

**Minutes of the North Logan City
Planning Commission
Held on January 3, 2019
At the North Logan City Library, North Logan, Utah**

**(The time stamps throughout the minutes below, located next to an item, indicate the time an item begins in the recording of the meeting.)*

***00:00:36**

The meeting was called to order by Nelson Boren at 6:33 p.m.

Commission members present were: Nelson Boren, Casey Moriyama, Robert Burt and Buzzy Mullahkhel. (Craig Humphreys and Larry Hepworth were excused.)

Others present were: Bruce Birky, Dan Wilhelm, Christie Hansen, Don Barringer, DeAnna Fry, Jenny Smith, Eric Hansen, Craig Mecham, Alan Thomander, Neil Murray, Rod-Mary Jackson, Daniel Rawlings, Lynn Green, Effie Wilhelm, Louis Wilhelm, Gae Murray, Kenneth Reese, Beth Larcher, Mike Oksness, Jeanine Anderson, Matthew Shoemaker, Keri Shoemaker, Virginia Bligh, Dan & Susan Broschinsky, James & Gail Parker, Jim Bullen, Bill Bullen, Brent & Shelley Dahle, Sara & Mitchell Richardson, Julie Wilhelm-Wiley, Kate Petersen, Samantha Ward, Davis Watkins, Barbara Middleton, Shanna Duke, Donnett Hawkes, Sydney & Josh Neilson, Tina McComber, Rex Probst, Dennis Lan_____ (illegible), Susan Green, Bonnie Flandro, Kristy Marshall, Brad Crookston, Cordell Batt, Nolan Krebs, Alan Luce and Marie Wilhelm.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Buzzy Mullahkhel.

An invocation was given by Robert Burt.

Nelson Boren thanked Robert Burt for his service on the Planning Commission, as it was Robert's last meeting.

Adoption of Agenda

00:03:26 Motion

Robert Burt made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. Buzzy Mullahkhel seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Approval and Follow-up of Minutes for September 21, 2017, October 5, 2017, October 19, 2017, December 14, 2017, January 4, 2018, January 18, 2018 and December 13, 2018 meetings.

00:03:36 Motion

Casey Moriyama made a motion to approve the above-referenced sets of minutes as presented. Buzzy Mullahkhel seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business

6:35 Public Hearing to receive public input on a request to rezone parcel 04-084-0018, located at approximately 600E 2050N, from RE-1 to R-1-10. Following the public hearing a recommendation of this proposal may be considered. (Lifestyle Homes)

00:05:31 Explanation and discussion.

Cordell Batt introduced the item and briefly explained the situation, using a projected site map of the location to further explain the request.

Developer Beth Larcher went through a slide presentation to explain further details, as well as their intentions for the site and their request for the rezone. She also mentioned that secondary water is available for all of the lots. She addressed various questions from the commission. Casey Moriyama mentioned the zoning in the area adjacent to this project being R-1-12 and R-1-15, and asked if there was any reason this couldn't be R-1-12; and said no, but that they're "shooting for R-1-10". Casey asked if they had discussed this with the neighbors in the area to get their feed back; and she said they hadn't, but had heard some of the comments at a previous meeting when this was proposed as a senior development.

00:14:43 Public hearing with public comments.

Nelson Boren read aloud the guidelines for speaking at a public hearing and opened the public hearing at 6:51 p.m.

61
62 **00:18:00** Matt Shoemaker said he lives just south of this and commented that they have gone
63 through this before, but respects Mr. Barringer's right to do this. He said the presentation was not
64 germane to what the Planning Commission is deciding tonight, which is a rezone, and that they are
65 not deciding on a development. He said once this is rezoned, another developer could come in with
66 an entirely different concept; therefore the Planning Commission should consider that and not be
67 "swayed or wooed by the nice presentation". He said while he appreciates the developers' efforts to
68 address the concerns of surrounding property owners; but said they have fallen short with a 10K
69 rezone, especially where there are property owners there with R-1-12 and R-1-15. He said if they
70 had truly listened to the comments in the past meetings, which he said he attended them all; the
71 overwhelming consensus is that if they want to develop it, they need to develop it as it is, which is
72 one-acre, and that at minimum, they should develop it to match the surrounding properties.

