Notice is hereby given that the South Ogden City Planning Commission will hold a meeting August 11, 2016, beginning at 6:15 p.m. in the Council Chambers located at 3950 Adams Avenue, South Ogden, Utah.

A briefing session will be held at 5:30 pm in the conference room and is open to the public.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND OVERVIEW OF MEETING PROCEDURES - Chairman Raymond Rounds

II. ZONING HEARING
   A. To Receive and Consider Comments on Proposed Changes to Land Use Notification Requirements

III. ZONING ACTIONS
   A. Discussion and Recommendation on Proposed Changes to Land Use Notification Requirements

IV. SPECIAL ITEMS
   A. Presentation of Proposed General Plan Map and Land Use Chapter

V. OTHER BUSINESS

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
   A. Approval of June 9, 2016 Briefing Meeting Minutes
   B. Approval of June 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VIII. ADJOURN

Posted and emailed to the State of Utah Public Notice Website August 8, 2016.
The undersigned, duly appointed city recorder, does hereby certify that a copy of the above notice and agenda was posted in three public places with the South Ogden City limits on August 8, 2016. These public places being City Hall (1st and 2nd floors), the city website (www.southogdencity.com), and emailed to the Standard-Examiner. Copies were also mailed to each commissioner.

Leesa Kapetanov, City Recorder

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations, including auxiliary communicative aids and services during the meeting should notify Leesa Kapetanov at 801-622-2709 at least 48 hours in advance.

FINAL ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA
10-1-4: CHANGES AND AMENDMENTS:
This title, including the maps, may be amended from time to time by the city council after holding a public hearing. At least ten (10) days' notice of the time and place of such hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area. For any amendment to the zoning map, the notice for a public hearing will be sent at least (10) calendar days before the public hearing to the record owner of each parcel to be rezoned, and the record owner of each parcel located within five hundred feet (500') of the property to be rezoned regardless of whether such property is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the city. All proposed amendments shall be first proposed by the planning commission or shall be submitted to the planning commission for its recommendation which shall be returned to the city for its consideration within thirty (30) days. Failure of the planning commission to take action on the proposed amendment within the prescribed time shall be deemed approval by such commission of the proposed change or amendment. The city council may overrule the planning commission's recommendation by a majority vote of its members. (Ord. 00-24, 12-5-2000, eff. 12-5-2000; amd. 2001 Code)

10-15-4: REVIEW PROCEDURE:
A. Application: Application for a conditional use permit shall be made to the planning commission via assigned city staff using application forms provided by the city.

B. Information Required: At a minimum, detailed location, site, and building plans shall accompany an application for a conditional use. For a conditional use located in an existing structure, only a location plan needs to be provided.

C. Consideration: The application, with all pertinent information, shall be considered by the planning commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting following receipt of the completed application.

D. Public Hearing: The planning commission may hold a public hearing on any application after adequate notice, if it is deemed in the public interest. If a public hearing is held, notice of the public hearing shall be sent at least ten (10) calendar days to the record owner of each parcel located within five hundred feet (500') of the property seeking a conditional use regardless of whether such property is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the city. The planning commission shall take action on the application by the second meeting of the planning commission after the application filing date. (Ord. 15-22, 10-6-2015, eff. 10-6-2015)
Planning Commission Report

Subject: Amendments to the General Plan  
Draft Land Use Chapter and Land Use Map Update

Author: Mark Vlasic

Department: Planning & Zoning

Date: August 11, 2016

Background
Staff has been updating the Land Use Chapter since the beginning of the year, with the intent of providing clear and consistent vision for land use. Input by staff originally focused on revising the 1997 Land Use Chapter, incorporating relevant portions of the South Ogden Quality of Life Plan (2001) and the Land Use chapter of the 1998 General Plan Update, as described below:

Quality of Life Element (2001)
This plan was adopted as a new element to the general plan in May 2011. The plan contains three chapters as follow:

- Chapter 1 – Pedestrian and Vehicular Safety
- Chapter 2 – Beautification of Streets, Gateways and Neighborhoods
- Chapter 3 – Parks Recreation, Open Space and Trails

Chapters 1 and 2 focus on making improvements to city streets, many of which have since been implemented or are no longer valid due to changes that have taken place in the ensuing fifteen years. Chapter 3 made specific recommendations for acquiring parks land and establishing trails, some of which were completed and others not.

