It will be a modular building but once it is installed it will require significant effort to move.

Vice-Chair Fowler asked about the criteria to allow the deviations. Mr. Taylor referenced page six of the Staff Report, which requires three of the criteria to be met to approve the design modification. The landscaped area exceeds the minimum required by 10%. Pages 6 and 7 list the five criteria that staff believes the request meets.

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to APPROVE the Deviation Request from the exterior colors, materials, and building orientation requirements as requested by Draper City Application 2023-4631-VAR based on the following findings:

1. **The requested deviations are consistent with the purpose and intent of the development standards of the applicable zoning district or land use category.**

2. **The proposed development satisfies at least three (3) of the criteria listed in DCMC 9-22-030(B).**

Second: Commissioner Fidler.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Commissioner Fidler moved to APPROVE the Site Plan Amendment as requested by Draper City Application 2023-4627-SP based on the following findings:

1. **The Site Plan reflects the full development of the property.**

2. **The Site Plan with approval of the deviation requests conforms to applicable standards set forth in the ordinance, including but not limited to, building heights, setbacks, access points, parking, landscaping, and building materials.**

3. **The proposed development plans meet the intent, goals, and objectives of the General Plan and the purpose of the M1 zoning district in which the site is located.**

4. **The public facilities and services in the area are adequate to support the subject development, as required by engineering standards and specifications.**

5. **The proposed development plans will comply with the engineering standards found in Titles 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, and 18 of the Draper City Municipal Code, including traffic, stormwater drainage, and utilities concerns.**

Second: **Commissioner Ogden.**

Vote: **A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

E. Public Hearing: City-Initiated Bluffdale Deannexation Zoning and Land Use Map Amendment (Legislative Action)

On the request of Draper City to amend the Zoning and Land Use Maps to remove from the maps 0.889 acres of property located approximately at 600 West 14600 South. The property is currently zoned M1 (Light Manufacturing) and has a Cultural/Institutional Land Use designation. Applications 2023-4628-MA, 2023-4629MA. Staff contact is Jennifer Jastremsky, 801-576-6328, jennifer.jastremsky@draperutah.gov.

Community Development Director, Jennifer Jastremsky, reported that the property is located on the boundary between Bluffdale and Draper cities next to the former prison property. The property owner also owns the property directly to the south which is within Bluffdale City. Currently, the two cities are looking at adjusting the municipal boundary so that the entire property that is owned by the property owner is in Bluffdale. The portion they own in Draper is landlocked and unbuildable. The property owner owns a substantial amount of property in Bluffdale City and is looking to develop it. The preference is for all of the property to be in one municipality.

In October, the City Council approved a Notice of Intent to adjust the common boundary between Bluffdale and Draper. The request tonight is to adjust the zoning and land use maps with the intent for the matter to be addressed by the City Council the same night as the boundary adjustment. The property will be removed entirely from the map. When Bluffdale City annexes the property into its boundary it will have to be added to the Bluffdale City Land Use and Zoning Maps.

Vice-Chair Fowler asked why the Zoning and Land Use Maps have to be changed in advance of annexing the property. Ms. Jastremsky stated that the matter will be addressed at the same City Council Meeting as the boundary adjustment. If the Council decides not to adjust the boundary, they will not approve the Rezone and Land Use Map Amendment. It was noted that the City Council will make a decision on the boundary adjustment and remove it from the map. If the boundary adjustment is approved, the property will need to be removed from Draper City's Zoning and Land Use Maps. Ms. Jastremsky did not know the history of the property but assumed the parcel was left over when the State was acquiring land for the prison property.

Vice-Chair Fowler opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Ogden commented that the property is landlocked and has no use for the landowner. He considered what was proposed to make the most sense.