73
74 **00:20:12** James Parker said he lives just adjacent to the long strip of land on this. He said having
75 moved here from Texas and being involved in construction and the newer philosophies of building of
76 essentially smaller lots and streets; said he has not found it to be productive or helpful at all to
77 property owners. He indicated one picture from the presentation and said it is what 90% of the new
78 construction phases look like after the fact. He asked how much was invested in the City's 25-year
79 plan, and said it was likely a lot of money; and said it is a lovely plan and that the reason "we're here
80 is because we're ignoring the plan" which he said he find's very frustrating. He said the "skinny strip"
81 of land is an "abomination" and happened because a partial family sale occurred, and is not
82 conducive to any of the construction and is going to bring the property values down. He said what is
83 additionally frustrating is that two of the property owners adjacent to this have tried to purchase that
84 skinny property from the owner and he hadn't even "talked to us about it, but this is going to kill us".

85
86 **00:23:15** Alan Thomander said he lives near this, and said he has the same concerns as Mr.
87 [James] Parker. He said the layout they have seen here and at least with two in the past, where
88 people are crowded into these space; they only have one entrance and exit to the community and are
89 far smaller than the 10K square feet that is being requested in this rezone. He said that they also
90 have the focus of everything being closer to 600 East rather than 800 East, and said it would be very
91 easy to open it up to the west side of town, as all the services and shopping, etc., are to the west and
92 the south, not to the east and north. He said this is the one street in North Logan that is essentially
93 non-stop from 200 South in Hyde Park down to 1400 North in Logan. He said he thinks this is a real
94 danger and very undesirable to have this many homes, with deliveries and various services provided,
95 on the busiest street in our community.

96 Nelson mentioned that the City had also received Mr. Thomander's letter.

97
98 **00:26:19** Dan Wilhelm who said he lives near this, thanked the Planning Commission for hearing the
99 citizens again. He said his concern is that they want to go to R-1-10, which they wanted to do last
100 year in October; and asked if this gives the developer room to sneak in and do twin-homes homes,
101 which Cordell said was not possible. Dan said that R-1-12 would be great and R-1-15 would be
102 better; but that R-1-10 puts more money in [the developer's] pocket. He said he's not against
103 someone making money, but that we all want to live with a little space. He pointed to the map and
104 said to the south of what they are proposing, they're saying it is R-1-10 and that that is what they're
105 doing; however, their lot takes up less than an R-1-10 lot, so there are almost two lots to an old lot.
106 He said he does not agree. He also said if everyone will notice, they are going to have two-story
107 homes in their backyards if this goes forward.

108
109 **00:27:00** Gail Parker said that strip is right behind their home. She said she wants us to know how
110 stressful it is to have this come up every month, or every three months, or six months, over and over,
111 and said she couldn't sleep the night before. She said she does *not* want a home on that strip. She
112 said if one looks at the strip without the road, there isn't room for it there. She said the lots on the
113 properties to the west and to the south, the lots and the streets will not fit and will not work. She said
114 if this goes to an HOA, they are going to do exactly what they want to do. She said this is also much
115 more dense than the properties to the west and the south. She said this is a concept and not a fact,
116 and said we could go back to R-1-12 or R-1-15. She said the strip was purchased with she thinks
117 was in anticipation of getting the other lot and making it one big property. She said she personally
118 does not want a road or a house backed right up to her property. She asked them to please take the
119 time to measure the property to the south and the west, including the streets and see if this will fit.
120 She also said the developer is saying that secondary water is there, but that she has been told that it

121 is *not*, according to the people who are on the committee for secondary water. She said they
122 understand that developers want to make money with what they do; but that they do not live in that
123 neighborhood, and don't have to worry about this every few months and whether it will be approved
124 by the Planning Commission.

125
126 **00:30:39** Mike Oksness said when he sees the possibility of this going to R-1-10, it makes him more
127 frustrated with this not following the 25-year plan. He said the goal of North Logan is to be rural and
128 R-1-10 is not, it is urban, tight and compact, and goes against the whole nature of what North Logan
129 is suppose to be. He said he implores the Planning Commission to really maintain the integrity of
130 what North Logan is supposed to be. He said he understands that growth happens and that we need
131 to accommodate more people in this area; but packing them in and getting them into a tight, urban
132 development is not the way. He said perhaps one-acre lots are not quite feasible, but said that
133 maybe we can meet in the middle with R-1-12 or R-1-15 and still maintain that open, green, rural City,
134 and maintain what North Logan is supposed to be.

