

The Meeting of the Nibley Planning and Zoning Commission held at Nibley City Hall, 455 West 3200 South, Nibley, Utah on Thursday, July 18, 2019.

The following actions were made during the meeting:

Commissioner Swenson moved to approve the ability for staff to issue the building permit with the conditions outlined by staff.

- 1. The applicant will finish the sidewalk to the end of the right-of-way on the east side**
- 2. The applicant will put the cul-de-sac in a permanent easement for emergency and public vehicles.**

Commissioner Logan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Mansell and Commissioner Obray all in favor.

Commissioner Obray moved to recommend approval of the proposed Mountain Vista Subdivision Preliminary Plat, a proposed 33.04-acre Rural Preservation Subdivision located at approximately 3575 South and 600 West; subject to creating an access point along the southern road to provide future connection to 3650, and swapping phases 2 and 3. Commissioner Albrect seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1; with Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Swenson, and Commissioner Logan all in favor. Commissioner Mansell was opposed.

Commissioner Obray moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.24.090 Fence Regulation; removing section D.1.i-iv as well as D.2.1. Commissioner Logan seconded the motion.

Commissioner Obray made a motion to amend to add a two-year expiration on any fencing permit approval. Commissioner Swenson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Mansell, and Commissioner Logan all in favor.

The amended motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Mansell and Commissioner Albrect all in favor.

Commissioner Logan moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.28 Conditional Uses as presented. Commissioner Swenson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Mansell, and Commissioner Obray all in favor.

Commissioner Logan moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.20 Land Use Chart as presented. Commissioner Obray seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, and Commissioner Mansell all in favor.

Commissioner Logan moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.04 Definitions as presented. Commissioner Obray seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, and Commissioner Mansell all in favor.

Planning and Zoning Commission Chair Garrett Mansell called the Thursday, July 18, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Those in attendance included Commissioner Garrett Mansell, Commissioner Tyler Obray, Commissioner Carol Albrect, Commissioner Matt Logan, and Commissioner Bret Swenson. Mr. Stephen Nelson, Nibley City Planner, was also present.

Approval of 6-20-19 meeting minutes and the evening's agenda

General consent was given for the evening's agenda.

General consent was given for the previous meeting's minutes.

Discussion and Consideration of approval for staff to issue a building permit for parcel 03-043-0021

Mr. Nelson said Nibley City staff typically handled a building permit, however, when a building permit is requested for a lot that is not incorporated into a subdivision the Planning Commission should review the application and grant staff the ability to approve the rest of the building permit. Mr. Nelson Nibley had received a request for a permit for a property located at the end of 250 East near the Cottonwood development. Staff had a few concerns with issuing the permit.

Mr. Nelson reviewed that the lot was located at the end of 250 East with a fire turn-around at the end of the street. Staff was concerned the sidewalk didn't reach all the way to the end of the easement and the right-of-way access was a temporary turn-around; the road was planned to go through all the way and connect to Hollow Road. Since the road wasn't planned to continued through anymore, staff wanted to see the temporary easement recorded as a permanent easement for the City and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Nelson showed where the flood plane was designated on the property and said the applicant had already received eLOMA (issued because a property has inadvertently been mapped into a flood plain). Mr. Nelson described the measures city staff

recommended be placed for a building permit to be issued. Other than the four items discussed by Mr. Nelson, staff recommended the Planning Commission grant staff the ability to continue to review the building permit and issue the building permit when it was ready.

Commissioner Swenson moved to approve the ability for staff to issue the building permit with the conditions outlined by staff.

3. The applicant will finish the sidewalk to the end of the right-of-way on the east side
4. The applicant will put the cul-de-sac in a permanent easement for emergency and public vehicles.