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Zoning Map Amendment as requested by Draper City for the City-initiated Bluffdale Deannexation Zoning Map Amendment, Application 2023-4628-MA based on the following findings:

1. **The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.**

2. **The proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.**

3. **The proposed amendment is consistent with the standards of any applicable overlay zone.**

4. **The proposed amendment will not adversely affect adjacent property.**

5. **There will be adequate facilities and services intended to serve the subject property within Bluffdale City. Given the property being landlocked, Draper City cannot provide services to this property. Services include, but are not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.**

6. **The proposed amendment complies with DCMC Section 9-2-020(F).**

Second: Commissioner Fidler.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Commissioner Fidler moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Land Use Map Amendment as requested by Draper City for the City-initiated Bluffdale Deannexation Land Use Map Amendment, Application 2023-4629-MA based on the following findings:

1. **The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.**

2. **The proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.**

3. **The proposed amendment is consistent with the standards of any applicable overlay zone.**

4. **The proposed amendment will not adversely affect adjacent property.**

5. **There will be adequate facilities and services intended to serve the subject property within Bluffdale City. Given the property being landlocked, Draper City cannot provide services to this property. Services include, but are not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.**

6. **The proposed amendment complies with DCMC Section 9-2-020(F).**

Second: Commissioner Ogden.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

F. Public Hearing: Radnet Corporate Office Building Site Plan Request (Administrative Action)

On the request of Brent Harris, representing Harris Architecture, Wendel and Trudy Gibby, and Radnet Properties, LLC, for a Site Plan Request including requests for deviations from building design standards, on a 2.75-acre property, approximately 39 W. 11400 S., known as application SPR-59-2021, Staff Contact: Todd A. Draper, (801) 576-6335, todd.draper@draperutah.gov.

Planning Manager, Todd Draper, presented the Staff Report and stated that the request is for a Site Plan Application that includes deviations from the building design standards. The property was identified on a vicinity map displayed and consists of three individual parcels. The proposed Site Plan shows access from State Street with a central building toward the western portion of the property with access and parking around it. The Record of Survey shows an existing access

easement. The property was formerly owned by the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") before it was sold as surplus and the easement into the property was granted. The proposed Landscaping Plan and elevations were also presented. The application was presented initially in 2021. As a result, it qualifies under the former standards for requesting a deviation to height limitations. The deviation criteria provided in the Staff Report are from that time period.

Mr. Draper reported that the lower levels are mostly stone with glass on the upper floors. The design also includes the required horizontal and vertical articulation. The basement plan includes a ramp from the south to the north and underground parking. The stone will include two different faces with the same color. Mr. Draper stated that the conditions enumerated in the Staff Report need to be tied back to the elevation drawings and the materials specified. An example of the window glass that will be required near any of the pedestrian walkways where transparency is required was described.

The criteria required to meet the height deviation were reviewed and cannot have a material adverse effect on the character of the area and the public health and general welfare. The height range must also be compatible with the use and development of neighboring properties with respect to scale and massing. The building will be designed to relate to the human scale and incorporate at least one of the following three features:

1. Architectural detailing including on the ground floor to emphasize the pedestrian level of the building.

2. Architectural detailing at the cornice level or accentuated building zones.

3. Roofline architectural features that give it a distinctive form or skyline.

The findings for the materials deviation were reviewed. The only primary material that the building will be constructed of will be stone, which is over 90% because windows are not counted. Three colors, as required, were shown on the updated drawings. The 10 options were identified with the Commission finding at least three. Staff found that items 6, 9, and 10 meet the standard. The Planning Commission will have to find that the variations are consistent with the purpose of the chapter and any applicable master plan or ordinance. The applicants believe it is a Transit-Oriented development. Staff does not feel it meets that. Mr. Draper explained that there is a bus stop one-half mile to the west but getting to it requires crossing under I-15. It is not very accessible, particularly since the building is set back from the street. Site photos were presented.

In response to a question raised by Vice-Chair Fowler about the slope of the property, Mr. Draper explained that the plan is to raise the grade on one side so that the building will sit level to 11400 South. The grade across the front will be mostly uniform. The slope of the site was described. Mr. Draper reported that not all of the basement level will be exposed in the rear. More will be exposed near the entry. The dumpster enclosure was to be located next to the freeway.

