



NOTICE AND AGENDA
SOUTH OGDEN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2019

Notice is hereby given that the South Ogden City Planning Commission will hold a meeting October 10, 2019, 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. SPECIAL ITEMS

- A. Consideration of Application to Allow Small Scale Manufacturing in the City Center Core Subdistrict as a Conditional Use and Set Date for Public Hearing
- B. Discussion on Cannabis Pharmacies and Where They Should Be Allowed
- C. Discussion on Hard Surface Driveways and If They Should Be Required

III. OTHER BUSINESS

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Approval of September 12, 2019 Meeting Minutes

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VI. ADJOURN

Posted and emailed to the State of Utah Public Notice Website on October 7, 2019

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 October 7, 2019. 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.

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

801-589-2980

Max.Faiz@gmail.com

Applicant Name Beehive Flower Corporation Phone 801-8981870 email Brandon@greenlightservices.org
(Max Faiz)

Address 3772 Washington Blvd City South Ogden State UT Zip 84403
4287 Harrison Blvd

Request: We are proposing an amendment to the existing zoning designation that will add medical cannabis
allow processing / manufacturing as a conditional use, allow
small scale

Fee – Zoning Ordinance Amendment

\$100.00 plus advertising costs.

OFFICE USE

Scheduled for Planning Commission Agenda _____

Request for Recommendation sent to the following by copy and return of this form:

City Engineer - Date _____ Received back - Date _____

Fire Dept. - _____

Public Works - _____

Other - _____

RECOMMENDATION: (OR INCLUDE ATTACHMENT)

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

APPROVED _____ DENIED _____ Date _____

CITY COUNCIL ACTION

APPROVED _____ DENIED _____ Date _____

STAFF REPORT



SUBJECT: Continued Discussion to Consider Allowing
Manufacturing Uses in the City Center Core
Subdistrict and to Set Date for a Public Hearing

AUTHOR: Mark Vlasic

DEPARTMENT: City Planner

DATE: October 10, 2019

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

This is a continuation of an application that was submitted to amend the City Center Core Subdistrict zoning to allow small-scale processing/manufacturing. The following are questions that emerged during the September Planning Commission meeting, which are followed by staff assessments (**in bold**):

1. Are small-scale processing/manufacturing uses aligned with the goals established for the City Center and 40th Street Corridor Form-based Code and the City Center Core Subdistrict?
No. Small-scale processing/manufacturing uses are not aligned with the stated goals for this subdistrict.
2. Should the ordinance be modified to permit such uses?
Staff does not believe that the ordinance should be modified to permit small-scale processing/manufacturing uses in the City Center Core Subdistrict.
3. Are such operations similar to office uses, and if so, should they be permitted on the upper levels of buildings in this district?
Small-scale processing/manufacturing uses differ significantly from office uses – a second story location does not change this assessment.
4. Are there other modifications that might be considered if the request to change the ordinance?
The Riverdale Road "General" Subdistrict is a transitional area that is envisioned to be occupied mainly by office, retail and residential uses. The area provides significant flexibility to accommodate auto oriented and similar uses, which may make it better suited for small-scale processing and manufacturing uses.
5. The application was made specifically to facilitate medical cannabis processing and off-site distribution. Does this change your interpretation and direction, and if so, why?
No.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission set a date for a public hearing to consider the application for changing the City Center Core Subdistrict zone to allow small-scale processing/manufacturing uses.

STAFF REPORT



SUBJECT: Discussion on Cannabis Pharmacies and Where
They Should Be Allowed in the City
AUTHOR: Mark Vlastic
DEPARTMENT: City Planner
DATE: October 10, 2019

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS

This is a continuation of a discussion from the September 2019 Planning Commission meeting. At that time a detailed report was provided regarding the current status of Medical Cannabis legislation in Utah, and how South Ogden should be prepared to respond once legislation is finalized. Staff was instructed to provide a monthly report, focusing on three inter-related topic areas:

- Distribution (pharmacies)
- Processing/manufacturing
- Growing (not applicable in South Ogden, as the city does not have any agricultural zones where such operations might take place)

The following are September news articles regarding legislative actions in Utah, and an article from Pennsylvania highlighting problems that state has faced since recently launching a similar medical cannabis program.

