

**Action Summary:**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
#1	Consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 to change the land use designation from Single-Family Density to Mixed-Use Density for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street.	Approved
#2	Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 from the A-10 and R-1-12 to the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street, excluding 0.95 acres proposed for commercial use	Approved
#3	Discussion of a proposed new use for Micro-Entrepreneurship within the RM-7 zoning designation.	Discussed
#4	Discussion of proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16 related to Conditional Uses.	Discussed
#5	Approval of minutes from the January 6, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.	Approved

**MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON JANUARY 20, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ON ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:02 P.M.**

**Commission Members Present:** Chair Sarah Moore, Vice Chair Jason Hill

**On Zoom:** Commissioner Chris Horrocks

**Commission Members Absent:**

**Appointed Officers and Employees Present:** Community Development Director Bill Cobabe, City Planner/GIS Analyst Tae-Eun Ko, Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore, City Attorney Tysen Barker, City Council Member Rhett Butler, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Nicole Ackman, Mayor Heidi Hammond, City Recorder Alicia Fairbourn,

**On Zoom:** City Manager Michael Resare

**Citizens and Guests Present:** Ayyoob Abbaszadeh, Sheldon Birch, Kyle Allred, Gary Merrill, Randy Monsan, Mandy Smith, Truman Lancaster, Jeanet Lancaster, Tyler Dimmick, Mark Nielsen, Christine Allred

**Citizens and Guests Present on Zoom:** Unknowns

**Chair Sarah Moore called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.**

## **PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Grantsville City Planning Commission will hold a Regular Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday January 20, 2025 at 429 East Main Street, Grantsville, UT 84029. The agenda is as follows:

## **ROLL CALL**

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

- a) **Consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01- 112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 to change the land use designation from Single-Family Density to Mixed-Use Density for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street.**

**Tyler Dimmick:** Tyler Dimmick was present to comment on this item. He stated that he did not like the proposal and noted that this was typically why people come forward to speak. He explained that he lives up the road from the subdivision and is relatively new to Grantsville, having lived there for about four years. He stated that he has observed a significant amount of high-density housing being developed in the area. He explained that when he first moved to the area, the lots were half-acre, spread out, and open, which he found appealing and was what drew him to the community. He expressed concern about increasing density and stated that he does not like the idea of placing more people into the same space than what was originally designed.

**Mark Nielsen:** Mark Nielsen was present to comment on this item. He expressed concern that the Grantsville Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council were not understanding or responding to issues raised during monthly meetings. He stated that it had been approximately three months since the last meeting and that he had not received any response to concerns previously raised. He said that when he asks questions due to a lack of understanding, he feels his rights are being violated when he is told he cannot ask questions. He stated that he has a learning disability and explained that issues should be explained clearly so he can understand them during meetings, rather than being unable to ask questions when unfamiliar topics arise. Mark Nielsen stated that he has raised code

violation concerns for the past three and a half to four years without receiving a response from City Council or the Planning Department. He stated that these issues involve residents rights and that he has not heard any acknowledgment or resolution during that time. He clarified that his comments were not intended as a threat and stated that the Justice Department has requested video recordings he possesses related to these matters. He explained that these issues are raised multiple times each year and stated that the City should be aware of them given the length of time involved. He asked whether the Commission had considered situations similar to those occurring in Tooele, referencing the Winco development and water rights. He stated that changing from single-family to Mixed-Use Density could set a precedent related to water rights for future developments or businesses. He stated that he was unsure of the City's current water situation and noted that while he has observed continued growth, he is aware that water is a broader concern. He then raised concerns about economic impacts, referencing other cities such as Denver. He stated that the City is mixing multifamily housing with existing single-family homes and compared this approach to Denver, stating that Denver has experienced decreases in property values and sales tax revenue due to similar development patterns. He stated that Denver lost approximately four percent in sales tax revenue in each of the past two years and expressed concern that Grantsville could experience similar losses. Mark Nielsen stated that declining property values could result from increased multifamily development near existing homes and that this could negatively impact City revenue. He stated that the City relies on businesses for sales tax and expressed concern that Mixed-Use development could reduce revenue rather than increase it. He concluded by stating that he agreed with previous speakers and expressed his belief that the issue had not been fully thought through due to the level of density being proposed.