1998 General Plan Update
This update also addresses three topics/chapters as follow:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction & Background
- Chapter 2 – Land Use & Neighborhood Design
- Chapter 3 – Socio-Economics

Chapter 1 establishes a new vision for the city that is representative of the values of its residents.
Chapter 2 establishes the fact that the city is nearly built-out, and that in order to move forward redevelopment efforts will be required. It is noted that redevelopment must be conducted with sensitivity, attention to detail and creativity. Key changes for meeting this goal include the addition of urban street trails, providing new gathering spaces, and establishing an attractive and identifiable city center in the area between 36th and 40th Street on both sides of Washington Boulevard.

Chapter 3 addresses the desire to maintain and strengthen the economic base of the city by redeveloping areas along Washington Boulevard in the north end of the city. The subarea to the west is identified for the redevelopment of larger-scale uses, and the area to the east should transition for m large uses along Washington Boulevard to smaller-scale, walkable uses that promotes small-scale neighborhood retail and a mixed-use profile that scales downward to the east where low-density residential uses will remain.

The final deliverable of this process will be a revised Land Use Chapter and Land Use Map, which should be adopted as an update to the 1997 Plan Land Use Chapter.

Preliminary Review and Analysis

The 1997 Land Use and Circulation Plan is illustrated in Map 1. In order to compare this map with the 2008 update, the original map has been converted into a digital GIS format (see Map 2). Map 3 is the Existing Land Use Map that was contained in the 2008 General Plan, reformatted and updated to reflect existing uses through 2014. Map 2 and Map 3 have been compared and analyzed, with nearly 50 inconsistencies/conflicts indicated, as illustrated in Map 4. Most of the differences are site-specific, reflecting the difference between the vision contained in the 1997 General Plan and what was actually developed.

The following is a list of some of the more significant differences between the three plans, which will require more in-depth analysis and thought:

- Incorporation of the City Center and 40th Street Corridor ideas, and modifications to the Neighborhood Preservation Zone text and maps;

- How to reflect existing and proposed parks and open space;

- How to address existing vacant land that may develop into other uses, including parks and open space.

- How to address the Burch Creek corridor which includes some open space through the center of the City with some trail connections. This should be continued and connected with both off-street and on-street trails to complete the trail corridor.
• Predominantly regional and local commercial uses including a mix of other uses including residential, office, schools, parks and open spaces, and other dense uses. This use area will be subject to the new form-based code which should allow for a variety of uses that are compatible in use, quality, and design.

• R/I Religious and Institutional – Do we want these indicated on the general plan map, or discuss where they are appropriate in the text

• Old Town District and City Center District – The 2008 Plan paid particular attention to the need to distinguish the differences between these two areas. Should this level of distinction be addressed in the map, the text, or both?

**Draft Land Use Chapter and Map**

The following draft text and map are presented for your input, review and discussion. Staff believes that this update, if approved, is adequate for providing a clear and consistent land use vision, incorporating the three general plan documents that have been prepared since 1997. As such, it will be an invaluable tool for city staff and decision makers, citizens, land owners and potential developers/investors.

Staff submits this draft to the Planning Commission for review, comment and direction. Once received, the draft chapter and map will be revised as necessary. Once modifications have been made, staff recommends that the revised land use chapter and map be forwarded to the city council for their consideration and adoption.
The South Ogden City General Plan encompasses approximately 2,500 acres of land, which is the extent of existing and future development. It is bounded on the north and east by Ogden city, on the west by Washington Terrace and on the south by a steep bluff of land located in unincorporated Weber County. The city boundaries include all lands within the city’s Annexation Declaration boundary, which are currently under Weber County jurisdiction. Less than 5% of the total land area is vacant or undeveloped.