Commissioner Ogden remarked that much of the building is glass. The stone materials to be used include rough stone and smooth stone above the ribbon. It does not count as two colors or materials because they are the same but there is some differentiation and a distinct visual difference.

Vice-Chair Fowler asked if there was concern with the traffic pattern coming out of the building as it is a very busy corner. Mr. Draper stated that the request did not trigger the need for a traffic study. He stated that UDOT already controls the access onto State Street and 11400 South.

A public comment was sent to the City Manager that was forwarded to staff and the Planning Commissioners. The concern was that the existing median creates issues with the proposed parking lots and creates small pockets of parking and someone who enters must turn right to exit. They proposed that the accesses be realigned to create an internal access drive and lose a few parking stalls. Staff had not reviewed the plan in detail as it was received earlier in the day.

Mr. Draper indicated that an office building to the south was recently approved. He believed there would be another access through that lot. Ms. Jastremsky did not think there was cross-access through the entire office building. The hatched cross access shown serves the different properties. Her understanding was that there is not one that goes through the entire office building to State Street. Vice-Chair Fowler clarified that for this property and the restaurant, there is one exit onto State Street. The property to the south will have its own exit onto State Street.

Ken Harris identified himself as the Project Architect. A few members of the team were present. Mr. Harris stated that this is an impressive company that is coming into the City and he wanted to allow them to introduce themselves.

Dr. Wendel Gibby's Assistant, Kristine Buxton, reported that he was unable to be present as he was on a humanitarian trip in South Africa. In 2019, they installed an X-ray machine that can be used with a digital camera. It was installed in a small village. It was not working so they have gone back to modify it to allow for an x-ray to be taken with a cell phone or small digital camera. It is now being installed in other small villages. They have worked hard and want to be in Draper. They have opportunities for high-paying jobs and will provide cutting-edge technology.

Sierra Melanson, a member of their Communications Department, reported that Novarad is the technology portion that will be in the building. They have been in business for over 30 years and have developed innovative medical and imaging technology that is used globally and increases health equity. It allows for surgeries to be done in small countries at a much more affordable price. It is ground-breaking technology and they are competing with top companies such as GE and Phillips. They also have a health care facility on the main floor that provides great health care at affordable prices. As a previous resident of Provo and a current Draper resident, Sierra attested to the job creation and community benefits.

Currently, at their Provo location, half of the bottom floor is an imaging and surgical center. The other half is an urgent care facility. A similar layout was proposed for this building with a clinic, surgical center, and imaging center. The surgeries performed are mostly interventional radiology surgeries for cysts, hernias, etc. that can be performed in an outpatient facility.

Mr. Harris stated that the owner is interested in a Class A office building that is constructed of steel and concrete with a lot of glass to be energy efficient. The stone is granite with two different finishes. The same material is on their Provo building and it is beautiful. The texture difference looks like two different colors. They feel that the building is well-designed and fits in with the larger buildings that are adjacent to it. The lower level on the north side is more pedestrian-friendly with a drop-off and covered port cochere. The stone goes up about 1½ stories with glass above.

Civil Engineer, Matt Brown from MW Brown Engineering, reported that the site to the south is going through a similar process. UDOT required a complete cross-access all the way through. The intent was for left-hand turns to be made there. He clarified that a connection was mandated by UDOT.

Commissioner Ogden expressed concern with the parking and stated that 44 stalls will have to turn right to get into a position to turn around and go the opposite direction and exit the property if there is no cross-access. He asked if any thought had been given to making access from one to the other so that everyone is not coming in on the main road. Mr. Harris stated that it will depend on how the overall parking works on the site. UDOT did not raise concerns about that to them. They are fairly tight with respect to the parking requirements. Mr. Draper reported that there are 184 stalls on the site with the range being from 178 to 218 with natural adjustments. As a result, they can lose no more than six stalls. Vice-Chair Fowler stated that the goal will be to remove the barrier down the entrance road. At the top, there is no circular access through the three lots so four stalls along 11400 South could be removed to make a circular access. Mr. Draper explained that to do what has been proposed would require the elimination of 12 stalls.