135
136 **00:31:57** Kenneth Reese referred to the statement made by Beth Larcher that "everyone wants to be
137 the last one in and then shut the gate". He said that is the same, tired refrain we hear developers
138 saying over and over again, which is just a blatant misrepresentation of what most of the people at
139 the meeting feel. He said we're not opposed to the development of this parcel, and no one at the
140 meeting is saying that. He said they're just saying that this it is zoned the way it is for a reason; and
141 said to the developers that they purchased that piece of property understanding that it is zoned that
142 way and that they should develop it as it is zoned. He said it is the same as gambling to buy a piece
143 of property assuming you can rezone it to maximize your profit later on; it is just an unwise
144 investment.

145
146 **00:33:18** Julie Wilhelm-Wiley said she is part of the family that owns the land that has not been sold,
147 which she said they farm. She said she appreciates the rights of everyone there, and that they will
148 continue to come to these meetings if they have to. She asked the commission that as someone who
149 receives these letters, she would like to know how many houses they are proposing and who is
150 proposing it; because she said tonight she learned that there are 38 houses; but when you do the
151 figures and there are no roads and dimensions, 46 homes could go on there. She said people need
152 to know what the plan is and who's doing it so they don't learn all of that information just when they
153 come to the meeting. She said when she considers the families that are at the meeting opposing this;
154 those families moved into those homes because they wanted the area, and were here first, and
155 wonders if they would have moved here if they had known that this was coming in. She said she is
156 opposed to this and thanked all those in attendance who are opposed to it, that keep coming back.

157
158 **00:35:06** Barbara Middleton said she is wondering about the Phillips property where a lot of homes
159 are going in, and the Israelsen property where a lot of homes are also going in; and said these are
160 not necessarily reflective of the homes that are in the area, and now there is this property. She said
161 she had three friends who wanted to move to North Logan in the last three years, and who wanted a
162 modest home with a place to have a couple of horses; and said she is not seeing this happen in our
163 area. She said we are going to smaller lots and are trying to squeeze these homes in. She said we
164 are missing an economic resource in having equestrian properties, and explained a development
165 going in Franklin that has horse properties that is going into an area that had existing farmland and
166 explained further. She said keeping our rural characteristics, and having people move in who are
167 willing to pay for larger pieces of land because they want to have animals; this might be a property
168 where that could work well, and commented further. She referred to zoning, and said she wonders
169 why we are always going smaller, and why we're not looking at a market that is looking for those
170 properties. She said those three friends who wanted to move to North Logan have moved elsewhere,
171 where they have two to three acres with modest homes, and that is what they wanted; but they really
172 wanted to live here because they had rented here before that. She said we need to look at a market
173 possibility that we are overlooking.

174
175 **00:37:33** Lynn Green said he lives on 2200 North and that he would like to see this developed into
176 single-family residences, and is not opposed to this at all. He said the thing that worries him the most
177 is the initial statement with the skinny portion, and knowing that we're going into this knowing that
178 variance requests are going to be coming for that. He said we know right now that this isn't going to
179 work, as does the developer. He said he would feel better if this was kept at an R-1-12 minimum and
180 change the thin piece of land to green space or something similar, and then he would be completely
181 behind this. He said with an R-1-10 request, knowing that variances are still going to be coming; he

reiterated that that is the part that is really worrying him.

00:38:39 Jenny Smith said she lives south of this. She said when they moved to the valley, they were desperate to get into a home, and purchased a type of home in an area similar to what is being proposed here, and said it was nightmare. She said at the time, they thought a smaller home would be better than a townhome; but that years later when they tried to sell, they were competing with townhomes, and due to their small streets with very little parking, and little space for kids to play and a small yard; that people were opting for townhouses instead because they could turn around and rent it when they outgrew it. She further expressed the very difficult time they had in selling their home, and was "really a nightmare", which she explained further. She said resale value did not increase, and they got out when they could, after a lot of stress. She said if the goal is ultimately single-family homes, having it done right is what is most important. She said providing a place where families can purchase a home, grow, be there for a while, and contribute to the North Logan community, would be a better option.