Commissioner Obray noted the temporary cul-de-sac would be a permanent cul-de-sac and asked if there would be a sidewalk all the way around it? Mr. Nelson said the City would require the sidewalk reach the edge of the right-of-way they had. The applicant would be welcome to put in a sidewalk. Mr. Nelson reviewed what the City would require. Commissioner Obray asked about cement-capped edge on the permanent turn-around. Mr. Nelson believed the city would take over maintenance of the road.

Rob Summers, representing Garrett and Allison Larsen was present at the meeting.

Mr. Summers asked if Commissioner Obray was asking that a concrete ribbon would be installed around the permanent turn-around asphalt? Commissioner Obray said he would make this a condition to maintain the durability of the road. Mr. Nelson said staff would work with the homeowners to make sure the road was brought to a condition where City staff could maintain it properly.

Commissioner Logan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Mansell and Commissioner Obray all in favor.

A Public Hearing to receive comment on the proposed Mountain Vista Subdivision Preliminary Plat, a proposed 33.04-acre Rural Preservation Subdivision located approximately at 3575 S and 600 W

Mr. Nelson reported on this action item. Mr. Nelson said a rural preservation subdivision is a by-right application; it was a permitted use within the zoning code. Mr. Nelson described the purpose of a rural preservation subdivision. Mr. Nelson summarized the specifications of the proposed preliminary plat. Mr. Nelson described concerns with canals on the proposed development. Mr. Nelson described the proposed development of each designated open space parcel and reviewed rural preservation open space requirements.

Commissioner Mansell gave direction to the public present. Commissioner Mansell opened the public hearing at 6:35 p.m.

Curt Jenkins of 438 West 3575 South was concerned with the density of housing and the number of cars and traffic the development would create and access 3575 South. Mr. Jenkins liked the green space and likes parks but wondered if Nibley had overextended themselves with taking care of parks and couldn't maintain them. He said maintenance on Nibley's current park didn't look as good as they should look.

Hill Wade of 3786 South 450 West seconded what Mr. Jenkins had said. He was concerned with the density and number of outlets. He was concerned with the amount of traffic that would be traveling on residential roads.

Mark Dewey of 3730 South 200 West asked if there were the possibility of 450 West being expanded all the way to 3200 South as another way of people getting in and out of the property.

Mark McNeil of 430 West 3575 South was concerned with congestion. He discussed why he had bought the property he had. He took good care of his space, which emphasized the open space. Mr. McNeil said he liked the parks but emphasized the city taking care of the park because they had not been taken care of. He was concerned with the value of his home. He felt the City should pursue whether the smaller houses would reduce the property value on his home. He discussed that quarter acre was very small.

Jon Stucky of 465 West 3800 South was concerned with density and the outlets in and out; particularly at 250 West. He was concerned with the number of kids that would be in the area. He liked the open space and agreed that the park upkeep was dismal and described canal debris that had been at the 250 park for three weeks. Mr. Stucky was concerned with the condition of the road in regards to curb and gutter or if it would be like Apple Creek, which didn't work really well and felt the roads wouldn't hold up. He didn't know how they got to choose if they get to do rural or they had elements to make them do what do more developmentally on their side. Mr. Stucky discussed the revisions of the Master Plan and knew that Nibley was now development friendly and being opened up to density.

Joe Hahne of 3766 South 450 West said he was echoing the concerns of everyone else. He was concerned with the size of lot and really would prefer the open space be homes rather than park. He was concerned the natural open space would be weeds and not controlled. He was concerned with the access to the subdivision. He felt it should be a requirement that phase 3's opening be opened in phase 1. This should be a requirement right from the beginning. He said there was a lot of congestion on 3650. He said these things needed to be thought about.

Mr. Hill Wade spoke again and said the Stake Center in the neighborhood was not being considered. 3650 was already a dangerous road and was a big safety concern.

Ada Orth of 3628 South 450 West was concerned about the sheer number of homes going in and would also like to see the lot sizes be bigger to include the more open space. This was why they build in Nibley; for the big open lots. She said she had younger children and was concerned there was only one access with phase one. Phases one and two only had access on to 450 West. Ms. Orth said the previous day was the first time through the whole summer that the park on 250 West was weeded so there was a concern with adding more parks.