**Mandy Smith:** Mandy Smith was present to comment on this item. She explained that she lives immediately next to the property. She stated that she agreed with the previous speakers and expressed that she does not like the idea of Mixed-Use Density. She said she would like to see the property put to good use but does not want her property to be further devalued. She stated that people live in Grantsville because of the available space, the small-town feel, and the sense of community. She acknowledged that the town will continue to grow but stated that it does not need to resemble the Salt Lake Valley. She explained that people choose to live in Grantsville because they do not want to live in the Salt Lake Valley. She stated that she does not like having Mixed-Use Density development near her home and expressed concern about keeping her family safe, noting that not everyone has the same priorities.

**Kyle Allred:** Kyle Allred was present to comment on this item. He explained that he lives directly across the street from the property. He asked what the actual plan would be if the project moved forward, questioning whether it would involve 70 to 80 apartments or a few dozen townhomes, and whether there would be a significant difference between

those options. He stated that if the proposal involved a couple dozen townhomes, he would not have a concern, however, if it involved 60 to 70 apartments, he explained that he would have a problem with that level of density.

**Christine Allred:** Christine Allred was present to comment on this item. She asked questions about the property, explaining that the area is located on an alluvial fan and within the floodplain. She inquired about what flood mitigation plans would be required if development were to occur, particularly if the site were built up or the ground altered. She expressed concern for those who have recently built in the area and stated that she would like to see a flood mitigation plan in place before any rezoning or construction is approved.

- b) **Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01- 112-0-0011 from the A-10 and R-1-12 to the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street, excluding 0.95 acres proposed for commercial use.**

**Mark Neilson:** Mark Nielsen was present to comment on this item. He expressed concern that the proposed development would place a large number of residents in close proximity to existing homes, stating that approximately 40 to 50 people could potentially have views directly into neighboring backyards. He stated that this would result in a lack of privacy for surrounding residents and described the situation as unreasonable. He expressed that development should be located away from existing homes to avoid these impacts. He explained that due to the proximity of the proposed development, a significant portion of neighboring properties would be able to see into his backyard and home. He stated that this would eliminate privacy for his disabled wife and raised concerns about safety and the need to keep windows open at times. He referenced previous issues in the neighborhood related to privacy and stated that the close spacing would exacerbate those concerns. He also questioned whether the property remains within a flood zone and stated that he did not understand why development would occur in a floodplain when it could be avoided. He expressed frustration with not receiving clear responses during public meetings and reiterated concerns about building in flood-prone areas.

**Truman Lancaster:** Truman Lancaster was present to comment on this item. He explained that he and his wife recently moved into the neighborhood and live next to the Allreds, with the subject property located directly across the street from his home. He stated that the property is already there and acknowledged that it will be developed in some form. He explained that his primary concern is what type of development will occur. He questioned whether the proposal would result in apartments, which he stated would be a concern, or townhomes with individual ownership. He stated that ownership

brings responsibility and explained that his main question was what would ultimately be built on the property.

**Tyler Dimmick:** Tyler Dimmick was present to comment on this item and stated that he wanted to raise an additional point regarding traffic. He explained that although he had only lived in the area for four years, traffic had gotten exponentially worse during that time. He stated that as more high-density housing was added on the west side of town, Main Street had become increasingly congested. He expressed concern that the city did not currently have the infrastructure to support that level of growth and noted that additional infrastructure such as stoplights, turn lanes, and other traffic improvements would be required, which would increase costs in order to manage the additional vehicles traveling to and from the west side of the city. He added that additional high-density developments had already been approved nearby, including townhouses to the north of his property and a site at Cherry Blossom and Cherry Street that he understood was approved for high-density mixed use, which he believed would add far more people than the existing infrastructure was designed to handle. He reiterated that residents in that area did not want additional high-density housing, stating that people chose to live there for space rather than increased density. He further expressed frustration related to nearby townhomes, explaining that residents frequently walked their dogs through his neighborhood, leaving pet waste on his lawn and park strip, which he then had to clean up.

**Ethan Derrick:** Ethan Derrick was present to comment on this item and stated that he wanted to make a brief comment. He recalled that in approximately November 2023, developers had brought a concept plan to the City Council for 150 apartments. He stated that he wanted to know whether that proposal had since changed to townhomes and what that would look like moving forward.

**Mark Nielson:** Mark Nielson was present to comment on this item and stated that he agreed with the previous speaker regarding issues related to dog waste, noting that it could be harmful and make people sick and that it was something the Commission should be aware of. He then asked whether the Commission was aware that two stoplights were planned to be installed in the area.