As a city approaching build-out, future development opportunities will be limited primarily to redevelopment areas and limited infill. It is therefore critical that all such efforts should match the land use vision for the future community.

**Land Use Plan and Categories**

The Land Use Plan and Map illustrate the type and location of existing development as well as future development and redevelopment for the future. The purpose of each land use category, as well as the standards for development are described below. These uses, where possible, reflect the currently established patterns and designations, as well as future changes envisioned as part of long-term redevelopment efforts.

Ten land use categories are indicated, each depicting specific land use types and patterns that are encouraged. Each category describes allowable uses and densities, as follow.

**Low Density Residential/ Residual Preservation (1-8 units per acre)**

This is the primary land use category in the city, reflecting typical single-family detached homes, limited duplexes, as well as appropriate and necessary public and quasi-public uses such as public schools, religious institutions, government uses, parks and open space. The main intent is to preserve the overall residential character of the established neighborhoods.

**Medium to High Density Residential (6 to 12 units per acre and higher)**

This category supports detached and attached homes and multi-family units, as well as appropriate and necessary public and quasi-public uses such as public schools, religious institutions, government uses, parks and open space. Densities typically range from six to twelve units per acre, with up to 50 units per acre on a case-by-case basis. Higher density uses should buffer lower density uses and neighborhoods from commercial and office uses, which can also help increase the population base to support commercial development.

**City Center**

The majority of future change and development within South Ogden will be in the form of redevelopment. As regional transitions and changes in development occur, particularly those trends and adjacent land uses in neighboring municipalities, it is important for South Ogden to identify appropriate goals and policies, and implementation measures which will maintain the existing feeling of safety and attractiveness.
The City Center area has been identified as priority redevelopment area, where a “city center” should be developed over time. In addition to providing a range of residential, commercial and mixed uses, the area should be redeveloped in a manner that ensures residents are proud of their city, and that visitors want to stop and visit this destination as they pass through the community. Accordingly, the area should be developed into a discernable and attractive downtown for South Ogden. This should also encourage a major transformation of Washington Boulevard into an urban corridor that establishes the sense of downtown to motorists and passersby. As such, the City Center should become a distinct place and the “heart of the community”. It should be transformed into a place where residents of South Ogden can gather for community events, and which can be carefully integrated with existing neighborhoods. City Center should encourage existing residents to remain downtown and new residents to locate in the area as part of new, mixed use development. New uses should be transitional, honoring the scale and feel of the surrounding residential blocks. It should also encourage creative development and mixed-residential development, where people can gather for community events and activities. Finally, the City Center should be unified and consistent, clearly designating and signifying routes which connect residents to other neighborhoods and important places within the city and adjacent to it.

Arterial Transition Corridor
This district allows transition from existing low-to-medium density residential uses to appropriate-scaled higher density residential uses, commercial, office and mixed uses, more appropriate for a major street corridor. The intent is to allow and encourage appropriate uses and discourage uses and patterns that foster strip development and which rely on high volumes of auto traffic. Ultimately, the corridor should become an extension of the City Core, providing a range of places and activities that are people-oriented.

Commercial Campus
These areas are earmarked for well-designed, master-planned, campus-type commercial developments that will contribute to the establishment of employment in the city. Envisioned uses include research and development, office parks. Primary uses should be centered in these areas and along primary streets, with transitional office, higher density residential and similar uses located along the edges with residential uses.

Neighborhood Commercial/Office
These areas are primarily intended for general office, medical and similar office-type uses. These uses are intended in part to act as a transition to adjacent residential uses and to help prevent commercial sprawl along the primary street corridors.

Public
These areas encompass key public office and similar uses, including City Hall, police and fire operations, military uses, and other comparable uses.

Parks/Open Space
This category includes public parks and open spaces devoted to natural, scenic, wildlife resource and recreational uses. Park land is generally developed and maintained to accommodate sports and similar uses, while open space sites include wetlands, waterways, steep slopes ravines and similar natural features. This category also encompasses the Ogden Golf and Country Club, which is partially located in South Ogden and partially in Weber County.

**Cemetery**
This category includes a single private cemetery. It is assumed that this use will be maintained in perpetuity.

