

**CITY OF OREM
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 9, 2015**

The following items are discussed in these minutes:

- ZOA – PROJECTIONS INTO SETBACKS – RECOMMEND APPROVAL**
- ZOA – PRD DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS – RECOMMEND APPROVAL**
- OREM CONVENIENCE STORE – APPROVAL**
- GPA – ADOPT CANYON VIEW, ORCHARD & CASCADE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN – RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

STUDY SESSION

PLACE – Orem City Main Conference Room

At 3:30 p.m. Chair Moulton called the Study Session to order.

Those present: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton, Planning Commission members; Bill D. Bell, Development Services Director; Jason W. Bench, Planning Director; David R. Stroud, City, Planner; Clinton Spencer, GIS Planner; Brandon Stocksdale, Planner; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Steve Earl, Legal Counsel; David Spencer, City Council Liaison and Loriann Merritt, Minutes Secretary

Those excused: Becky Buxton and Michael Walker, Planning Commission members; Cliff Peterson, Private Development Engineer

The Commission and staff briefly reviewed agenda items and minutes from November 18, 2015 meeting and adjourned at 4:25 p.m. to the City Council Chambers for the regular meeting.

REGULAR MEETING

PLACE - Orem City Council Chambers

At 4:30 p.m. Chair Moulton called the Planning Commission meeting to order and asked Lynnette Larsen, Planning Commission member, to offer the invocation.

Those present: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton, Planning Commission members; Bill D. Bell, Development Services Director; Jason W. Bench, Planning Director; David R. Stroud, City, Planner; Clinton Spencer, GIS Planner; Brandon Stocksdale, Planner; Sam Kelly, City Engineer; Cliff Peterson, Private Development Engineer; Paul Goodrich, Transportation Engineer; Steve Earl, Legal Counsel; and Loriann Merritt, Minutes Secretary

Those excused: Becky Buxton and Michael Walker, Planning Commission members; David Spencer, City Council Liaison

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.1** as follows:

AGENDA ITEM 3.1 is a request by Development Services to **AMEND SECTION 22-6-9(C)(3) AND SECTION 22-6-8(E) OF THE OREM CITY CODE PERTAINING TO PERMITTED PROJECTIONS INTO SETBACKS IN A RESIDENTIAL ZONE.**

Staff Presentation: Mr. Stroud said the current Code permits "...bay windows, box windows, chimneys..." to encroach into a setback no more than 24 inches. Staff has interpreted this to be a window structure without any floor space. This section of the Code cannot be interpreted to include cantilevered floor space which is often found in bathroom and closet areas of a house.

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

The Code does not define a bay window or box window. Since there is ambiguity to the what the definition could be, staff has proposed changes to the Code to allow projections into the setback while not limiting the definition of the projection. The proposed language still includes bay and box windows but also uses the term “non-direct foundation supported projections” to include any other type of structural element that encroaches into the setback. The proposed change will allow up to two (2) projections of no more than twenty-four (24) inches and ten (10) feet wide into any setback. Easements may prohibit the use of a projection. Each projection that encroaches into a setback shall be located on a separate structural elevation.

Advantages

- Clarifies permitted projections
- Treats projections as the same
- Increases options with respect to house design and improves aesthetics

Disadvantages

- None identified

Recommendation: The Development Review Committee recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend Section 22-6-9(C)(3) and Section 22-6-8(E) of the Orem City Code pertaining to permitted projections into setbacks in a residential zone.