## **AGENDA**

**1. Consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 to change the land use designation from Single-Family Density to Mixed-Use Density for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street.**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided background information on this item. She explained that the site, formerly known as the Applegate Apartments, was approved by

the Planning Commission in January 2005 for apartment development, with construction beginning in 2006 and later stalling due to funding issues. Several partially constructed structures remained unfinished for many years. The current request involved four parcels and proposed a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation to Mixed-Use density while retaining the existing CS commercial zoning. This change would allow townhome development and create a transition between commercial uses along SR-138 and residential uses to the south. Shelby noted that the proposal was consistent with the General Plan and Future Land Use Map, allowing up to 10 dwelling units per acre, with up to 15 units per acre subject to additional approval.

Vice Chair Hill asked the applicant to describe the proposed plans. Randy Krantz, representing Grantsville-Morocco LLC, explained that the existing garages would be removed and the partially constructed building would be completed and converted into a clubhouse with amenities such as a gym and pool room. The development would be gated and consist of townhomes on individual lots, replacing the previously approved plan for approximately 150 apartments on nine acres. Randy stated that the revised concept focused on higher-end townhomes, including some with main-floor master bedrooms. He added that the property had been cleaned, secured, and stabilized, and that the proposed townhomes would generate fewer impacts than the previously approved apartment project.

He further explained that the site bordered mostly commercial and industrial uses, including a junkyard, auto shop, roadway, and storm drainage facilities, with limited adjacent residential development.

Chair Sarah Moore clarified that the Commission's discussion was limited to land use and zoning, noting that detailed site plans are typically reviewed after zoning decisions are made. She emphasized that property owners have the right to develop their land as long as the proposal complies with City regulations. Based on a prior site visit during winter outreach, she noted the property's long-standing deterioration and expressed appreciation for the applicant's willingness to reinvest in the site. She then asked whether affordable housing options might be considered in the future.

Randy responded that rising construction and development costs made it difficult to meet subsidized affordability standards, though the townhomes would be priced as affordably as feasible given current conditions.

The Commission discussed floodplain and storm drainage issues, with Randy explaining that stormwater improvements were already in place and that the project would comply with all applicable standards during later review stages. Vice Chair Hill emphasized that the Commission's role at this stage was to evaluate consistency with the General Plan.

**Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of a proposed General Plan Amendment for parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 to change the land use designation from Single-Family Density to Mixed-Use Density for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street. Chris Horrocks seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”. The motion was carried unanimously.**

**2. Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 from the A-10 and R-1-12 to the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street, excluding 0.95 acres proposed for commercial use.**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore provided background information on the item, explaining that under the proposed zoning, townhomes and apartments would be allowed as a conditional use in the RM-15 district. She noted that the rezone would retain the commercial component along SR-138, as requested by the applicant, and confirmed that the proposal was consistent with the General Plan.

Vice Chair Hill noted that members of the public would have additional opportunity to comment during City Council consideration, and Chair Sarah Moore added that approval of the rezone would help solidify future development expectations.

**Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the Consideration of a proposed rezone of parcels 01-066-0-0006, 23-001-0-00A, 01-112-0-0012, and 01-112-0-0011 from the A-10 and R-1-12 to the RM-15 (Multiple Residential District) for the Apple Street Townhomes Subdivision, located at approximately Cherry Blossom Lane and Apple Street, excluding 0.95 acres proposed for commercial use. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”. The motion was carried unanimously.**

**3. Discussion of a proposed new use for Micro-Entrepreneurship within the RM-7 zoning designation.**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore introduced a discussion-only item proposing a new conditional use titled micro-entrepreneurship within the RM-7 zoning designation. She explained that the proposal stemmed from prior conditional use requests that did not clearly fit existing categories. The intent was to create a narrowly defined, low-impact business option that would allow small, locally owned businesses to operate in residential areas without creating commercial corridors or negatively affecting neighborhood character. She stated that the goal

was to support self-employment and small-scale economic activity while preserving Grantsville's residential focus.

Shelby outlined the proposed definition and standards, describing Micro-Entrepreneurship as a single, low-intensity business operating within one building or site. The use would be limited to no more than two employees, minimal customer traffic, primarily indoor activities, and residential-level impacts related to noise, traffic, lighting, and appearance. She explained that permitted activities could include artisan or craft production, woodworking, art and textile work, cottage-scale or micro-enterprise food production subject to state and county regulations, professional and office-based services, tutoring, appointment-based personal services, and incidental online sales.