00:40:38 Craig Mecham said they moved to North Logan a couple of years ago and said one of the main reasons that they located here was because of the openness of the community, and the semi-rural feeling. He said this [development] is not consistent with the neighborhood, nor with what anybody wants who currently lives in North Logan. He said they should be R-1-15 at minimum, and said that's what he would recommend. He said if this happens, it might look nice, but in ten years, it's going to be a problem.

As there were no further public comments, Nelson Boren closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

00:42:07 Planning Commission discussion.

Cordell Batt said he got a call from Norma & Jim Bennett who were in favor of it; and also received letter from Ray Wilhelm who owns property near this, who is opposed to it.

The Planning Commission continued their discussion, and Cordell addressed their various comments and questions.

Per a question from Buzzy Mullahkhel about not allowing twin-homes; Cordell explained that twin-homes are not allowed in any of our residential zones, but only in R-2. This was discussed further.

Per a question from Buzzy, Cordell explained the process for moving forward. He also detailed the various zones within the City.

Robert Burt said the last time this came before the commission, his primary opposition was because of the lot size and increased density, and said he still feels that way. He said he would like to see that property remain RE-1 and if it was to be rezoned, to have it be at least R-1-15, or even half-acre. He said that narrow strip makes that property difficult and the best way to divide that might be to split it into two one-acre lots, and explained further, including having one with the entrance on 800 East, and the other one to have it from another direction.

The discussion continued.

Buzzy Mullahkhel commented that he does not think this area fits RE-1 zoning anymore, even though he appreciates the zoning being that originally, but that times have changed. He said he does not however think it should be R-1-10 either, and that it should be somewhere in the middle. He asked for a vote of the audience to see who would agree to R-1-10, as well as R-1-15, to which most people agreed.

Cordell explained the differences in the lot sizes for the benefit of the attendees.

Casey Moriyama said he agrees with Buzzy's comments and said the feedback is that this should be something that would jive with the rest of the neighborhood. He said he doesn't think it's realistic to leave this as RE-1, as it is R-1-10 and R-1-12 on two sides and then R-1-15. He commented further and commented that this should be more acceptable and complement the neighborhood and explained further, including his desire to have a quality project. He also discussed their role as Planning Commissioners and that they are obligated to give a positive recommendation to a project if it meets the code, and explained further. He said this is ultimately the City Council's decision, which he asked attending City Council member Brad Crookston about, who said the commission still needs to give their opinion.

The discussion continued and Cordell addressed various questions and comments.

Nelson said that North Logan is very open and said that 75% of the housing zoning in North Logan is one-acre or more, and said that much of the feedback the City gets are requests to keep it that way,

and commented further; including the struggles the Planning Commission has in maintaining that while also attempting to accommodate those who want to move here. He also mentioned that the prediction is that Cache Valley will be getting 5K residents per year. He expressed his concern about the "pan handle" of this development, and that this project eats up space in North Logan. He also mentioned that North Logan City's Master Plan continually discusses maintaining open space, and commented further. He said he does not think this property is a place to put R-1-10 and would like to see it higher, and maybe even R-1-20, or even to stay RE1. He said he does not think the project is "there yet".

Buzzy Mullahkhel would like to see a development that is R-1-15, and that the people have shown that they are willing to do R-1-15, which he said is a step in the right direction. He said we have a group of neighbors who come in here every time who are willing to compromise.

The comments continued.

01:09:23 Motion

Robert Burt made a motion to make a negative recommendation to the City Council on this rezone request. Buzzy Mullahkhel seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Continued consideration and possible recommendation of changes proposed by Staff (reviewed by Planning Commission) after City Council's direction for making changes to the Land Use Permitted and Conditional Use Matrix concerning Assisted Living, Skilled Nurse Care Facilities and Dog and Cat Daycare Ordinance.

01:10:50 Explanation and discussion.

Cordell Batt introduced the item and said that per Nelson Boren's request, North Park Police Animal Control Officer Nolan Krebs is at the meeting and also mentioned the information he sent to the Planning Commission, including recommendations from the City Attorney. He explained the process this went through, including going to the City Council who are returning it to the Planning Commission for them to determine the appropriate recommendations and lists of conditions on the various uses. Cordell said he made changes to in the document for the commission to review and consider, which he reviewed with the commission, and addressed their various questions. He said the changes he made were taken from another city in which they had to put conditions on a dog and cat daycare situation, and also includes a list of conditions made by the City Council. He said this is also limiting this use to one zone in the City, which he said was the recommendation of the City Council.