Commissioner Ogden asked about the height of the building and stated that it seems tall. It is 22% taller than what the Code allows. The roof appears to have a significant pitch from the top of the third floor upward. Project Manager, Doug Spohn from Harris Architecture, indicated that the building proposed on the neighboring property to the south was approved at a height of 62 feet, which is nearly as tall as the proposed building. He stated that they had to increase the height slightly to provide additional height in the surgery center.

Vice-Chair Fowler opened the public hearing.

Steve Pruitt identified himself as the owner of Phoenix West who leases property to Tuscano. He was anxious to have the applicants as a neighbor. His only concern was the parking since when he originally negotiated the easements, UDOT required the median be put in primarily because it was less than their administrative requirement for proximity to the radius at the intersection. The median was proposed as a control mechanism. He was concerned about circulation, motorists making U-turns and causing congestion. He hoped to connect the two lots and have reciprocal use of the parking. Mr. Pruitt stated that they do not need parking during the day. His primary concern was safety.

There was no further public comment. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Draper reported that the tallest point of the building is 62 feet with an average height being 55 feet.

Mr. Ogden liked the look of the building and stated that the proposed location is great. The height, however, was of concern as it will look like a five-story building from 11400 South. He recalled that height was also identified previously as a concern when development was proposed on the site. Ms. Jastremsky stated that staff received an application from the same property owner a few years ago for a text amendment a sign. At that time they discussed their vision for the property. There are freeway frontage sign allotments so the applicants were modifying the height and signage area.

City Attorney, Mike Barker, stated that the issue is whether the applicants have met three of the 10 requirements listed. If they have, they are entitled to approval. If not, the Commission must provide substantial evidence and determine which have not been met.

Mr. Draper reported that the zone allows for a maximum height of 55 feet. The property to the south is in a different zone with the maximum being 45 feet. Commissioner Fidler suspected that the building will look large on that corner but it is a beautiful building that will be an improvement over what is there currently. The glass will make it appear less intrusive and bring interest to the corner. Staff felt that criterion 6, 9, and 10 have been met and are as follows:

6. The variations are consistent with the purpose of this chapter and any applicable master plan or ordinance.

9. The building design is a specific architectural style, such as contemporary or modern, which utilizes facade materials differently than prescribed in subsection 9-22-040F of this chapter and is designed by a licensed architect.

10. The amount of primary materials used for a facade is at least ten percent (10%) greater than the minimum required amount.

Commissioner Ogden commented that the materials look good. They are using the same material but one is smooth and one is rough, which provides a different look and feel. He had no issue with that deviation.

Mr. Barker commented on the awkward layout of the parking area and stated that the Planning Commission's approval of the Site Plan does not mean that the two adjacent property owners cannot come to an agreement to improve it. Approval would give the applicant the ability to pull a Land Disturbance Permit and begin work on the project. They could choose to amend the parking if a better solution is found. Commissioner Ogden was concerned that the two lots will be a problem with the median island. Traffic circulation issues were discussed. It was recognized, however, that what is proposed is compliant.

Vice-Chair Fowler was concerned about the limited access into and out of the property and its proximity to the intersection. Mr. Barker commented that UDOT would not have allowed the

entrance to be there if it did not meet their standards. In addition, State Street is a state road. It can be assumed that UDOT is amenable to where the entrance is located.

Motion: Commissioner Fidler moved to APPROVE the deviation for increased height as requested by Brent Harris representing Harris Architecture, Wendel and Trudy Gibby, and Radnet Properties, LLC for the Radnet Corporate Office Building, Application SPR-59-2021 based on the following findings:

1. **The proposed height will not have a material adverse effect on the character of the area or the public health, safety, and general welfare.**

2. **The proposed construction and arrangement of the building height are compatible with the use and development of neighboring properties with respect to scale and massing.**

3. **The building is designed to relate to the human scale and incorporates at least one of the following:**

    a. **Architectural detailing including on the ground floor to emphasize the pedestrian level of the building.**

    b. **Architectural detailing at the cornice level or accentuated building zones.**

    c. **Roofline architectural features that give it a distinctive form or skyline.**

Second: Commissioner Ogden.