She reviewed key operational limitations, including restrictions on wholesale distribution, limits on outdoor production unless specifically approved, class size and frequency caps, hours of operation between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., lighting standards to prevent light spillover, signage compliance, and parking and buffering requirements. Shelby also noted that eligibility would be limited by a minimum lot frontage requirement of 200 feet and that approval would occur through a conditional use permit reviewed by the Planning Commission on a case-by-case basis.

Vice Chair Hill asked how the proposed use differed from a traditional home occupation, particularly regarding residents producing goods indoors for online sales. Shelby explained that activities conducted entirely indoors with no customer interaction would remain classified as home occupations. The proposed Micro-Entrepreneurship use was intended for situations involving detached buildings or limited on-site customer interaction that exceeded typical home occupation allowances.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe added that the proposal functioned as a targeted expansion of home occupation standards. He emphasized that it was intentionally limited to larger lots where limited customer activity could occur without impacting surrounding properties. Discussion then focused on wholesale sales, delivery volume, and traffic impacts. Bill explained that many of those concerns would already be regulated through existing state and county requirements, particularly for food-related uses.

Chair Sarah Moore asked clarifying questions about garden produce sales and collaborative or consignment arrangements. Shelby clarified that off-site consignment or resale of goods produced elsewhere would not be allowed. She reiterated that the item was presented for discussion to allow refinement, including potential adjustments to the frontage requirement.

Commissioners expressed general support for the concept while noting the need for fine-tuning. Vice Chair Hill and Commissioner Horrocks supported the intent but suggested further evaluation of frontage standards. Chair Sarah Moore thanked staff and the Commission for the discussion and closed the item without action.

#### **4. Discussion of proposed amendments to Chapters 2, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16 related to Conditional Uses.**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore introduced the next agenda item, explaining that a proposed update to the conditional use permit section had expanded into a broader review of the Land Use Code. What began as a limited amendment required revisions to definitions, use tables, and related chapters to maintain consistency and enforceability. She advised the Commission that she would summarize the major changes.

Shelby explained that several definitions were revised to align with City standards and existing documents, including replacing the term “clear view zone” with the City’s standard term “sight triangle.” She also refined definitions related to conditional uses, mitigation, and detrimental impacts, emphasizing that conditional uses must be supported by substantial evidence and written findings demonstrating compatibility with surrounding properties.

She noted that staff added definitions for housing types not previously defined, including duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, and clarified definitions for final plans and final plats to align with state law and City requirements. Vice Chair Hill asked questions regarding accessory dwelling unit kitchen limits. Shelby explained the intent was to prevent single-family homes from functioning as multi-unit rentals and acknowledged that the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) language may need further refinement.

Shelby also explained that floodplain-related definitions were being updated to align with state language. She then reviewed significant revisions to the home occupation section, stating that home occupations must remain subordinate to residential use and not alter neighborhood character. She explained that a 100-foot frontage requirement was added for home occupations requiring conditional use approval. Chair Sarah Moore raised concerns about narrow townhome frontages and clustered developments, noting potential impacts on emergency response, and Shelby agreed those concerns informed the tighter standards.

Additional discussion addressed updates to animal-related definitions, including clarifying exclusions for dangerous animals. City Attorney Tysen Barker agreed the language could be simplified to avoid confusion. Shelby also noted that definitions already referenced in use tables, such as Kennel Permit Class A, were added to Chapter 2, and that transportation-related definitions were reorganized for clarity.

Vice Chair Hill asked about the addition of a stormwater facility definition. Shelby explained that the definition was necessary to enforce existing open space standards and noted that policy changes would require amendments to other chapters. Vice Chair Hill expressed interest in considering certain stormwater areas as open space under appropriate conditions.

Shelby reviewed additional conditional use approval criteria, emphasizing the need for written findings to support Commission decisions. Discussion also addressed customer traffic limits, delivery activity, and enforcement flexibility. Chair Sarah Moore noted similarities with the Micro-Entrepreneurship discussion and suggested the City consider reasonable flexibility for occasional increases in activity.

City Attorney Tysen Barker explained the role of master development agreements (MDAs), noting that they are used to document project-specific commitments approved by City Council and must remain consistent with the Land Use Code and state law.

Shelby concluded by summarizing updates to landscaping standards, park strip materials, use table clean-up, and general administrative organization.