Per a question from Buzzy Mullahkhel, the recommendation the Planning Commission makes on this will be for *all* of the uses, including the Assisted Living, Skilled Nurse Care Facilities.

Nelson asked Officer Krebs to explain his experience with the dog and cat daycare in our city.

01:14:24 Officer Krebs said that Logan City has attempted having a couple of pet hotels, and have ended up having big problems with the ones that were located in residential areas, which he said included dogs barking, no place to park, dogs getting loose, dogs fighting, and more. He said Logan City ended up rezoning their pet hotels to industrial or commercial areas only, and they still have problems which he further explained; including dogs that fight, and injuries to the people working with the dogs in those situations, and said there are a lot of safety issues involved. He said when he recently spoke to Police Officers from Logan, they told Officer Krebs that they wished they'd never seen [a pet hotel]. Officer Krebs said he thinks there is a need for pet hotels, but that they do not belong in a residential area. He discussed his experience with the one in North Logan. He said when this one was set up, he was supposed to be able to visit it anytime, uninvited, and check out the facility; but that three out of the four times he wanted to check out the facility, no one answered the door. He said the one time that he did get in and went down to where the dogs were kept, and asked the owner how many dogs were there, she told him there were thirty dogs. He said she asked him if he would like to see how well the dogs got along, which he agreed to; and when she opened a door to the room where they were, a pit-bull charged at him aggressively. He said it might have been his uniform or the scent of other animals on his uniform. He said in his opinion, they were doing a very good job of keeping the dogs together, and none of the dogs were having problems with each other; and said he has not received any complaints about the dogs barking. He said he has driven by several times and heard dogs barking. He said the home was not set up in the way he had recommended. He said the dog kennels are being kept in the bedroom areas downstairs, with the carpet removed. He said the kennels are however are sitting against sheetrock walls and his recommendation to them was to have some way to cover that sheetrock with plastic or some sort of hard material, so that they can be bleached and cleaned without having bacteria and infection get into

it. He said dogs transfer disease quite a bit in kennels. He said he found that the owners of the establishment did not have their own dogs licensed which was one of the first requirements of the conditional use permit, and hadn't happened. He said in his opinion, if a pet hotel is going to be allowed in a residential area, it needs to be in a big area, and not where you have neighbors next door on both sides. He said he doesn't think there's any way you can keep the dogs from barking. He said they seem to be doing a fairly good job of taking care of the animals. He said if the City is wanting to make a new ordinance or to fix it, this needs to be in an industrial or commercial area; and needs to be in an area where it is not going to bother businesses or other entities. He said there is going to be a smell involved with this business and there has to be somewhere to put all of the feces that is dropped. He said most of the domestic problems he has with animals are in small areas, because when a dog goes out in a small area, they are not far from neighbors' yards, and is a problem, because he gets a lot of calls for that. He said he is in favor of pet hotels and they are needed; but that they need to be clean, and kept like the humane society where they have walls and floors that are all washed down with Clorox and keep the smell down. He said Cache Humane has their own issues with disease, even though they do all of that.

Officer Krebs addressed various questions from the commission.

Per a question from Casey Moriyama about the website listing pet daycare places, Rover.com; Officer Krebs said he does not have a problem with people watching one or two dogs, but that when a kennel permit is given, there needs to be a limit on that permit.

Cordell explained the current dog limit, which is two; and that if they want more, the applicant has to live in the RE-1 zone. Then they can apply for a kennel permit with the Planning Commission, and the commission sets the number through the conditional use permit.

This was discussed further, and the number of dogs is supposed to be based on the size of the dogs when determining the number. He said a lot the request for kennel permits are for people who want to breed dogs and have puppies, as opposed to full grown dogs, which number is to be specified when the conditional use permit is done-how many puppies and how many adult dogs, and other criteria. He said we have never before had a request for a dog and cat daycare.

The Planning Commission and Officer Krebs continued their discussion on this.

Cordell reminded the commission that this is for any new applications that come in after the ordinance is passed; that any current conditional use permits remain with the owner as long as they stay in compliance.