Shelly Waite of 3786 South 450 West noted that the proposed road came out right across from a neighbor's home. She was not a fan of the access points and thought they could be better and not go directly to someone's home.

Jan Hahne of 3766 South 450 West discussed the park with no parking around it. She said with the dense population there would be kids going between cars and they needed to think about safety at the park if it was a park that would draw anyone that would want to go to it. Mrs. Hauney was also concerned with the small lots that were less than half of what they lived on. Ms. Jauney reported she had discussed 450 West being expanded and reported David Zook had told her it wasn't an option.

Roy Mann at 447 West 3575 South reiterated what had been said and said there were two outlets out of their neighborhood now that were already congested and adding another 150 was insane.

Fred Baugh of 3614 South 450 West asked about the canal down 450. He said if 450 West were expanded it needed to be expanded to 50 feet. Mr. Baugh said in past years when past homes had been proposed they had been turned down because of access points and high density. Everyone was very much against it then and didn't see that the opinion had changed.

Kent Smith of 2316 South 1200 West gave perspective from his area of town on traffic levels. He lived by the Charter School and had three access points and was very time intensive. He didn't feel it was overly congested. He didn't have a hard time getting in and out of his driveway.

Melissa Malan of 421 West 3650 South echoed what had been said about density and lot sizes and increased traffic. She reported traffic from the Stake Center affecting her on Tuesday nights. Ms. Nealen said the park at 250 West never got used and was filling a quota of open space and the proposed park would be the same. The density would overwhelm the school systems that were already in place.

Amai Orth of 3528 South 450 West said she thought the traffic was really important. She described the number of drivers in her family. Adding all the homes would all a lot of back and forth traffic. She was concerned with how many people would be traveling.

She reported what she had noticed at the stop sign at 450 West and people not making a full stop at the sign.

Shelly Waite asked if there were another public hearing if it could be held at a later time; perhaps 7:00 so there could be more people.

Kent Smith of 2316 South 1200 West suggested the developer study traffic flows and loading on the streets to quantify the traffic instead of assumptions on current demand. This would address all three accesses being open from the beginning and would give the actual increase on demand to it was a known and not an academic assumption. It would be wise to have the developer conduct the study.

A resident said it seemed they had the cart before the horse. They ought to considering building access to the property before putting 68 homes there. He hoped they would look at access to the property first.

Melissa Malan suggested a traffic study not be done during the summer but during a regular school day.

Ada Orth said she didn't understand the reasons why the access points on 450 West were not lining up with 3575 South. She didn't like two accesses on to 450 and didn't know why it didn't line up with the existing road.

Rod Malan of 421 West 3650 South was concerned with the density of housing and had seen other subdivisions with densities similar layout and that the types of homes and families that they brought in seemed to be very transient with families moving in and out. He wanted the developer had considered a different layout with homes on half to third acres lots. He was also concerned with traffic flow.

Seeing no further public comment, Commissioner Mansell closed the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Discussion and Consideration of a recommendation for the proposed Mountain Vista Subdivision Preliminary Plat, a proposed 33.04-acre Rural Preservation Subdivision located approximately at 3575 S and 600 W

Mr. Nelson presented data on traffic and the things that had been done to mitigate some of the traffic concerns. Mr. Nelson displayed Nibley's Transportation Master plan. He reported it was planned for 600 West and 450 West to be expanded to a 66-foot right-of-ways and the canal would be piped. Mr. Nelson said initial review by the Nibley's engineer said the street layout met code and design standards for traffic flow and was well within safety standards and guidelines. Mr. Nelson said a traffic study could potentially be done but typically for subdivisions of the proposed size was there were assumptions make for the number of homes and traffic trips made each day. Mr. Nelson reported fire code standards for access points/ 30 home or more needed two

existing accesses in or out of a subdivision. He said the subdivision currently met the standard. He described the access points for each phase.