#### **5. Approval of minutes from the January 6, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting.**

Vice Chair Hill noted that City Council Member Derek Dalton had previously pointed out typos in one of the documents and wanted to make sure those corrections were captured. Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore asked whether he was referring to the MDA language. Vice Chair Hill clarified that his concern was mainly that the minutes reflected that the document had been approved with the understanding that a typo needed to be cleaned up.

Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant, Nicole Ackman clarified that, as she remembered it, the typo issue had been discussed, but it was not included as part of the formal motion when the Commission approved the Master Development Agreement (MDA).

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe confirmed that the minor revisions had been made prior to City Council consideration and described them as de minimis changes such as typos and formatting or ordering adjustments.

**Jason Hill made a motion to recommend approval of the minutes from the January 6, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting. Chris Horrock seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye,” Chris Horrocks “Aye”. The motion was carried unanimously.**

#### **6. Report from City Staff.**

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore informed the Commission that the application deadline for the UAPA asphalt preservation awards had been extended. She reported that she submitted two applications on behalf of the City, including one for the City’s largest asphalt preservation project, and noted that award announcements were expected around January 26.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe then provided a brief update, explaining that staff had been working on an annexation policy plan update. He stated that the draft would be

brought before the Planning Commission at the next meeting for discussion only, similar to other recent policy items. He explained that the goal would be to gather feedback, address any concerns, and refine the proposal prior to holding a public hearing, after which the item would return to the Commission.

## **7. Open Forum for Planning Commissioners.**

Chair Sarah Moore shared that she sometimes felt concerned that members of the public may leave meetings feeling unheard, even though many resources and detailed information are available on the Grantsville City website. She noted that while the public process can feel limiting, the information needed to understand procedures and decisions is accessible, and the intent is never to dismiss community concerns.

Planning and Zoning Administrator Shelby Moore encouraged the public to reach out directly to staff, stating that she and Nicole Ackman are available to answer questions, provide guidance, share relevant information, or meet one-on-one when needed. She emphasized that staff are willing to help clarify processes and address concerns outside of formal meeting constraints.

Chair Sarah Moore acknowledged that the public comments raised during the meeting were thoughtful and meaningful, and she recognized that community concerns often come from a genuine place. She reiterated that while the Commission follows state law and established procedures and cannot respond during public comment, that limitation should not be interpreted as a lack of care or concern.

## **8. Report from City Council.**

City Council Member Rhett Butler provided an update to the Planning Commission, noting that City Council would be discussing and potentially recommending John Montgomery for appointment to the Planning and Zoning Commission at an upcoming City Council meeting scheduled for Thursday of that week.

He then summarized several items recently considered by City Council, including an ordinance related to the MDA and easement access for the Cloward Court minor subdivision, which was approved by City Council. He also noted that City Council approved the rezone from RM-15 to CN for properties located north of Main Street. He explained that City Council did not approve the rezone at the corner of Main Street from a commercial development district to RM-15, citing a desire to preserve Main Street as a commercial corridor.

He addressed public comment procedures and described a new approach recently used by Mayor Hammond during City Council meetings. He explained that the approach places the public hearing immediately before Commission or Council discussion on a specific agenda item, rather

than separating public comment from deliberation. He stated that this format can help residents feel more heard by allowing the Commission to address key concerns shortly after testimony, while still avoiding direct dialogue during the public hearing. He encouraged the Planning Commission to consider whether a similar approach would be appropriate and to coordinate with staff if changes were desired.

Commissioner Horrocks stated that the approach was worth considering. City Council Member Rhett also encouraged the Commission to establish clear ground rules before public comment, including explaining the purpose of the hearing and setting reasonable time limits. He suggested that this could improve meeting flow and offered to assist as a timekeeper if needed.

Chair Sarah Moore agreed that setting expectations is important but noted the challenges of limiting comments when residents feel unheard, especially when multiple agenda items involve related issues. She emphasized the need to balance fairness, civility, and efficiency and stated that the Commission would work toward clearer ground rules in future meetings. She also expressed appreciation for residents who participate in public comment, acknowledging that speaking publicly can be difficult.

Rhett suggested that a standard three-minute time limit is reasonable, and Chair Sarah Moore agreed, noting that some flexibility may still be needed depending on circumstances. He concluded by reiterating that adjusting the timing of public hearings and discussions could help improve public engagement and understanding.

## **9. Adjourn.**

**Jason Hill made a motion to adjourn. Sarah Moore seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Sarah Moore “Aye,” Jason Hill “Aye”, Chris Horrocks “Aye”. The motion was carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.**