Per a question from Nelson, Cordell explained the process when complaints are made about the situation, including the Planning Commission considering what the complaints are and whether they are abiding by the conditions. He said a letter is given to the applicant stating the complaint(s) and are called in to come before the Planning Commission.

The discussion continued. Nelson asked about having someone from the Cache Human Society come to a meeting to discuss this with the commission.

Buzzy said he did not think he was ready to proceed without more information on some of the numbers, particularly as it relates to the pet hotels.

The review continued and they discuss how to proceed.

Casey Moriyama said he did not have an issue with the matrix, but with just getting the information on the proportionality and ratio for a commercial enterprise. He said he feels they need more time to review the information for that.

The Planning Commission agreed to table the item until they could review further, additional information as it relates to the pet hotels. Casey discussed the need to put some kind of cap on the number of dogs.

Nelson recommended that Cordell get some more information and discuss this with the Cache Humane Society and get their standard.

The Planning Commission asked Cordell to come back with more information, including a standard from Cache Humane Society, particularly as it relates to square footage, and how many animals per caretaker.

Concept Plan Consideration (Bullen Brothers Commercial Subdivision Phase 2). Located at Approximately 2500N and Main Street (NE Corner of Intersection), consisting of 1 Lot/s with an agricultural remainder parcel.

01:47:49 Explanation and discussion.

Developer Bill Bullen explained his project and their intentions for the site, which is for it to be a car

356 wash.

357 Cordell Batt further explained the situation and what will be required of the developer on this. Cordell
358 ran a video clip showing a car wash that this one will be modeled after.

359 Cordell and Bill explained further details, and Cordell answered questions of the commission; and
360 said that staff is recommending approval on this commercial subdivision.

361
362 **02:01:12 Motion**

363 *Buzzy Mullahkhel made a motion to make a positive recommendation to City Council on this concept*
364 *plan.*

365
366 Casey Moriyama said he wants more information, and Cordell explained further, including the
367 subdivision process, and how items like this have been done in the past. Bill also gave some
368 additional details.

369
370 **02:04:22 Second on motion and vote.**

371 *Casey Moriyama seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.*
372

373 Discussion regarding an Accessory Dwelling Unit possible application located at approximately
374 2700N 1600E. (McCombers and Hastings)

375 **02:04:48 Explanation and discussion.**

376 Cordell Batt introduced the item and explained the situation with accessory dwellings in general,
377 including this request, and how it relates to a second family, as well as an attached or detached unit.
378 Cordell said the City Attorney has reviewed this and he recommended that even though they are not
379 asking for a second family; that because it is detached but want it as a dwelling, we have to require
380 that they have to come in and do a conditional use permit.

381 Cordell said we need to review this for further clarification. He said currently however, we have an
382 application in for a conditional use permit and have to address it. Cordell addressed various
383 questions from the commission.

384 Nelson reviewed the requirements for an ADU.

385 Cordell explained the process and how it will move forward.

386
387 Discussion on zoning along 2500 N from 200 West to railroad tracks from MC to CG.

388 **02:18:43 Explanation and discussion.**

389 Cordell Batt introduced the item and explained the situation. He explained the ordinance and the
390 map that goes along with this. Cordell further explained the zoning and what the City would like to
391 see happen here, which in is large part to have the projects that get developed along 2500 North be
392 something more in line with that road being the "gateway to the City".

393 Alan Luce addressed various questions from the commission.

394 They continued to discuss various related items.

395
396 **Set Next Agenda and/or Adjourn**

397 **02:30:25 Discussion**

398 There was discussion about the new Planning Commission members, as Robert Burt and Larry
399 Hepworth will be off the Planning Commission after this meeting. Cordell said at the next meeting,
400 they will be choosing a new Chair and Vice Chair, although he said that's typically done at the first
401 meeting in February.

402
403 **02:31:52 Motion**

404 *Robert Burt made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Buzzy Mullahkhel seconded the motion. A vote*
405 *was called and the motion passed unanimously.*

406
407 The meeting adjourned at: 9:05 p.m.

408
409 Approved by Planning Commission:

January 17, 2019

410
411 Transcribed by Marie Wilhelm

412
413 Recorded by

414

Scott Bennett/City Recorder