Mr. Nelson displayed the spreadsheet used to calculate the Rural Preservation subdivision code and the number of houses allowed in rural preservation subdivision. He showed the calculations he used for the current proposal. Mr. Nelson said the application for density and lot sizes met the rural preservation code, which was not a conditional use, and the city is obligated to approve the subdivision.

Mr. Nelson addressed the stormwater concerns. He said the subdivision planned to do traditional high back curb and gutter with a retention pond and not swales.

Mr. Nelson discussed park maintenance and felt the City Council was best suited to address park maintenance in the budget. He said the open space would contribute to Nibley's Park Master plan goals.

Mr. Nelson described the differences between standard subdivision zoning and rural preservation subdivision.

Mr. Nelson described the process that would be taken for consideration of the proposal moving forward and the future public hearing with the City Council.

Commissioner Mansell questioned the access point on to 450 West and felt there were a number of safety concerns with all access points being within 350 feet of each other. Mr. Nelson said that typically with local road there could be 5,000 to 10,000 trips per day for local roads. The engineer had no safety concerns with how streets were laid out. Commissioner Albrect asked if there were a formula for how many parks employees they needed to maintain parks. Mr. Nelson said there was and described how Nibley City had a hard time hiring seasonal employees because the economy was so good and typical seasonal employees hadn't returned because of better employment opportunities and the parks department had gotten a later start in the current year.

Dallas Nickel, representing the developer spoke and said they would be willing to swap phases 2 and 3 to accommodate some of the access concerns. Mr. Nickel discussed the proximity of the connections on to 450.

Mr. Nelson summarized written comments submitted by David Oblock of 620 West 3200 South (included in the printed meeting minutes).

Commissioner Obray said he didn't like the subdivision; nothing rural was being preserved in the subdivision. A two acre park was not a usable park and native grasses were just weed patches. Commissioner Obray was confused why this was the first time they had seen the subdivision and the City Council had already seen it. Mr. Nelson said this would be an administrative decision by the Planning Commission. He said the City

Council was the land use authority because it was a rural preservation subdivision. Mr. Nelson said the City Council had reviewed the plan once and had made recommendations. In this case the Planning Commission was a recommending body to the City Council and needed to determine if the subdivision met code. Mr. Nelson said he believed that within the standards themselves the developer met the standards of the Rural Preservation code. Commissioner Obray didn't feel this met the objective of the code or met the original goal of rural preservation in Nibley City and asked if there was anything the Planning Commission could do? Mr. Nickel addressed the waterways and relayed the developer's discussion with the canal company who had instructed them to pipe the canal. Mr. Nickel said they would entertain leaving the canal open. Mr. Nelson said Nibley code required canals in front yards and side yard be piped but if there was a dedicated of trail space along the canal then they could leave the canal open. Commissioner Albrect asked what the developer planned to do with the park. Mr. Nickel said they planned for it to be fully irrigated and landscaped with trees. He said there could be negotiations of what the developer would offer. Commissioner Albrect said research showed that parks were not used unless they provided something.

Commissioner Obray said 3650 was going to be a collector road and one of their major concerns from the neighborhood was the traffic. He asked if there was a way to set aside the secondary access point to 450 West as a right-of-way that went though to 3650. He'd like to see the road punch through and pick up the development to the south as part of the master transportation plan. Somewhere along the corridor needed direct access to 3650. The developer, Mr. Nelson, and Commissioner Obray debated if the subdivision met with Nibley City's current Transportation master plan. Commissioner Mansell said he was under the impression that 450 West would be widened the whole and had a major problem with it only being widened along the frontage of the proposed development.