22-6-8(C)(3)

Setbacks. No portion of a principal building or dwelling shall violate the required setbacks except as noted herein.

a. ~~Roof overhangs, bay windows, box windows, chimneys, covered stairwells, and stairs, or non-direct foundation supported projections (collectively referred to as “projections”)~~ may encroach into ~~the~~ required setbacks ~~a total of~~ no more than twenty-four inches (24”) ~~provided that with a maximum~~ the width of any such encroachment is no more than ten (10) feet. ~~A single-family residential structure may have no more than two (2) such projections into a required setback and each such projection must be located on a separate elevation. Eaves and projections shall not encroach over a public utility easement. Building codes may apply that prevent encroachment into a setback.~~ Porches and the roofs over them may project up to five feet (5’) into a required front or rear yard setback. ~~Nothing herein shall be construed to permit the encroachment of a projection into a required setback where such encroachment is prohibited by an applicable building code.~~

b. ~~Covered decks/patios and decks/patios extending from upper floors of the main structure shall comply with the setback requirements of the zone. Uncovered decks/patios may extend to the side and rear property lines provided that the deck/patio floor level does not exceed eighteen inches (18”) in height above the grade. If the uncovered deck/patio exceeds eighteen inches (18”) in height above the grade, it shall be set back at least ten feet (10’) from the side and rear lot lines.~~

• c. The Director of Development Services may approve a setback that is less than that required by this Article, provided that:

i. the corresponding setback on at least seventy percent (70%) of the lots within a distance of three hundred feet (300’) in all directions, excluding lots within planned residential developments, is less than that required above; and

ii. The reduced setback is no less than the average of all the corresponding yard setbacks in “(1)” above.

22-6-8

E. ~~Covered Decks and Patios. Covered decks/patios and decks/patios extending from upper floors of the main structure shall comply with the setback requirements of the zone. Uncovered decks/patios may extend to the side and rear property lines provided that the deck/patio floor level does not exceed eighteen inches (18”) in height above the grade. If the uncovered deck/patio exceeds eighteen inches (18”) in height above the grade, it shall be set back at least ten feet (10’) from the side and rear lot lines. RESERVED~~

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stroud.

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

When no one came forward, Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff. When none did, he called for a motion on this item.

Planning Commission Action: Ms. Larsen said she is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. She then moved to recommend the City Council amend Section 22-6-8(C)(3) and Section 22-6-8(E) of the Orem City Code pertaining to projections into setbacks in a residential zone. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.2** as follows:

AGENDA ITEM 3.2 is a request by Development Services to **AMEND ARTICLE 22-7 OF THE OREM CITY CODE PERTAINING TO DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF THE PRD ZONE.**

Staff Presentation: Mr. Stroud said that according to Article 22-7 of the City Code, the purpose of the PRD zone is to create diverse and quality housing in the City of Orem. This is accomplished by 1) allowing higher densities than a typical residential development, 2) establishing standards for site and building design, and 3) requiring standards that enable PRD’s to fit into surrounding neighborhoods.

There are thirteen locations in the City where the PRD zone has been approved. Only one of these locations has not been developed due to UVU purchasing the property and developing a parking lot.

A PRD development is much like a PD development in that a rezone is required before development can take place. At the time of rezone to a PD zone, a concept plan, text, and building elevations are usually presented to the City and adopted as part of the ordinance. PD zones are site specific and development standards are determined with each PD zone. A PRD zone differs in that it has development standards and is only required to have a concept plan and building elevations are shown at the time of rezone but not approved as part of the Code. Currently, the developer is not required to follow the concept plan of a PRD zone provided a PRD development meets the requirements outlined in Article 22-7.

The Code is proposed to be amended to require the concept plan and elevations of any PRD zone to be adopted into the appendix of the City Code. This will then serve as a readily accessible location to review any PRD approval and function similar to PD exhibits in the appendix.

Another proposed change to the PRD zone concerns roads. The current PRD ordinance permits public or private roads. The change to the road standard requires all roads to be public, have a landscaped separated sidewalk on both sides of the street, and all dwellings to follow the street setback as shown on Appendix K of the Code which is the current sub-local street design standard. A private drive will only be permitted in unique circumstances and shall only access up to four units. Private roads can become maintenance issues for a homeowner’s association when the time comes to repair or replace. Often, the HOA will ask the City to take over a private road at such time because the HOA cannot afford the maintenance. The City is hesitant to accept responsibility of any road that does not meet City standards.