**Utilities**
Critical public infrastructure includes public utility substations, water reservoir tanks, canals, overhead power lines and similar uses. Such facilities should be sited where required, with special care and review undertaken to ensure they fit well within the various zones and adjacent uses.
The briefing meeting began at 5:31 pm. Chair Todd Heslop welcomed new planning commissioner Jerry Jones. Mr. Jones gave a brief summary of his history and experience as an architect and said he was happy to be back in the area.

Chair Heslop began discussion on the first item on the agenda, the request for a rezone. City Planner Mark Vlasic pointed out the general plan did not call for the area to be residential; however, it did call for the area to use office and light commercial as a transition between heavier commercial and the nearby single family homes. He recommended that high-density residential be used as a transition instead, as the location did not support commercial uses. He also pointed out the city council had recently approved the rezone request for the parcels directly to the north of the one being considered that evening.

Commissioner Jones said he felt the highest and best use of the property was high-density residential. He also asked if there were any design standards in place in the area. Mr. Vlasic said there was not, but a form based code was being considered for the area. There was discussion on how soon the form based code for the area would be ready to adopt. They also reviewed the uses allowed in an R-5B zone. Commissioner Bradley said he liked some of the uses allowed in the R-5B zone, but felt there was too much high density housing in the area already.

Chair Heslop then opened discussion concerning proximity requirements. City Recorder Kapetanov said during the meeting she would pull up the county’s website and use it to show how the different proximities affected noticing.

The commission next discussed compensation for the planning commission. They reviewed the list of compensations for planning commissions in other cities. Chair Heslop pointed out the city council had given more authority to the planning commission. City Recorder Kapetanov said that was true, however it did not give them more work; it simply meant that the planning commission would be the final say on items that previously had gone to the city council for final approval. Chair Heslop agreed, but pointed out that when the city council gave final approval it
took some of the heat off of the planning commission. Commissioner Rounds stated he had been on the city council in the 90’s, and it appeared the planning commission then had spent a lot less time fulfilling their responsibilities than the planning commission now was spending. The planning commission had done a lot of work and taken a lot of heat in the past few years because of things like the Form Based Code (FBC) and monastery property. The City was now looking at implementing another FBC which would take a lot of work. Commissioner Rounds had looked at the comparisons from other cities and felt they would be within the general parameters of other cities if they received $25 per month and $50 per meeting. He recognized that the planning commission was more of a voluntary position, but they were having a hard time keeping commissioners, due in part to the amount of time and effort it took.

Chair Heslop then turned discussion to the General Plan update. Planner Vlasic said the new map had been completed and staff was now looking at writing the land use chapter. The city was way overdue for a general plan update if one was to look at the typical standards; however, at 97% build out, there was a debate as to whether a complete general plan update was worth the cost. Mr. Vlasic stated the one thing lacking in the general plan was the ability to point someone to a single map or chapter for land use; they had to look at three different general plans. The commission discussed the General Plan, with Mr. Vlasic explaining that the various updates only changed specific parts of the original 1997 General Plan. He also explained there were two questions concerning the General Plan: 1) if the city should simply update the map and land use chapter and how much, if any, public involvement should take place with that, and 2) if the City should look at doing a complete General Plan update.

Chair Heslop noted the other item on the agenda was the nomination and election of a new chair. He then concluded the briefing meeting.
Chair Todd Heslop began the meeting at 6:18 pm. He welcomed those present and called for a motion to open the meeting.

Commissioner Bradley moved to open the meeting, followed by a second from Commissioner Rounds. Commissioners Stewart, Layton, Bradley, Jones, and Rounds all voted aye.

Chair Heslop read through the items on the agenda. He then called for a motion to close the public meeting and enter into a public hearing.

Commissioner Rounds moved to open the public hearing for consideration of the zone changes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bradley. The vote was unanimous to open the public hearing.

