



WASATCH COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

NOVEMBER 13, 2025

MEETING TIME: 6:00 P.M.
MEETING PLACE: Wasatch County Administration Bldg., 25 North Main, Heber City, Utah
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Chuck Zuercher, Kimberly Cook (via Zoom), Doug Hronek, Scott Brubaker, Daniel Lyman, David Thacker, Michael Murphy
EXCUSED: Commissioner Mark Hendricks
STAFF PRESENT: Doug Smith, Wasatch County Planner; Austin Corry, Assistant Wasatch County Planner; Anna Anglin, Assistant Wasatch County Planner; Jon Woodard, Assistant Wasatch County Attorney
PRAYER: Commissioner Scott Brubaker
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Commissioner Daniel Lyman and repeated by everyone

BUSINESS ITEMS

❖ APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 9, 2025 MEETING

MOTION

Commissioner Scott Brubaker made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 9, 2025 meeting as written.

Commissioner Daniel Lyman seconded the motion.

VOTE (7 TO 0)

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Kimberly Cook	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	David Thacker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN				

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM #1 APPROVAL OF THE 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

STAFF PRESENTATION – The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff’s analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

APPLICANT AND PUBLIC COMMENT – Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

MOTION

Commissioner Scott Brubaker made a motion to approve the schedule as presented.

Commissioner Daniel Lyman seconded the motion.

VOTE (7 TO 0)

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Kimberly Cook	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	David Thacker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN				

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM #2 SARA E. BOULEY, REPRESENTING CRAIG A. ALEXANDER, REQUESTS A PLAT AMENDMENT TO EXCHANGE 2,231 SQUARE FEET OF LAND BETWEEN LOT 47 OF DEER MOUNTAIN RESORT PLAT 3 AND THE ADJACENT OPEN SPACE PARCEL LOCATED ON THE DEER MOUNTAIN RESORT PLAT 4 SUBDIVISION. THE REQUEST ALSO INCLUDES AN ADJUSTMENT TO THE COMMON BOUNDARY BETWEEN LOTS 47 AND 48 OF PLAT 3. THE PROJECT IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY AT 12664 MUD SPRINGS CIRCLE, WITHIN THE JORDANELLE BASIN OVERLAY ZONE (JBOZ). **IF FORWARDED, THE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL AS THE LAND USE AUTHORITY, AT A PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 19, 2025. (DEV-11191, ANNA ANGLIN)*

STAFF PRESENTATION – The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff’s analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

APPLICANT AND PUBLIC COMMENT – Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- Sara Bouley applicant addressed the planning commission and discussed how the driveway was built in the common area with the consent of the developer.

- The new owners of the property wanted to own the ground underneath the driveway.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Commissioner Thacker asked if there were options for moving the driveway into their lot as it exists now.
- Applicant responded that it would be cost prohibitive to remove the driveway and the HOA is in agreement with the plat amendment.
- Commissioner Lyman felt that the exchange was not equal. The property in the back is not as desirable as the property along the road.
- The planning commission members discussed that the exchange does not seem to be fair and some felt that it was fair.
- Commissioner Cook stated that she is in favor of the proposal.

MOTION

Commissioner Scott Brubaker made a motion that we recommend approval of the plat amendment.

Commissioner Kimberly Cook seconded the motion.

VOTE **(6 TO 1)**

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Kimberly Cook	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	David Thacker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman	AYE	<u>NAY</u>	ABSTAIN				

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The motion includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

1. Good cause for the plat amendment exists because:
 - a. The proposed plat amendment does not alter the overall density of the development.
 - b. The amendment enhances compliance by bringing one of the affected parcels into greater conformance with applicable development standards.
 - c. The adjustment eliminates driveway access from the designated open space parcel, and allows the owner of the adjacent parcel to own the property their driveway is on thereby resolving an existing encroachment.
 - d. Relocation of the driveway access preserves the integrity and intended function of the open space area.
 - e. Open space acreage does not change.
 - f. The reconfiguration aligns Lots 47 and 48 with the contours of the emergency access driveway.
 - g. The improved alignment enhances site functionality, circulation, and overall layout.
2. This proposed revision conforms to the Wasatch County development standards.
3. The Development Review Committee has reviewed the project and provided a favorable recommendation with a condition.

CONDITIONS

1. The applicant resolves any conditions noted in the DRC report to the satisfaction of the applicable review department.

ITEM #3 TYSON TIDWELL IS REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE-FAMILY HOME ON A RIDGELINE WITHIN THE CROSSINGS AT LAKE CREEK SUBDIVISION. THE PROPOSED HOME WOULD BE LOCATED AT 482 SOUTH OLD STONE ROAD IN THE RESIDENTIAL-AGRICULTURAL (RA-1) ZONE. (DEV-11590, ANNA ANGLIN)

STAFF PRESENTATION – The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

APPLICANT AND PUBLIC COMMENT – Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- There were no comments from the applicant or public

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- The Commission agreed that the proposed house is in character with the existing homes on the ridgeline.