Advantages

- Eliminates future road maintenance issues for an HOA as any road will be constructed to City standards
- Provides sidewalks on both sides of a street
- Requires standards allowing PRD’s to more easily fit into single-family neighborhoods

Disadvantages

- None identified

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

Recommendation: The Development Review Committee recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend Article 22-7 of the Orem City Code pertaining to development standards of the PRD zone.

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stroud.

Mr. Cook asked if the property is the back of the curb happens to be the sidewalk, is it in a sidewalk easement. Mr. Stroud said a subdivision typically has a 20-foot sidewalk & PUE easement that takes care of that. Ms. Larsen asked who maintains the planter strip. Mr. Stroud said most PRD’s are not individual lots and the planter strip is in the common area. Most PRD’s will be done through the HOA’s. Ms. Larsen asked if there are certain trees that are allowed. Mr. Stroud said that Appendix U list what trees are appropriate for this subdivision. Vice Chair Iglesias asked if the subdivision is required to have an HOA. Mr. Stroud said yes if there is any common area. The hope is it will be maintained.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

When no one came forward, Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Chair Moulton said he likes this proposal. Mr. Stroud said there will be more money for streets since they are wider, however, they will get a density bonus and should be held to the same standards as a single family development. Ms. Jeffreys said her mom lives in an HOA that does not have a snow removal issue, but a sewer issue. There was a situation where water backed up into her basement. If it is a public street it would not be an issue and would be taken care of. Mr. Stroud said that sewer lines in the street are public. Typically the homeowner is responsible for the sewer lateral to the main. On a waterline the City takes everything up to the meter and the meter to the home it is the responsibility of the homeowner. Mr. Kelly said typically even in a private development the sewer is still private. Even though they will have public roads the sewer is not public, however, the sewer still could be a private system. That would have to be something that would be negotiated at the time it comes through. Mr. Cook asked that even if the road is private, the sewer could be private or the other way around. Mr. Kelly said there are some cases where it is a private development and because of the way it is routed the sewer is public. There is some public sewer in Northridge, though it is a private development.

Planning Commission Action: Chair Moulton said he is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. He then recommended the City Council amend Article 22-7 of the Orem City Code pertaining to development standards of the PRD zone. Vice Chair Iglesias seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 3.3** as follows:

AGENDA ITEM 3.3 is a request by Spencer H Wright to vacate Lots 2 and 3 of Wasatch Orem Center Street, Plat A and final plat approval of **WASATCH OREM CENTER STREET, PLAT B** and site plan approval of **OREM CONVENIENCE STORE** at 1152 West Center Street in the PD-41 zone.

Staff Presentation: Mr. Spencer said the applicant is proposing to construct a new convenience store and gas station. The property is part of the PD-41 zone which includes the residential apartment development adjacent to the proposed project. The property for the proposed convenience store is designated as commercial and the proposed use is an approved use in the zone.

The proposed final plat combines the two (2) existing subdivided lots designated for commercial into one (1) lot with 1.60 acres. Easements on the plat include a new sewer line location and a revised storm drain location.

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

The proposed building is twenty-five (25) feet tall and is finished with red brick and several window and door openings on each side of the building. There is a total of 5,094 square feet in the building. Twelve (12) gas pumps are also proposed with a twenty (20) foot canopy covering.



As per code requirements twenty-one (21) parking stalls are required and twenty-five (25) have been provided.

No fencing is proposed or required with the project.

The landscape plan includes a total of 19,211 square feet. Thirty-five (35) trees will be located on the property including the required thirteen trees along Center Street as well as others on the private street frontages. Five (5) trees will also be planted on the west side of the property adjacent to the future water feature on Center Street.

The dumpster is located on the property to the east of the proposed site plan and is enclosed as per City code.