II. ZONING PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. To Receive and Consider Comments on an Application for a Zoning Map Amendment to Parcels 07-69-7002 and 07-69-7004, Located at Approximately 1894 Skyline Drive, From R-5A to R-5B

The chair asked City Planner Mark Vlasic to give an overview of the item to be discussed for the public hearing. Mr. Vlasic explained some of the differences between the current zoning and the proposed zoning and stated that the commission should look at whether the
uses allowed in the R-5B zone were appropriate for the area. Staff was of the opinion that the area was not well suited for commercial uses and felt that other transitional uses such as high-density residential would be better. Mr. Vlasic noted the General Plan did not foresee residential uses in the area, however, the area had developed in a different way than anticipated, making the General Plan inconsistent not only where this property was concerned, but also other properties in the area.

Chair Heslop then invited anyone who wished to speak on the item to come forward.

Matt Lowe, applicant, 6028 Ridgeline Dr. – Mr. Lowe said he had previously owned this property but had sold it to the current owners. The current owners had planned to develop the property as senior housing, but had scrapped those plans due to market saturation. Mr. Lowe was now purchasing the property back in hopes of developing it along with the property to the north which had just been rezoned to R-5B.

Kurt Halverson, son of property owner in the area – said he had talked with his father’s realtor concerning his father’s property. The realtor had said there was no interest in the property that had been on the market for 8 years and was currently zoned C-2. Anyone who had shown interest in the property had said Wasatch Drive was not a good location for commercial. Mr. Halverson said he and the property owner next to him would also seek to get their properties rezoned and then sell to Mr. Lowe. Mr. Halverson had spoken to Mr. Lowe after the meeting last month, and after discussing the properties and Mr. Lowe’s plans, he felt this was the best thing for the area. It would be much better than storage units or an auto body shop.

Kristy Lucero, 6032 S. Wasatch Drive – voiced her concerns to the change in the neighborhood the rezone would cause. The street had always been quiet, and with apartments it would not be quiet anymore. She felt the change would be a detriment to the value of her home.

David Rice, 5920 Wasatch Drive – said he was not opposed to high density multi-family housing, however he was concerned with the increased traffic and crime rates that came with it. He asked that if the multi-family housing was allowed, it be kept to a high standard.

Jeff Turner, 2001 Highland Springs Road – stated that no one in the area wanted low income housing because of the impact it had on the community. He asked that the commission consider cautiously the rezone and the impact it would have.

There were no further comments concerning the rezone. Chair Heslop called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Rounds moved to close the public hearing and enter back into a public meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stewart. All present voted aye.

III. ZONING ACTIONS - Legislative

A. Discussion and Recommendation on an Application for a Zoning Map Amendment to Parcels 07-69-7002 and 07-69-7004, Located at Approximately 1894 Skyline Drive, From R-5A to R-5B
The chair opened the floor for discussion on the rezone. Commissioner Rounds pointed out no one knew yet what any development on the parcels would look like and it did not make sense to deny a rezone based on potential development they did not know about. He felt it made sense to rezone it as a transition to the single family homes that already existed in the area. He felt they should forward a recommendation to approve the rezone to the City Council.

Commissioner Bradley stated it was his intent to vote against the rezone, but he wanted to explain the reason. It was not because he had any interest in keeping the property commercial, it was because the change in zoning would allow high-density multi-family housing; in this case up to one hundred units. Mr. Bradley felt there was already too much multi-family high-density housing in the area and went on to name them all. He stated that high-density housing placed a huge burden on the neighborhood it was in; more services, more crime and more traffic. Commissioner Bradley felt the area would be well suited for patio or twin homes, but he had no control over that. His only control was whether to change the zone or not; therefore, he intended to vote against the rezone.

Chair Heslop noted that last month Mr. Halverson had spoken against the zone change, but after speaking with Mr. Lowe, was now for it. Mr. Heslop said they all had the same concerns about traffic, crime, and property values.

Commissioner Jones said he agreed that something needed to happen in the area other than commercial. If he lived in the neighborhood, he would be happier with any type of residential development rather than commercial. Commercial development increased crime and traffic as well, not to mention the aesthetics of all the different commercial uses. Mr. Jones pointed out that it wasn’t known yet whether high-density residential development would increase or decrease residential property values in the area, but commercial development would certainly decrease it.