MOTION

Commissioner David Thacker made a motion to approve the item with the conditions and findings.

Commissioner Michael Murphy seconded the motion.

VOTE (7 TO 0)

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Kimberly Cook	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	David Thacker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN				

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The motion includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

1. The property is located in the Residential Agricultural (RA-1) zoning District.
2. The staff analysis indicates that the proposal complies with Section 16.08.01 of the current Wasatch County Code, related to the purpose of the RA-1 Zone.
3. The project complies to Note 15 within The Crossings at Lake Creek Phase 1 Subdivision with Conditions.
4. The staff analysis indicates that the proposal complies with Section 16.23.07 of the current Wasatch County Code, related to Conditional Uses.
5. Notice has been sent to neighboring property owners within 500 feet of the subject property.
6. There are no known zoning violations on the property at this time.

7. The Development Review Committee has reviewed the project and forwarded it to the Planning Commission for approval.

CONDITIONS

1. All outdoor light fixtures shall be designed and installed to minimize light trespass and glare onto adjacent properties and the night sky.
2. The project's landscaping be required to be compatible with the existing homes in the surrounding area and meet all applicable landscaping standards outlined in the County Code.

ITEM #4 UNCOMMON ARCHITECTS, REPRESENTING THE CORPORATION OF THE PRESIDING BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS, HAS SUBMITTED AN APPLICATION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A 21,200-SQUARE-FOOT CHURCH ON A 5.02-ACRE SITE LOCATED AT 2899 E COTTAGE LAKE ROAD IN THE RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURAL (RA-1) ZONE. (DEV-10048; ANNA ANGLIN)

STAFF PRESENTATION - The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

APPLICANT AND PUBLIC COMMENT - Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- Britney Johnson applicant spoke with the ACC and mentioned that they would rather do a lower cost wall.
- Andrew Weuling applicant spoke and requested that a solid fence be used that might be wood.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION - Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Commissioner Lyman felt that there should be some flexibility with the solid wall requirement.
- It was pointed out that the code requires a fence and not necessarily a masonry wall.
- The planning commission was asked if they would have a problem if a wall/fence was not installed if there was a legal path for that. The planning commission stated that they did not have a problem with removing the requirement for a wall/fence if a legal path was found.

MOTION

Commissioner David Thacker made a motion to approve item 4 with the conditions and findings and allowing staff to have some discretion on if fencing is required and what type of fencing can be used.

Commissioner Scott Brubaker seconded the motion.

VOTE (7 TO 0)

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Kimberly Cook	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	David Thacker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN				

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The motion includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

1. The RA-1 zone permits churches as a conditional use.
2. The parcel was platted with the intent for a future church that would go through the conditional use and site plan process
3. The staff analysis indicates the proposal complies with Section 16.08.03 of the current Wasatch County Code related to development in the RA-1 zoning district.
4. The staff analysis shows the project generally Complies with title 16 of the Wasatch County Code and any inconsistencies can be worked out through the permitting process.
5. The staff analysis indicates the proposal generally complies with Section 16.23.07 of the current Wasatch County Code related to Conditional Uses.
6. The use does not have approval from the Homeowners Association architectural committee
7. Notice has been sent to neighboring property owners within 500 feet of the property.
8. There are no known zoning violations on the property at this time.
9. The Development Review Committee has reviewed the project and has verified it generally meets all County code requirements.

CONDITIONS

1. The applicant must submit verification that the meeting house has received Architectural Control Committee approval for the Crossings at Lake Creek HOA prior to Planning Department approval of a building permit.
2. All lighting standards found in section 16.21.16 will be complied with before building permit approval.
3. Buffer requirements found in section 16.21.19 will be complied with before building permit approval. Unless there is a legal path to not require a fence/wall (see planning commission discussion).

ITEM #5 DOMINION ENGINEERING, REPRESENTING MIKE VERHOOGEN, REQUESTS LARGE SCALE FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL FOR ARC JACKSON FORK SUBDIVISION, A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 44 SINGLE PUD UNITS, 84 DUPLEX UNITS, AND 24 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS (152 ERUS) ON 153.92 ACRES LOCATED AT 2966 EAST HWY 32 IN THE JORDANELLE BASIN OVERLAY ZONE (JBOZ). (DEV-8688; DOUG SMITH)

STAFF PRESENTATION – The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff’s analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

- Preliminary approval of project had a number of conditions.
- Developments in the Jordanelle are becoming more difficult on properties with more physical constraints.
- This project is in an area with a number of landslide scarps.
- The landslide scarps will be excavated to bedrock and material removed under the supervision of the applicant’s geotechnical engineer.
- The remediation of the scarps has been approved by the County Geotechnical Reviewer.
- There is an extensive trail plan open to the public.

