

# **NORTH OGDEN PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **MEETING MINUTES**

June 4, 2014

The North Ogden Planning Commission convened in a regular meeting on June 4, 2014 at 6:31 pm 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 May 30, 2014. Notice of the annual meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24, 2014.

### **COMMISSIONERS:**

Eric Thomas	Chairman
Don Waite	Vice-Chairman
Scott Barker	Commissioner
Joan Brown	Commissioner
Blake Knight	Commissioner
Dee Russell	Commissioner

### **STAFF:**

Jon Call	City Attorney
Gary Kerr	Building Official
Rob Scott	City Planner
Stacie Cain	Community Dev. Coord./Deputy City Recorder

### **VISITORS:**

David Marsh  
Ryan Johnson  
Maria Johnson

### **REGULAR MEETING**

Chairman Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm. Commissioner Russell offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE MAY 7, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

**2. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE MAY 21, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

**Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the May 7, 2014 minutes as presented and the May 21, 2014 minutes as amended. Commissioner Russell seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Knight</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>

**ACTIVE AGENDA**

**1. PUBLIC COMMENTS.**

There were no public comments.

**2. PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENTS TO AMEND NORTH OGDEN CITY ZONING ORDINANCE TITLE 11, TO ADD REGULATION REGARDING BEES.**

Chairman Thomas opened the public hearing at 6:34 p.m.

City Manager Chandler reported he has not made any changes to the proposed ordinance since the last Planning Commission meeting. City Planner Scott stated that he received one phone call from a resident who simply asked for a copy of the proposed ordinance; he has not received any negative comment about the proposal.

**Vice-Chairman Waite made a motion to close the public hearing at 6:35 p.m. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Knight</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>

**The motion passed.**

**3. DISCUSSION AND/OR RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND NORTH OGDEN CITY ZONING ORDINANCE TITLE 11, TO ADD REGULATIONS REGARDING BEES.**

Commissioner Knight made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend Title 11, the North Ogden City Zoning Ordinance, to add regulations regarding bees. Vice-Chairman Waite seconded the motion.

**Voting on the motion:**

Chairman Thomas	yes
Vice-Chairman Waite	yes
Commissioner Barker	yes
Commissioner Brown	yes
Commissioner Knight	yes
Commissioner Russell	yes

The motion passed.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE COMMENTS TO AMEND THE NORTH OGDEN CITY ZONING ORDINANCE TITLE 11, TO ADD REQUIREMENTS REGARDING SHORT TERM LENDERS.**

A memo from City Planner Scott explained 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, requires compatibility with the general plan and existing codes. On February 5, 2014 the North Ogden Planning Commission (NOPC) made a motion directing staff to prepare a title loan ordinance as requested by the City Council. On April 16, 2014 the North Ogden Planning Commission discussed the basis for establishing a title loan ordinance. The following issues were discussed and determinations made:

- Establishing a separation requirement between title loans, community center, school, or other public gathering place, or sexually oriented business was deemed appropriate.
- A maximum number of businesses was not appropriate.
- The existing site plan and architectural standards are sufficient.
- Establishing standards for disclosure requirements that the title loan business must give to loan applicants is appropriate.

On May 7, 2014 the Planning Commission reviewed a draft ordinance based upon the above discussion. The Planning Commission gave direction to expand the section on location to give examples similar to the separation standards in the retail tobacco specialty business standards. They found that 660 feet is approximately a block separation and that it is adequate. Staff was

asked to bring an example of a notification sign to the public hearing where a decision on the appropriateness of the sign size will be made.

The memo reviewed existing zoning ordinance language as follows:

#### 11-2-1 Definitions

**LENDING INSTITUTION:** Any bank, insurance company, savings and loan association, or any other person in the business of lending money or guaranteeing loans, any person obtaining, arranging or negotiating loans or guarantees as agent or broker, and any person in the business of buying or selling loans or instruments for the payment of money which are secured by title to or a security interest in real estate.

The memo referenced the projects conformance to the General Plan. The following extracts from the General Plan apply to this consideration.