The applicant is providing additional sidewalk access which will increase pedestrian accessibility going to and through the site. There are no other traffic concerns.

Recommendation: Based on compliance with all applicable City codes, staff recommends the Planning Commission vacate Lots 2 and 3 of Wasatch Orem Center Street, Plat A, and approve the final plat of Wasatch Orem Center Street, Plat B and the site plan of Orem Convenience Store at 1152 West Center Street in the PD-41 Zone.

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Spencer.

Vice Chair Iglesias asked if the turn right into the drive-thru may cause back up onto the main road. Chair Moulton suggested the ingress should be on the right (looking out the driveway) and the egress on the left. Ms. Larsen said that will put the driver on the wrong side for the drive-thru. She noted that there could be staking problems and it is a funky design.

When Vice Chair Iglesias asked if the City Traffic Engineer had looked at this plan, Mr. Goodrich said this is a drink drive-thru. That means there will not be waiting for food to be cooked; they will just get their item and leave. He has seen some places that have 2-3 cars waiting. The driver needs to be next to the building. The drive-thru is a long loopy drive, but the real problem is access onto 1200 West. He does not think it will be a problem. Ms. Jeffreys asked if there is sidewalk along Center Street. Mr. Goodrich said yes, it will be an eight foot park strip with the trees and a sidewalk on the north side of this development. A person could park in the west lot and walk on the sidewalk to the front door of the building on the east side. The sidewalk along Center Street is a pedestrian sidewalk, but there is a sidewalk connection to the building. Mr. Cook wondered why the sidewalk is not continuous on the north on the west of the east drive through. Mr. Spencer said the applicant proposed either sidewalk or landscaping and staff would like landscaping. There is sidewalk access across the street.

Mr. Cook said the drive area on the north side of the pumps seems to be minimum width. Mr. Goodrich said there are no minimum or maximum standards in the Code for the layout of a gas pumping area. This was left up to the applicant to determine what is located there. The staff supported more landscaping. Vice Chair Iglesias said it also provides a barrier with the trees. Mr. Spencer said there are now two property owners, the property to the north suggested having some landscaping separation. Ms. Jeffreys asked if the landscaping to the east was suggested by the property owners to the north. Mr. Spencer said they are the evergreen trees required by ordinance. They are supposed to have one every 300 square feet on the site. It does buffer from the development across the street. Mr. Goodrich said there is sidewalk from 1200 West to the front of the building.

Chair Moulton invited the applicant to come forward. Phil Holland introduced himself.

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

Mr. Holland said when looking at the access to the drive-thru, they looked at stacking. They think they will be able to stack 4-5 cars comfortably. Those in line will not be waiting for burger and fries, but more of cookie and drink. The size and shape is unique. They do not have a lot of space north to south and so it has to be made wide. That is some of the reason for the landscaping and where the sidewalk stops.

Chair Moulton asked if gas trucks will be able to turn around in the space. Mr. Holland said the spacing is the reason for the placement of the underground tanks out front. That will provide enough radius for the trucks to come in and head out with ease. Ms. Larsen asked if they will come in the east and go out the west. Mr. Holland said they could enter at either entrance. Ms. Larsen then asked if they will turn east upon exiting the site. Mr. Cook said that that turning to the west will cause them to have to turn right on 1200 West. He then asked if there is enough turning radius on the east drive for either direction. Mr. Holland said the studies showed yes. Making sure that works is the first thing a gas business needs to have happen. Ms. Larsen said she likes having the trees outlining the property; it camouflages the sea of asphalt.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

Justin Livingstone, Orem, said he is a student. He addressed the drive-thru holding 4-5 cars. Sodalicious is a half mile east of this site. During the day there are 15+ cars in the drive-thru and it stays busy for many hours. There is also a walk in line also. If this drive-thru can only accommodate 4-5 cars, then people will need to find other alternatives for parking. Vice Chair Iglesias said that Sodalicious is a fixed mixed drink. This is a fountain drink or hand out a six pack of coke. Chair Moulton said that there is a gas station on 1600 North near where he lives. Having 4-5 people in line is plenty. He has never seen more than two at a time. Mr. Livingstone said that these mixed drinks are becoming very popular and if they branch off then it will be a major concern.

Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Ms. Larsen said the drive-thru window will be market driven. If customers cannot get service, ultimately they will go somewhere else.

Chair Moulton called for a motion on this item.

Planning Commission Action: Mr. Cook said he has found that neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by vacating Lots 2 and 3 of Wasatch Center Street Subdivision, Plat A, and that there is good cause for the vacation. He then moved to:

1. Vacate Lots 2 and 3 of Wasatch Center Subdivision, Plat A; and
2. Approve the final plat of Wasatch Orem Center Street Subdivision, Plat B with one lot; and
3. Approve the site plan of Orem Convenience Store at 1152 West Center Street.

Ms. Jeffreys seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Moulton introduced **AGENDA ITEM 4.1** as follows:

AGENDA ITEM 4.1 is a request by Development Services to adopt the **CANYON VIEW, ORCHARD AND CASCADE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN** and amend the Orem City General Plan to include the **CANYON VIEW, ORCHARD AND CASCADE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AS APPENDIX C**.

Staff Presentation: Mr. Stocksdales said this is the first neighborhood plan to be completed in the City of Orem’s Neighborhood Plan Program. The major goals of the plan include promoting community planning by working with residents to identify local concerns and needs; improving communication with residents; and applying city-wide plans at the neighborhood level.

Three public open houses were held and a citizen-driven Advisory Committee was formed to help identify concerns, shape the vision statement, and assist in drafting the plan. Community outreach was also

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

supported by the City’s MindMixer and mySidewalk pages. The major elements of the plan include an introduction, an inventory of existing conditions, future land uses; transportation, neighborhood preservation, and implementation.

Some of the major objectives of the plan include:

- Preserving the character of the neighborhoods while allowing for appropriate growth and redevelopment;
- Addressing current and future traffic congestion concerns;
- Improving non-vehicular access throughout the community;
- Maintaining and improving parks and recreational facilities;
- Improving coordination and ordinance enforcement; and
- Providing sufficient amenities throughout the neighborhoods.

Each neighborhood plan serves as a guide for future planning decisions made by city staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council based on the goals and vision established by the residents. It is intended that each neighborhood plan will be updated approximately every five years.

Recommendation: The Development Services Department requests the Planning Commission provide a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the approval of the Canyon View, Orchard & Cascade Neighborhood Plan and adopting it as Appendix C of the Orem City General Plan.

Diane Fraser said she came out to the first meeting and was interested in what the City was planning for her area. She wants her neighborhood to stay close to the same as is now. It was a great experience to participate on the committee. There were people from all three neighborhoods and they did not always agree, but they were able to come to a consensus. It was interesting to see how the City really does things, instead of it being a mysterious thing.

Mr. Stocksdale presented the Vision Statement for the Neighborhood Plans.

Enhance our quality of life by improving public safety and awareness; expanding transportation options through making streets safer for pedestrians, children, and bicyclists; increasing access to parks and open space; and making wise land use choices to consider future growth as we create homes that support the preservation and beautification of our neighborhoods.

This document creates a guide for future Planning Commission, City Council and Staff regarding development in these neighborhoods.

Mr. Stocksdale reviewed the major objectives.

- Preserving the character of the neighborhoods while allowing for appropriate growth and redevelopment;
- Addressing current and future traffic congestion concerns;
- Improving non-vehicular access throughout the community;
- Maintaining and improving parks and recreational facilities;
- Improving coordination and ordinance enforcement; and
- Providing sufficient amenities throughout the neighborhoods.

He then reviewed Land Use and Transportation concerns.