- The ridgeline analysis and the viewing platforms provided by the applicant were reviewed and discussed as part of the power point. Viewpoint 4 at approximately mile marker 4.6 was discussed because it showed no infractions with height limitations.
- There are areas of the project that will require further ridgeline analysis.

APPLICANT AND PUBLIC COMMENT – Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- Farley Eskelson, Dominion Engineering- spoke about getting access from the waterline that will pump into the Benloch Tank from the secondary access.
- There were inconsistencies with the geotechnical report and the numbering of the lots for lots with slopes between 25-30% that need to be worked out and corrected with the plat.
- The ridgelines can be addressed by adjusting the maximum building height per lot depending on location and slope through notes on the plats.
- Josh Bouthillier- Will change lot numbers in accordance to geotechnical report for site specific analysis so the report and lot numbers are consistent.
- The applicant identified the ridgeline areas that allow the 35’ height issues through the ridgeline analysis process.
- There was no public comment.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- The road to the west, being built by Momentum, will be the formal access to the golf course in the area.
- Daniel Lyman asked who reviews the ridgeline view analysis? (Doug) There is overlap in this case. Planning and engineering reviewed the ridgeline analysis. Ardurra the County’s review engineer, at the time, provided a “heat map” of the 4 closest viewing platforms. More platforms were not explored because the applicant had provided an analysis from mile marker 4.6 that did not show any infractions. Several of the code required platforms in Ardurra’s heat map were not applicable because the project was not visible from those platforms. There were no additional platforms requested by staff based on the analysis provided by the applicant, because viewpoint 4 did not show any infractions.
- Daniel Lyman asked about how and when ridgeline issues, if further explored, would be done. Doug explained the permitting process.
- The ridgeline analysis was discussed more, and it was noted that staff felt like there could be infractions even though the analysis provided by the applicant did not show any. This is more specifically concerning viewpoint 4 from the applicant’s analysis.

MOTION
Commissioner Daniel Lyman made a motion to approve with findings and conditions including condition number 9.
Commissioner Doug Hronek seconded the motion.

VOTE **(7 TO 0)**

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Kimberly Cook	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	David Thacker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN				

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The motion includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

1. The subject property is 153.92 acres per the applicant survey.
2. The proposal contains 152 ERU's.
3. The project received master plan approval on April 4, 2007 with a substantially similar layout.
4. The property has been bifurcated since that time and due to a foreclosure by the JSSD. The property was cut in half as well as the ERU numbers.
5. The project received overall preliminary approval on January 18, 2023.
6. The master plan, final and preliminary are substantially similar.
7. There were a number of conditions that needed to be resolved prior to final approval being granted including a resolution of the landslide scarps.
8. The developer is proposing to excavate the landslide scarp areas and any potentially unstable material down to bedrock, with supervision by their geotechnical engineer IGES.
9. The proposal contains 66% open space.
10. A ridgeline analysis was done on highway 32. The proposal does not violate the code according to the analysis done by the applicant.
11. The application includes connections to public sewer and public water through the Jordanelle Special Service District (JSSD).
12. The proposed subdivision will have all private roads.
13. A second access will be provided with a connection to the road currently being built by Momentum development to the west of the development site.
14. The public trails in the project are required to be maintained by the HOA as indicated in the proposed development agreement.
15. Wasatch County Code 16.21.06 requires specific ownership and maintenance responsibilities for open space parcels.
16. The applicant has offered a 10% affordable housing obligation proposed to be paid by a fee-in-lieu included as part of the application consideration. The obligation would total \$425,600 to be paid to the Wasatch County Housing Authority prior to plat recording.
17. The Development Review Committee has reviewed the technical requirements of the proposed project and determined the project is ready for decision by the Land Use Authority.

CONDITIONS

1. IGES will have on-site review of all excavations and remediation of scarps.
2. Refining of notes on the plat in regard to building heights on fill.
3. Coordinate with Benloch Ranch on the trail connection at the northeast corner of the development.
4. The lots stated in the geotechnical report and the note 6 on the plat are inconsistent. Provide an updated geotechnical report that includes all lots with envelopes over 25% grade and a note on the plat referring to the date of the report and the report uploaded into the portal.
5. A 60' access and utility easement with a potential 24' wide road as depicted in the document recorded entry #495949 similar to the alignment of the preliminary approval to the Benloch property line to provide for potential secondary access for Benloch and Jackson Fork.
6. Lots 23-26 need to have some additional work to see if the envelopes can be more regular.
7. All issues raised by the DRC shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the applicable review department in accordance with applicable standards.

8. The open space parcels shall include dedication to the HOA and an open space easement in favor of Wasatch County or other options as available under WCC 16.21.06.
9. Verification of ridgelines may be required as construction commences with the subdivision development permit.