#### Commercial Development:

North Ogden's goals and policies concerning commercial developments address the aesthetics and location of commercial developments. The desire of City officials is to provide an attractive, pleasing environment in which to shop or work within a commercial core. Enough vacant property exists in North Ogden to accommodate future commercial growth. In order to function efficiently, proposed commercial developments should be evaluated for adequate internal circulation for automobiles and pedestrians with limited access points to the major streets serving the developments. The focus of commercial development in North Ogden should be to provide services that support the resident population of the City and adjacent areas. Regional commercial centers would be inconsistent with citizen desires and the direction of this Plan.

#### Commercial Development:

New commercial and other business development will enhance the community when meeting the objectives of the General Plan. An improved standard of function, quality, and appearance is expected by the citizens.

The memo provided the following summary of Planning Commission considerations:

- Is the proposed amendment consistent with the North Ogden City General Plan?
- Does the proposed use meet the requirements of the applicable City Ordinances?
- Are the new ordinance standards appropriate?

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission conduct the public hearing and receive comment from interested parties, take into account any comments, identify appropriate findings, and make a recommendation to the City Council for adoption.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo. There was a focus on the requirement to provide a notification sign in both English and Spanish to inform customers of the practices of the establishment. Commissioner Knight asked if the requirement would be imposed on the existing short term lending business, to which Mr. Scott answered yes and noted existing businesses will be required to comply with the new ordinance by a certain date. City Attorney Call recommended that the existing businesses be given 45 days to comply with the ordinance. There

was a brief discussion regarding the appropriate location of the notification sign, with Mr. Scott noting the ordinance calls for the notification sign to be located as near to the entry door as building code permits. Commissioner Brown stated that the purpose of the sign is to communicate to customers the practices used by the company offering short term lending services and she would like for the sign to be as visible as possible; if a sign is located behind the entry door people will not see it. Mr. Scott noted that the ordinance provides some discretion to the business owner regarding where the sign will be located; he added it is also an option to locate the sign on the interior surface of the door. The Planning Commission continued general discussion regarding the purpose of the sign and the appropriate location with Commissioner Knight stating the City can only do so much to protect patrons of a specific business and he feels the ordinance language is appropriate. Vice-Chairman Waite agreed. Mr. Scott noted that he borrowed the language in the ordinance from a similar ordinance used in Ogden City.

Chairman Thomas opened the public hearing at 6:46 p.m. There were no persons appearing to be heard.

**Vice-Chairman Waite made a motion to close the public hearing at 6:47 p.m.  
Commissioner Russell seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	yes
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	yes
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	yes
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	yes
<b>Commissioner Knight</b>	yes
<b>Commissioner Russell</b>	yes

**The motion passed.**

**5. DISCUSSION AND/OR RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE NORTH OGDEN CITY ZONING ORDINANCE TITLE 11, TO ADD REQUIREMENTS REGARDING SHORT TERM LENDERS.**

**Commissioner Knight made a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend Title 11, North Ogden City Zoning Ordinance, to add requirements regarding short term lenders. Commissioner Barker seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	yes
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	yes
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	yes
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	no

Commissioner Knight        yes  
Commissioner Russell        yes

**The motion passed.**

**6. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO APPROVE A SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO EXPAND THE CONSTRUCTION YARD AND DANCE STUDIO LOCATED AT 325 E 2000 N**

A memo from City Planner Scott explained when the Planning Commission is acting as a land use authority, it is acting in an administrative capacity and has much less discretion. Examples of administrative applications are conditional use permits, design reviews, and subdivisions. Administrative applications must be approved the Planning Commission if the application demonstrates compliance with the approval criteria. The applicant is requesting the approval of a site plan review to allow the renovation and expansion of the existing dance facility and the expansion and new construction of a construction yard office, and shop. The unique nature of this project is that it combines a traditional manufacturing use (construction yard and office) with a commercial use (dance studio). The construction yard office is currently being shared with the dance studio. The proposal is to build a new construction office and shop in separate buildings. The dance studio will take over the shared building and do an addition.