The chair entertained a motion concerning the rezone.

Commissioner Rounds moved to recommend to the City Council approval of the application to rezone parcels 07-69-7002 and 07-69-7004, at approximately 1894 Skyline Drive from R-5A to R-5B. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Chair Heslop asked if there were further discussion, and seeing none, he made a roll call vote:

- Commissioner Layton - Yes
- Commissioner Jones - Yes
- Commissioner Bradley - No
- Commissioner Stewart - Yes
- Commissioner Rounds - Yes

The motion stood.

**IV. SPECIAL ITEMS**

A. **Discussion on Proximity Requirements for Land Use Notifications**
City Recorder Leesa Kapetanov spoke to this item. She stated the only proximity requirements for noticing were in the newly adopted Subdivision Ordinance and were set at 300 feet. She then used Weber County’s website to show the Commission what various distant requirements looked like and how many properties they took in.

Commissioner Rounds reminded everyone that they often heard people complain that they didn’t know that something was happening. He felt they should “throw out the biggest net” they could to inform as many people as possible, therefore 500 feet seemed to be the best choice. Commissioner Bradley agreed; the cost to the City was negligible to inform more people.

Recorder Kapetanov then asked if the Commission would like to make a distinction between notices for conditional use applications when and if the planning commission wanted to call a public hearing for one. The Commission felt there should not be a distinction. Notices for conditional use public hearings should be sent out to those within 500 feet. Commissioner Layton asked if the notices had to go to people who did not live within the City. Ms. Kapetanov said they had for the rezone as a matter of courtesy, but it was not required. Staff could put language into the code that would require it. The Commission agreed the language should be added. Ms. Kapetanov said staff would present the changes to the code at the next meeting.

B. Discussion on Planning Commission Compensation

Commissioner Rounds stated he had been on the City Council in the 90’s and had now served on the Planning Commission for two years. The City Council had originally been paid a very low compensation for their service and it had become a problem, so they surveyed other cities, took an average and increased the Council’s pay. Mr. Rounds pointed out the Planning Commission had had quite a bit of turnover lately, and wondered if it had to do with the pay. The Commission had also been involved in matters such as the monastery and Form Based Code, things that took up much more time than anyone had anticipated. He recognized the commissioners were not there to make a living, however, with the added work load they had dealt with and the continued workload they anticipated, combined with the amount of time it took to fulfill their responsibilities, he felt they should receive more compensation. Commissioner Rounds suggested they receive $25 per month and $50 per meeting; this amount was within the average parameters for which other cities compensated their planning commissioners.

Commissioner Layton said it would be impossible to compensate any of the Commission members for their experience and hours, and felt that any payment received was more of an honorarium or token of appreciation. He cited nearby cities where the commissioners were not receiving any compensation. He felt the position was more of a service to the City.

Commissioner Bradley noted South Ogden was unique in that it gave a steady compensation of $25 per month and then another $25 per meeting attended. He felt the payment method was insightful, and no matter what, wanted to keep it in the same form. He added that he had been surprised at the amount of work it took to be on the planning commission in the short time he had been a member; it was comparable to what he had done as a city council member. Mr. Bradley agreed that none of them were there for the pay. There was no
more discussion. City Recorder Kapetanov said it was unclear as to whether there was a consensus among the commissioners to forward the request for an increase to the City Council. She requested that a vote be taken.

Commissioner Rounds moved to recommend to the City Council that the compensation for the South Ogden City Planning Commission be increased to $25 per month and $50 for each meeting attended. Commissioner Bradley seconded the motion. In a voice vote, Commissioners Rounds, Stewart, Bradley, and Jones voted aye, with Commissioner Layton voting nay.

The motion passed.