ITEM #6 ORDINANCE 25-16 AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF TITLE 16 OF THE WASATCH COUNTY CODE REGARDING THE REGULATION OF RETAINING WALLS. **IF FORWARDED, THE RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THIS ITEM WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COUNTY COUNCIL AS THE LEGISLATIVE BODY, AT A PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 19, 2025. (DOUG SMITH)*

STAFF PRESENTATION – The Staff Report to the Planning Commission provides details of the facts of the case and the Staff's analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

- Retaining walls are becoming more time-consuming for staff and applicants.
- There are more difficult lots to develop requiring more retaining walls.
- The conditional use process for retaining walls after a building permit has been submitted is cumbersome.
- Want to avoid using retaining walls to flatten out areas and not work with the natural terrain.
- Summit County, Park City, Heber City seem to be less regulatory than our current code.
- Problems we are trying to solve is lessening review time and staff time. Do we want to regulate aesthetics or height or both?
- We are seeing large homes on relatively small steep lots, so they do require significant retaining walls.

APPLICANT AND PUBLIC COMMENT – Any comments received prior to completion of the Staff Report are addressed in the Staff Report to the Planning Commission. Key issues raised in written comments received subsequent to the Staff Report or public comment during the public hearing included the following:

- No applicant or public comment.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION – Key points discussed by the Planning Commission included the following:

- Charles Zuercher- Looked at the retaining wall at the Hyatt hotel by Mayflower. The retaining wall is significant there. The County requires steps with landscaping. MIDA did not have that requirement.
- Deer Valley Drive retaining wall by Marriott would be a real problem to fix.
- David Thacker- Roads Versus private development should be considered two separate things. Park City has large retaining walls go through the CUP process. A lot of challenges with stepping walls and developing because of costs and added earthwork.
- Doug Smith- Sometimes stepped walls are more intrusive than straight walls because they step up the hillside.
- Doug Hronek- discussed that retaining walls should be restricted by height like any structure in a zoning district. If we consider them a structure like a home, they would be limited to 35'.
- Charles- Could you limit the roads based on grade (nothing above 30%). Doug responded that it didn't go over well when they tried to do that with a code amendment several years ago.
- Daniel Lyman- Retaining walls should be tied to the same design requirements as the developments in the areas. We should regulate the design of the retaining walls to avoid intrusive large walls. The retaining wall section should limit their ability develop an area to avoid scaring hillsides.
- David Thacker- have standard design standards until you get to a certain height, then have it go to a CUP.
- Daniel Lyman- All retaining walls need to follow the natural terrain.

- Michael Murphy- Would like to see things be less regulatory and let HOA's decide design standards and wall height limits. Used a road as an example.
- Doug Smith- change the decision maker for retaining walls over 30' from County Council to PC as a conditional use. Individual lots should have separate regulations from roads.
- State requirements are not cohesive to building permit guidelines and the time it takes for a CU.
- Still regulate steps in walls, steps and height might be different between lots and roads. Regulate materials if they comply, then it is administrative if not it is a CUP.
- Park City allows each wall to have a two-foot break for everyone 1-foot height of retaining wall to consider separation between walls. For example, an 8' wall would have a 16' break. It seems that this would create more excavation into a hillside.
- Scott Brubaker- Historic walls can only built so high before they collapse.
- Final synopsis by Doug. Separate retaining walls for roads in subdivisions and lots. Set clear and specific guidelines including materials. If an application is in compliance, it is administratively approved. If over a certain height/length it is a conditional use heard by the planning commission. Make the walls as much "by right" as possible.

MOTION

No motion was made. Doug Smith said he will probably have the item on the agenda for the Dec. 11, 2025 Planning Commission meeting

FINDINGS / BASIS OF PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINATION

The motion includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted; Planning Commission determination is generally consistent with the Staff analysis and determination.

1. Current code requires a conditional use for walls that are over 10' and/or over 800' in length requires an administrative conditional use.
2. Current code requires walls over 30' in cumulative height and over 800' in length to be approved by the County Council.
3. The current process requires a great amount of staff resources and frustration from applicants.
4. Staff believes that the original code was intended to regulate retaining walls necessary for roads in subdivisions.
5. The proposal treats retaining walls for roads differently than retaining walls for individual lots.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

Commissioner Charles Zuercher made a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Michael Murphy seconded the motion.


VOTE (7 TO 0)

Charles Zuercher	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Scott Brubaker	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN
Michael Murphy	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN	Doug Hronek	<u>AYE</u>	NAY	ABSTAIN

Kimberly Cook **AYE** NAY ABSTAIN
Daniel Lyman **AYE** NAY ABSTAIN

David Thacker **AYE** NAY ABSTAIN

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



CHARLES ZUERCHER/CHAIRMAN