The request for a site plan review must meet the following criteria from the North Ogden Zoning Ordinance:

11-8B (Planned Manufacturing Zone MP-1) - The property has been operating for many years with both a construction yard and dance facility. The MP-1 zone does not provide for either of these uses and it is recommended that the MP-1 zone be amended to provide for these uses in the future. The existing dance studio was approved as a conditional use.

11-10-27 (Site Plan Approval Required) and 11-8D (Design Standards for Commercial Development) When an existing site is being expanded then the city standards must be complied with when the project's value is equal to or greater than 50% of the existing assessed value.

**Dance Studio**

The existing dance studio building will be retrofitted to be consistent with the new dance studio exterior. The front exterior is proposed to be a combination flag stone base with stucco above. The remaining three sides will be metal siding with a similar color to the existing dance studio building. The new dance studio is 50 feet wide by 60 feet for a total of 3,000 square feet and the existing dance studio is approximately 47 feet by 78 feet for a total of approximately 3,650 square feet. By combining the front of the existing dance studio and the addition there will be approximately 97 feet of front facing building. The applicant has indicated that they are interested in adding an additional door to provide more articulation. Staff is recommending that the stucco be in two separate band colors to enhance the articulation. The Planning Commission will need to determine if this building design provides sufficient articulation. The applicant has provided a rendering and color board. They are too large to reproduce. The colors contain a mix

of tans and grays as allowed as "predominantly natural, muted earth tones ... including browns, black, grays, greens, rusts, etc."

#### Construction Office

The new construction business office is planned to be located on the northeast corner of the property with frontage onto 2000 North. The building is 30 feet by 40 feet for a total of 1,200 square feet. The building is proposed to be the same as the dance studio stucco material with the flag stone band on the west elevation which is the entrance to the building. The front of the building has a door and window for articulation. The colors meet city standards. Staff is recommending that the flag stone band be extended to the west elevation facing 2000 North.

#### New Shop

The new construction shop is proposed to be in the southwest corner of the property. It is 50 feet by 50 feet for a total of 2,500 square feet. The building is set back over 200 hundred feet from 2000 North will hardly be visible. The exterior of the building is proposed to be metal siding with a similar color to the existing dance building. The ordinance allows for some flexibility in the design of manufacturing structures. Exposed fronts are required to be constructed of textured concrete, brick, stone and/or wood/wood-like materials. Staff believes there is room to balance the lack of visibility and the material standards.

#### 11-8D-5 (Landscaping)

This provision requires that 20% of the site be landscaped with the 20 feet along the frontage being landscaped. Again there needs to be some reasonableness to meeting this standard when converting an existing site to meet the intent of the ordinance standards. Manufacturing sites typically have landscaping along their street frontage and are screened from other properties. Since there is a commercial use involved this needs to be weighed as well. Staff is recommending that 20 feet of landscaping be installed along the frontage of 2000 North, except that 10 feet is sufficient in front of the construction office which is allowed to have 10 feet setback. The parking standards require that 5% of the interior be landscaped. The 20 foot frontage landscaping should satisfy this requirement and should be shown on the landscape plan. There is a requirement for 4 trees to be planted. In addition, the applicant will need to submit a landscape plan showing these revisions. The proposed plan shows the removal of the fencing along 2000 North and shows a new fence providing security for the construction yard.

#### 11-17 (Parking and Loading; Traffic Access)

The dance studio has a combined total of 3,650 square feet of space not including an upstairs footage. This translates into a requirement for 23 stalls. The construction office is 1,200 square feet with a requirement for 5 stalls. The shop has 2,500 square feet, but has no permanent employees and will not require any stalls. This may be adjusted based upon the number of employees who work there. The total requirement is 28 stalls. The site plan shows 31 stalls. The existing site has 3 drive approaches. The proposed plan shows adding a 3'ft drive approach to the dance studio with one to the construction yard. The new drive approach will require the removal and replacement of the existing sidewalk. One-way drives must be a minimum of 12 feet and a maximum of 15 feet. A two-way drive can be between 20 and 25 feet. Driveways must have a minimum separation of 20 feet. The parking layout will need to be redesigned to meet

these standards. There is plenty of room to accommodate the minimum dimensions for individual stalls.