Commissioner Albrect said there wasn't an issue with transient homes or with the subdivision and summarized a book that showed the smaller lots meant older couples, single people, and people that didn't want to mow larger lawns. She said the number of transient people wouldn't increase as long as there were decent homes being built. She said traffic may actually decline with smaller homes because of less children and older people. She didn't think it was the quarter-acre lot that was a concern. She was concerned with the parks and the access points.

Commissioner Obray said his biggest issue was to not overload the existing subdivisions and create a pathway of connectivity to the master planned road. He said the subdivision satisfied the engineering but it would be disruptive to future phases of development. He wanted the subdivision aligned with future long term plans.

Mr. Nelson recommended the Planning Commission make a motion. The Planning Commission could make a recommendation with conditions. He didn't recommend denial because the application did meet base code.

Commissioner Obray moved to recommend approval of the proposed Mountain Vista Subdivision Preliminary Plat, a proposed 33.04-acre Rural Preservation Subdivision located at approximately 3575 South and 600 West; subject to creating an access point along the southern road to provide future connection to 3650, and swapping phases 2 and 3. Commissioner Albrect seconded the motion. The motion passed 4-1; with Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Swenson, and Commissioner Logan all in favor. Commissioner Mansell was opposed.

There was general consent for a meeting recess at 8:04 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:13 p.m.

A Public Hearing to receive comment on the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.24.090 Fence Regulation

Mr. Nelson led this discussion. He reminded the Planning Commission that they had decided at their previous meeting to move away from fencing setbacks to site-triangle typed regulations. Mr. Nelson described the changed that were being proposed in the ordinance; including additional definitions, and corner lots and clear view triangles.

Commissioner Mansell read rules to the pubic present and opened the public hearing at 8:25 p.m.

Jonathan Whittmire at 3364 South 1500 West said he agreed with the fencing code changes because it treated everyone the same and made it more fair in his eyes. He described that he lived on a corner lot and it had been a hard going through the fencing processes. He wanted to be able to grant security for his family and a little bit of privacy that they all felt they deserved a little bit of on their own property. He thanked the Planning Commission.

Kyler Innarston of 2980 South 1050 West, said he lived on a corner lot. He described himself and his wife and the history of his property. He said they were highly in favor of the proposed ordinance change and appreciated the ability to build a six-foot fence in their backyard feel like their kids and family were safe.

Kent Smith of 2316 South and 1200 West said he felt some of the things in code needed to have latitude verbalized in the code so that decision could be make despite the code and gave the latitude to make individual approvals based on specific circumstances. Mr. Smith thought latitude should be granted in city government bodies to make conditions that agree with the spirit of the law more than just the letter of the law.

Mr. Nelson read written correspondence into the record (see the written meeting minutes for a copy of this letter).

Seeing no further comments, Commissioner Mansell closed the public hearing at 8:33 p.m.

Discussion and Consideration of a recommendation for the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.24.090 Fence Regulation

Mr. Nelson and the Planning Commission discussed fencing requirements along trails and proposed provision that the developers install code compliant fencing along trails. Commissioner Obray suggested the section that had vinyl be taken out and they leave 75%. Mr. Nelson reviewed the sections in part D. that could be taken out of the proposed ordinance.

Commissioner Obray moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.24.090 Fence Regulation; removing section D.1.i-iv as well as D.2.1. Commissioner Logan seconded the motion.

Commissioner Swenson asked if there were a time limit on building permits. Mr. Nelson said they were active as long as there was ongoing active work. They discussed that fence permits were only active for a year. Commissioner Swenson said he would like to extend the time to a couple of years.

Commissioner Obray made a motion to amend to add a two-year expiration on any fencing permit approval. Commissioner Swenson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Mansell, and Commissioner Logan all in favor.

The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Mansell and Commissioner Albrect all in favor.

A Public Hearing to receive comment on the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.28 Conditional Uses

Mr. Nelson summarized the proposed changes to the Nibley City conditional uses. He said the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman had looked at the proposed changes and showed the Planning Commission the sections the Ombudsman had recommended removed.