C. Update on General Plan Land Use Chapter
City Planner Vlasic reminded the commission there were currently 3 general plans; the original 1997 version and 2 updates. The updates were not complete rewrites of the original plan. They simply looked at specific issues at the time and addressed them. They were adopted as addendums to the original plan. Mr. Vlasic said it had been a challenge to have a clear vision for any given area, because he had always had to refer to three separate plans. He had slowly been working on an update to the land use chapter and land use map of the original general plan. He and his staff had identified conflicts in the land use map and were working on a proposed map to make corrections. They were also working on the text of the land use chapter. The intent of this update was to keep it on a small scale; it was never meant to be a rewrite of the general plan. However, it had ended up being more work than what he had originally thought. Whether the City should update the whole general plan was a separate discussion that had come up at other meetings. As a nearly built out community, it was not necessary to update the general plan as often as other cities. Mr. Vlasic said it was his intent to have the new map and text available for consideration at the September meeting.

Commissioner Stewart said that even though the City was 97% built out, it still needed a plan of where it wanted to go in terms of redevelopment. The commission discussed the process and timeline of completely updating the general plan. City Recorder Kapetanov suggested the commission review what Mr. Vlasic presented in September and also have a discussion on updating the whole General Plan once they saw what he had come up with. They would also know if staff should start looking for grants to update the General Plan. There was no more discussion.

Chair Heslop noted he had not excused Commissioner Pruess who had been unable to attend the meeting. He also welcomed Commissioner Jones as the newest planning commissioner and then moved to the next item on the agenda.

V. OTHER BUSINESS
A. Nomination and Election of Planning Commission Chair
Commissioner Layton nominated Commissioner Rounds as the planning commission chair and Commissioner Bradley as the vice chair.

Commissioner Rounds then nominated Commissioner Pruess as the chair and Commissioner Stewart at the vice chair.

Chair Heslop called for a second on the nomination of Rounds and Bradley. Commissioner Stewart seconded the nomination.

The chair then called for a second on the nomination of Commissioners Pruess and Stewart. There was no second.

Chair Heslop then made a roll call vote on the nomination of Commissioners Rounds and Bradley:

- Commissioner Layton - Aye
- Commissioner Jones - Aye
- Commissioner Bradley - Aye
- Commissioner Stewart - Aye
- Commissioner Rounds - Nay

Commissioner Rounds was elected as the chair and Commissioner Bradley as the vice chair.

Commissioner Layton praised Chair Heslop for the great job he had done especially in his interaction with the community. Chair Heslop was respectful to all those who spoke and acknowledged each person by name.

City Recorder Kapetanov then informed the Commission that Planner Vlasic would not be in attendance for the next meeting. Staff had discussed not having a meeting, but was now anticipating a site plan application. She said they could have a meeting if the application was received, or cancel it if it was not, but wanted direction from the Commission. The consensus was that if the application was received, they would have a meeting; if not, they would cancel the meeting.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

A. Approval of May 12, 2016 Briefing Meeting Minutes

Chair Heslop called for a motion concerning the May 12 briefing and meeting minutes.

Commissioner Layton moved to approve the briefing and meeting minutes of May 12, 2016. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stewart. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion, with Commissioners Rounds and Bradley abstaining as they were not present at the meeting.

B. Approval of May 12, 2016 Meeting Minutes

See motion above.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS
The Chair invited anyone who wished to come forward to comment.

Jerry Cottrell, 5765 S 1075 E – speaking as a taxpayer, Mr. Cottrell said he supported Commissioner Rounds proposal for higher compensation. Mr. Cottrell also wanted to acknowledge Chair Heslop for his consistent respectfulness to everyone. He was a model of decorum.

Mr. Cottrell stated he had also found Mr. Bradley’s remarks concerning the rezone persuasive and then praised all the commission for going to the more inclusive 500 foot radius for notifications whether property owners were in the City or not.

Walt Bausman, 5792 S 1075 E – agreed with the statements of Mr. Cottrell. He also voiced his respect for the Planning Commission. He did not always agree with their decisions, but he respected them. He also thought they should receive more compensation than that suggested by Commissioner Rounds.

Mr. Bausman then commented that if the City decided to do a substantial update to the General Plan, they should involve a citizen’s advisory committee.

There were no more public comments.

VIII. ADJOURN

Chair Heslop called for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Rounds moved to adjourn, followed by a second from Commissioner Layton. All present voted aye.

The meeting ended at 7:49 pm.