11-22 (Sign Regulations for all Zones) - There is a sign location shown on the plan. Sign permits will be applied for by a sign company at a later date.

The above described application conforms to the North Ogden City General Plan due to its being compliant with city ordinances and the following Plan goals: All existing and new development should be required to fairly and uniformly provide improvements according to city standards. Commercial development must be required to develop projects that are designed for functionality, appearance and include significant physical enhancement to the community.

The memo concluded by offering the following summary of Planning Commission considerations:

- Does the proposed use meet the requirements of the applicable City Ordinances?
- Are the building articulation and colors appropriate? Should a color band be included for the design of the dance studio and should a flag stone band be included on the north elevation of the business office?
- Does the unique nature of this project warrant adjustments to the landscape standards?
- Should the shop be allowed to be constructed of metal siding since it is out of view from 2000 North?

The memo also offered the following recommended conditions of approval:

- Compliance with North Ogden Zoning Ordinance
- Provide a revised landscape plan
- Provide a revised parking layout plan
- Compliance with any reviewing agency requirements

Staff recommends approval of the site plan for the Marsh dance studio and a construction yard with the requirement to provide a revised landscape plan, a revised parking layout plan, compliance with agency requirements, and allowing the construction shop to be metal siding with appropriate colors.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo as well as the site plan for the proposed development to identify the front elevations of the building.

Chairman Thomas inquired as to the required setback on 2000 North. Mr. Scott stated the setback is 10 feet.

Commissioner Brown stated when the Planning Commission considered the dance studio business years ago there was a concern regarding parking accommodations and providing safe drop-off and pick-up conditions for the students attending the dance studio. She asked the applicant to identify the drop-off and entry areas for the dance studio in relation to the

construction shop on the site. David Marsh, 173 E. 2000 N., confirmed the previous concerns regarding parking on the site and stated the dance studio will be enlarged and the decision was made to enlarge the parking area as well. He reviewed the site plan to identify the dance studio area, existing parking area, and future parking expansion area. He added construction traffic associated with the construction shop is minimal. He then provided an overview of the front elevations of the building and the landscaping improvements that will be made.

Commissioner Brown inquired as to the signage that will be used at the business site. Mr. Marsh stated he would like to install a small electric sign in front of the dance studio and signage on the building including the dance studio logo and wording. He noted the signage used on the construction shop will not change, but the sign will be moved to a different site on the building. He refocused on landscaping and parking requirements and stated he would prefer not to include a landscaping island in the parking lot because it would reduce the number of parking spaces and would create a problem for snow removal. Commissioner Knight stated he believed a landscaping island would actually make snow removal easier because it would give Mr. Marsh a place to pile the snow. Mr. Marsh identified the location where he currently stacks snow during the winter months and noted he would prefer to continue to do that rather than include a landscaping island in the parking lot. He stated he submitted a landscaping plan to the City as part of his site plan application and he briefly reviewed the components of the plan. The Planning Commission stated they are comfortable with the xeriscaping elements being proposed. Mr. Scott stated he does not have concerns about the use of xeriscaping, but he does have concerns regarding the locations on the site where landscaping will be located. He used the site plan to identify the locations on the site that he feels should be landscaped. Mr. Marsh stated those areas are not visible from the street and it does not make sense to landscape them. There was a brief discussion regarding utility connections for the site.

Commissioner Brown stated that she is happy with the components of the site plan application and stated she feels the applicant has given the site improvements a lot of thought. There was a general discussion regarding the parking capacity and the inclusion of American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compatible parking areas and ramps.

Vice-Chairman Waite stated he would place more importance on motorist visibility on the street and the business site than on landscaping and the planting of additional trees that could grow in a manner that would impede visibility. Mr. Scott stated it is not necessary to plant a large tree and there are plenty of species of trees that will not create visibility issues. He stated that is the reason he has requested a revised landscaping plan from Mr. Marsh.