Land Use

- Existing Conditions:
 - Largely Single Family Housing
 - Commercial/Office uses on 800 North
 - Parks build adjacent to schools
- Future Considerations:
 - Infill development on vacant lots and orchards

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

- Balance access to open space and parks; encourage new open space development
- Increased density through attached homes and accessory apartments
- Development of churches on existing lots
- Use of Professional Office (PO) zone on 800 North

Transportation Concerns:

- Improve safety around schools and parks.
- Improve nonvehicle transportation options and safety, including for bikes and pedestrians.
- Improve trail and sidewalk facilities.
- Maintain traffic capacities on major streets and utilize traffic calming techniques in the neighborhoods.

Goal/Objective/Action	Department	Implementation Timeline			
		On-Going	Short-Term	Mid-Term	Long-Term
Goal 1. Preserve the character of the neighborhoods while allowing for appropriate growth and redevelopment.					
a.	Objective: Preserve the single family nature of the neighborhoods through low density development and appropriate infill.	Development Services	X		
	Action 1: Amend the City of Orem General Plan to include appropriate housing types in the residential neighborhoods.	Planning Division		X	
	Action 2: Review Planned Residential Development (PRD) and Planned Development (PD) requirements to ensure appropriate infill design standards.	Planning Division		X	
b.	Objective: Maintain retail and office uses along the 800 North corridor.	Development Services	X		
	Action 1: Amend the City of Orem General Plan and Map to encourage the Professional Services (PS) and limited Community Commercial (CC) uses along 800 North.	Planning Division		X	
Goal 2. Address current and future traffic congestion concerns.					
a.	Objective: Maintain traffic capacities on major streets and utilize traffic calming techniques in the neighborhoods.	Development Services			X
	Action 1: Incorporate traffic concerns into the Orem Transportation Master Plan.	Engineering Division		X	
	Action 2: Complete a traffic calming study on neighborhood collectors.	Planning Division / Engineering Division		X	
Goal 3. Improve non-vehicular access throughout the community.					

Chair Moulton asked if the Planning Commission had any questions for Mr. Stocksdale.

Ms. Jeffreys asked if future neighborhood plans will be based on what has been learned from this plan. Mr. Stocksdale said they chose these neighborhoods because they are established. This gave Staff time to build a structure and framework that will be used in future neighborhood plans.

Chair Moulton opened the public hearing and invited those from the audience who had come to speak to this item to come forward to the microphone.

When no one came forward, Chair Moulton closed the public hearing and asked if the Planning Commission had any more questions for the applicant or staff.

Chair Moulton offered appreciation to Mr. Stocksdale and those who have volunteered and contributed to this plan. It is good to have neighborhood participation.

“Planning Commission minutes for December 9, 2015”

Ms. Larsen said she served on the committee and learned a lot. It was interesting to see how the City works and it is nice to have your voice heard and contribute to process.

Vice Chair Iglesias said now the citizens in the neighborhood can understand what the City wants and visa versus. With everyone is in the conversation there will be better participation. Mr. Cook said he is impressed with the process and the product.

Ms. Larsen reiterated it is nice to have your voice heard.

Chair Moulton called for a motion on this item.

Planning Commission Action: Ms. Larsen said she is satisfied that the Planning Commission has found this request complies with all applicable City codes. She then recommended the City Council adopt the Canyon View, Orchard, and Cascade Neighborhood Plan as part of the General Plan. Vice Chair Iglesias seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed 2016 calendar.

Planning Commission Action: Ms. Jeffreys moved to approve the 2016 Planning Commission Calendar. Chair Moulton seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

MINUTES: The Planning Commission reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting. Chair Moulton then moved to approve the meeting minutes for November 18, 2015. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURN: Chair Moulton called for a motion to adjourn. Chair Moulton moved to adjourn. Ms. Jeffreys seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Carl Cook, Carlos Iglesias, Karen Jeffreys, Lynnette Larsen, and David Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn: 5:37 p.m.

Jason Bench
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved: January 6, 2016