Vote: A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to APPROVE the deviation for use of only 1 primary material as requested by Brent Harris representing Harris Architecture, Wendel and Trudy Gibby, and Radnet Properties, LLC for the Radnet Corporate Office Building, Application SPR-59-2021 based on the following findings:

1. **The variations are consistent with the purpose of this chapter and any applicable master plan or ordinance.**

2. **The building design is a specific architectural style, such as contemporary or modern, which utilizes facade materials differently than prescribed in subsection 922-040(F) and is designed by a licensed architect.**

3. **The amount of primary materials used for a facade is at least ten percent (10%) greater than the minimum required amount.**

Second: **Commissioner Fidler.**

Vote: **A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

Motion: **Commissioner Ogden moved to APPROVE the Site Plan as requested by Brent Harris representing Harris Architecture, Wendel and Trudy Gibby, and Radnet Properties, LLC for the Radnet Corporate Office Building, Application SPR-59-2021 based on the following findings:**

1. **The site plan reflects the full development of the property.**

2. **The site plan with the approval of the deviation requests conforms to applicable standards set forth in the ordinance, including but not limited to, building heights, setbacks, access points, parking, landscaping, and building materials.**

3. **The proposed development plans meet the intent, goals, and objectives of the general plan and the purpose of the CI zoning district in which the site is located.**

4. **The public facilities and services in the area are adequate to support the subject development, as required by engineering standards and specifications.**

5. **The proposed development plans will comply with the engineering standards found in Titles 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, and 18 of the Draper City Municipal Code, including traffic, stormwater drainage, and utilities concerns.**

Second: **Commissioner Fidler.**

Vote: **A roll call was taken with the Commissioners voting 3-to-0 in favor of the motion. Commissioners Fowler, Ogden, and Fidler voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

The applicants were encouraged to work with the neighboring property owner with respect to parking.

G. Public Hearing: Town Center Station Area Plan (Legislative Action)
On the request of Draper City for a Station Area Plan for the Town Center TRAX Station, located at approximately 1131 East Pioneer Rd. The area covered under the Station Area Plan is approximately 1/2 mile radius around the Town Center TRAX station. Staff contact is Bret Millburn, 801-576-6516, bret.millburn@draperutah.gov.

The above item was continued to a date uncertain.

2. Discussion Items.

A. Discussion Item: 2024 Zoning and Subdivision Code Update Process.

Ms. Jastremsky reported that the City has hired a consultant to help rewrite the Zoning Code. She pointed out that a holistic rewrite of the Zoning Code has not been done since 2001. Text Amendments come to the Commission as needed, however. Houseal Lavigne has been retained to perform the work. The process is expected to take 18 months to complete. Several meetings will be held throughout the process with the City Council, Staff, and the Planning Commission. The first joint meeting is scheduled for January 9, 2024. The Consultants will be in the City that week for a tour and to meet with stakeholders, the Planning Commission, City Council, and Staff. A website will be published for the zone update process that will include open houses, drafts, and a survey that will be distributed to residents. Members of the Planning Commission will be asked to participate in the joint meetings. The Code will be divided up by topic and sections throughout the process. A number of meetings will be held to get feedback from the Commission on what is and is not working, elicit feedback, and ultimately result in drafts that can be reviewed.

Vice-Chair Fowler asked about compensation and if the Planning Commission Members' stipend will apply to the special meetings. Ms. Jastremsky offered to look into that further. It was noted that most of the meetings will be held jointly with the City Council.

Vice-Chair Fowler reported that this will be the last Planning Commission meeting for the year. The next meeting is scheduled for January 11, 2024.

3. Adjournment.

Motion: Commissioner Ogden moved to ADJOURN.

Vote: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 7:47 PM.