Commissioner Knight addressed the lack of sidewalks in front of the subject property. Mr. Marsh stated that when 2000 North was widened the City considered installing sidewalk to serve the residents in the area and students walking to and from the junior high school on the street. He stated the decision was made to put the sidewalk on the north side of the road because of the large cost of moving a transmission line to allow for sidewalk on the south side of the road. He stated eventually it may be possible or necessary to install sidewalks on the south side of the road, but he does not feel it is feasible at this time. He stated there is sidewalk on the north side of the road from Washington Boulevard to Highway 89. He stated that his proposal will improve the appearance of the area and will improve safety as well. There was a general discussion

regarding landscaping and sidewalks near the subject property, with Mr. Marsh reiterating he would prefer to use xeriscaping. Commissioner Brown stated she is supportive of Mr. Scott's request for an amended landscape plan that would include some variation in the landscaping materials to be used. Mr. Marsh requested that the Planning Commission grant site plan approval for the building with a requirement to submit a landscaping plan at a later date. Mr. Scott stated that the Planning Commission can dictate that the landscaping plan will be reviewed and approved by staff at a later date. He noted that xeriscaping does not mean that the property owners will only use rocks; it will be necessary to incorporate some plants in the xeriscaping and it may be necessary to hire a professional landscaping to create a realistic xeriscaping plan. Commissioner Knight agreed and stated he would suggest approval of the site plan for the building and defer approval of the landscaping plan to staff. Mr. Marsh asked if the Planning Commission would agree to no landscaping in the parking lot if he agrees to move the building back an additional five feet and landscape the area immediately in front of the building. Vice-Chairman Waite stated he would be comfortable with that. Mr. Marsh revisited the site plan to identify the locations where he would prefer to install landscaping.

**Commissioner Brown made a motion to approve the site plan application to expand the construction yard and dance studio located at 325 E. 2000 N., with a landscaping plan to be determined by staff and with the applicant meeting all conditions listed in the staff report. She requested that the applicant proceed with moving the building back an additional five feet and landscape the area in front of the building as discussed. Vice-Chairman Waite seconded the motion.**

Mr. Scott reviewed his landscaping recommendation and stated he needs some direction from the Planning Commission tonight so that he understands the Planning Commission's desires relative to landscaping. There was a general discussion regarding landscaping, signage, and parking at the subject property with Chairman Thomas stating he would prefer one landscaping island in the parking area and some landscaping around the monument sign. Commissioner Brown stated she would be comfortable with that recommendation, but she would also like to see the building moved back an additional five feet to accommodate additional landscaping. Chairman Thomas stated that the landscaping materials allowed on the site will be deferred to staff.

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Knight</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>

**7. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION ON A PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE JOHNSON ESTATES SUBDIVISION**

A memo from City Planner Scott explained when the Planning Commission is acting as a land use authority, it is acting in an administrative capacity and has much less discretion. Examples of

administrative applications are conditional use permits, design reviews, and subdivisions. Administrative applications must be approved the Planning Commission if the application demonstrates compliance with the approval criteria. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of a 4 lot subdivision at approximately 700 East 2600 North known as Johnson Estates. The 4 lot subdivision is on 1.39 acres and is located in the RCC zone. The RCC zone requires a minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet on interior lots and 9,000 square feet on corner lots with a frontage requirement of 80 feet. The property currently has a single family dwelling. This is an infill subdivision which will provide for the existing home and allow for the construction of three new dwellings. All lots meet the area and frontage requirements. Normally, this would be a minor subdivision approval process, however, the applicant is requesting that along 700 East that lot 1 be allowed to have the sidewalk placed next to the back of curb rather than providing a park strip. The frontage along 2600 North has an existing sidewalk. Lots 3 and 4 will have a park strip. The applicant desires this consideration in order to preserve two mature pine trees, leave the existing fire hydrant, and believes that the handicap ramp at the intersection will work better. There are intermittent sidewalks in this area with park strips. Staff concurs that saving the two mature pine trees is desirable; however moving the fire hydrant and the handicap ramp are not compelling. Staff recommends that a certified arborist investigate the health and potential for survival. If it can be demonstrated by the arborist that these trees have a reasonable future then the allowance for the sidewalk to be next to the curb for lot 1 should be granted. The City technical review committee met on May 1, 2014 and provided comments. The comments must be addressed as part of final approval.