Mr. Nelson described that conditional uses, land use definitions, and land use chart had been split into three separate ordinance based on the advice of Nibley's attorney because if one ordinance were overturned or appealed it could potentially appeal all of the conditional uses, land use definitions, and land use charts.

Commissioner Mansell opened the public hearing at 8:57 and seeing no public comment, closed the public hearing at 8:57 p.m.

Discussion and Consideration of a recommendation for the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.28 Conditional Uses

Commissioner Logan moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.28 Conditional Uses as presented. Commissioner Swenson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, Commissioner Mansell, and Commissioner Obray all in favor.

A Public Hearing to receive comment on the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.20 Land Use Chart

Mr. Nelson described that the Land Use Chart was a good summary of what uses were allowed in each zone as well as their permitted or conditional uses. He said the chart have been reorganized and described the way it had been reorganized as well as describing additions and deletions in the chart.

Commissioner Mansell opened the public hearing at 9:02 p.m.

Kent Smith expressed concerns with not permitting printing in residential zones and felt in a digital era there might be people in residential areas that might actually print and provide prints of their photography.

Mr. Nelson read the definition of "Printing, Copying-Commercial." Residential uses would fall under home occupation and home offices, which allowed for a wide range of uses as long as there was limited impact on the neighborhood. This was one of the biggest differences between the commercial and residential section. Commissioner Albrect asked for the details of "Group Living Facilities". Mr. Nelson clarified that Group Living Facilities were governed by Nibley City code 19.42. There were strict State and Federal laws the city needed to abide by.

Seeing no further public comments, Commissioner Mansell closed the public hearing at 9:02 p.m.

Discussion and Consideration of a recommendation for the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.20 Land Use Chart

Commissioner Logan moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.20 Land Use Chart as presented. Commissioner Obray seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, and Commissioner Mansell all in favor.

A Public Hearing to receive comment on the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.04 Definitions

Mr. Nelson led the presentation on this item. Mr. Nelson reviewed the changes to the definitions in section 19.04 of Nibley City code; including the definition of Home

Occupation, Short-Term Rentals, Park Strip, Personal Instruction Service, Temporary Food Vendor, and Residential Storage Warehousing.

Commissioner Albrect asked for clarification on halfway houses. Mr. Nelson said they were allowed in limited circumstances as defined in Nibley City code 19.42.

Commissioner Albrect asked that the Planning Commission review the section of code that regulated halfway houses at a future meeting. Mr. Nelson said he would read through the code to familiarize himself with it better.

Commissioner Mansell opened the public hearing at 9:15 p.m. and seeing no public comment, closed the public hearing at 9:15 p.m.

Discussion and Consideration of a recommendation for the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.04 Definitions

Commissioner Logan moved to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance update to Nibley City Code 19.04 Definitions as presented. Commissioner Obray seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 5-0; with Commissioner Logan, Commissioner Obray, Commissioner Swenson, Commissioner Albrect, and Commissioner Mansell all in favor.

Workshop: Moderate Income Housing Plan

Mr. Nelson said he had an initial draft of the Nibley City Moderate Income housing plan. The most recent copy had been included in the meeting Box and he asked that the Planning Commission review it so they could hold a workshop at the next meeting. He asked the Planning Commission to review it and send him their suggestions and recommendations.

Commission and Staff Report and Action Items

Mr. Nelson reported that the Nibley City Water Master Plan was almost done. He would be getting it to the Planning Commission for their review soon.

Mr. Nelson said he planned to do workshops and open houses on a future Capital Improvements Master Plan that would prioritize the capital improvements from the General Plan.

Ms. Bodily informed the Planning Commission of upcoming early voting and the Primary Meet the Candidates night.

There was general consent to adjourn the meeting at 9:21 p.m.

Attest: _____
Deputy City Recorder