The memo offered the following Planning Commission considerations:

- Does the proposed subdivision meet the requirements of the applicable City subdivision and zoning Ordinances?
- Should the sidewalk along 700 East for lot 1 be allowed to be placed next to the back of curb?

The proposed subdivision meets the requirements of applicable North Ogden City ordinances and conforms to the North Ogden City General Plan. The General Plan map calls for this property to be developed as single family residential.

The memo also offered the following conditions of approval:

- Requirements of the Technical Review Committee
- North Ogden City Engineer
- Obtain a report from a certified arborist that the two southerly pine trees are in good health and have a reasonable life expectancy.

Staff recommends preliminary approval of this application for Johnson Estates subject to the conditions from the reviewing agencies and that the sidewalk along 700 East be allowed to be placed next to the curb subject to receiving a report from a certified arborist that the two southerly pine trees are in good health and have a reasonable life expectancy.

Mr. Scott reviewed his staff memo.

Commissioner Russell referenced the sidewalk plan for the development and indicated he does not believe the plan will impact the existing trees on the site. Mr. Scott agreed. There was a general discussion regarding the existing trees that will be removed in association with the project.

Applicant Ryan Johnson, 965 W. 3000 N., Pleasant View, stated it may be possible to save the most mature pine tree on the property depending upon the approval he receives tonight. There was a brief discussion regarding the installation of sidewalk, curb, and gutter in the proposed development, with a focus on the required width of the sidewalk. Mr. Kerr stated the engineer may recommend a five-foot side sidewalk. Mr. Scott stated he would prefer a four foot to prevent it from disturbing the root system of the trees in the area.

**Vice-Chairman Waite made a motion to grant preliminary approval of the Johnson Estates Subdivision, with the condition that the sidewalk be contiguous with the curb on 700 East for the length of lot one based on a report from a certified arborist. If the arborist communicates that a varied sidewalk will not impact the root system of the trees, the sidewalk is approved as requested. Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Knight</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>

**8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**9. PLANNING COMMISSION/STAFF COMMENTS**

Mr. Scott provided the Planning Commission with an update regarding the process to create the Request for Proposals for the General Plan update. He then stated the City's Planning Intern has completed a draft land use inventory list and it includes very interesting information that will eventually be provided to the Planning Commission for review and consideration.

Mr. Call stated Craig Call, former State Property Rights Ombudsman, has offered his services to the City by way of providing additional land use training in the future. Mr. Scott stated he feels that training would be appropriate when all Planning Commission seats are filled.

Chairman Thomas referenced the construction taking place at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and 2600 North and asked if anyone on staff has considered what it would take to close Pleasant View Drive at the City's property and route traffic around Lee's to eventually be

tied into Washington Boulevard. Mr. Kerr stated he has not heard any discussions about that idea. There was a general discussion regarding the purpose of Chairman Thomas's recommendation, with a focus on improved safety in the area. Mr. Scott stated the City Manager is well aware of the safety issues in that area and City Administration has been working with Lee's to try to come up with a solution. Chairman Thomas stated it is something to think about as the City proceeds with the update of the General Plan.

Commissioner Russell asked if the ground breaking ceremony for the new Public Works facility was held yesterday. Mr. Kerr answered yes, but noted he was unable to attend.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Brown made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Russell seconded the motion.**

**Voting on the motion:**

<b>Chairman Thomas</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Vice-Chairman Waite</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Barker</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Brown</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Knight</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Russell</b>	<b>yes</b>

**The motion passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

---

Planning Commission Chair

---

Stacie Cain,  
Community Dev. Coord./Deputy City Recorder

---

Date approved