1. According to Marijuana Business Daily:

September 19, 2019

Utah legislators unanimously passed legislation on September 18, 2019 allowing 14 private medical cannabis dispensaries, substantially boosting the business opportunities for a program scheduled to launch as soon as March 2020. The measure, voted on during a special session called by Republican Gov. Gary Herbert, amends the state's MMJ law that called for a state-run pharmacy system combined with seven private dispensaries. An earlier proposal would have increased the number of private dispensaries from seven to 12, but lawmakers responded to concerns that a dozen wouldn't be enough to serve the state. The bill now goes to Herbert for his expected signature.

Utah backtracked from the state-run dispensary after county attorneys expressed concern that such a system would put public employees at risk of being prosecuted under federal drug laws. Here are key business aspects to Utah's bill:

State regulators will issue up to 14 dispensary licenses, eight in a first round and six in a second phase. The bill calls for regulators to complete the licensing process by July 1, 2020.

The state will be divided into no fewer than four geographic regions and regulators must issue at least one license for each geographic region.

Regulators would be allowed to issue additional dispensary licenses if warranted by a market analysis.

Regulators also could increase the number of cultivation licenses from eight to as many as 15 if needed to balance supply and demand.

Couriers would be licensed for home delivery.

Republican Senate Majority Leader Evan Vickers, who drafted the law, said his team is "doing everything we can" to have product ready by next March.

September 26, 2019

Utah would charge medical marijuana dispensaries between \$50,000 and \$69,500 each year in operating fees under a proposal state officials are considering – placing an unexpectedly high financial burden on future medical marijuana businesses.

An executive with a Washington state-based company interested in opening a dispensary in Utah called the proposed fees a "big pill to swallow" in a public hearing this week, The Salt Lake Tribune reported.

Still, Seth Bailey of Seattle-based Origins Cannabis added that the proposed fee, while substantial, probably wouldn't deter companies from entering the market.

Dispensary operating fees would depend on the facility's location and whether it offers home delivery.

Facilities in urban counties would pay more. The state's health department plans to refine its proposal, which covers a number of proposed fees, based on feedback. The fees are intended to cover the costs of regulating the MMJ industry as well bolstering state revenue.

Lawmakers recently increased the number of private dispensaries from seven to 14 and created a home-delivery option. Utah's medical marijuana program is set to launch as soon as March 2020. MJBizDaily projects medical marijuana sales in the \$25 million-\$35 million range in Utah by 2022, two years after medical marijuana sales are scheduled to launch.

2. According to Utahpolicy .com:

September 25, 2019

McAdams supports passage of bipartisan bill giving legal banking services to medical cannabis businesses

Congressman Ben McAdams supported the bipartisan passage of a bill which will help states such as Utah gain access to legal banking services for the state's medical cannabis businesses. The Secure and Fair Enforcement (SAFE) Banking Act of 2019 (H.R. 1595) passed the House by a vote of 321-103.

“Thirty-four states, including Utah, have now legalized medical cannabis, yet current federal law prevents banks from offering financial services to sellers of this product. That forces commerce to be carried out with cash-filled duffle bags, making medical cannabis vendors easy targets for crime. This bill provides a ‘safe harbor’ for these state-approved businesses, which in Utah’s case are set to open in March of 2020.”

McAdams said current federal law and lack of regulatory clarity puts medical cannabis businesses’ employees and the general public at serious risk of criminal activity and harm. McAdams said that the Utah State Treasurer and the Utah legislature have called on Congress to solve the problem. The Utah legislature recently revised the state’s medical cannabis law to include 14 privately-run pharmacies to sell medical cannabis to patients.

McAdams said that the SAFE Banking Act does not legalize marijuana but protects state-authorized medical cannabis businesses, along with supply chain companies, such as real estate companies, accountants or lawyers who work with the companies, from losing their banking services. It also requires federal banking regulators to develop uniform guidance and examination procedures to help financial institutions lawfully serve state-authorized medical cannabis businesses.

From further afield an article from Pennsylvania which has been dealing with similar legislation:

3. According to the Philadelphia Inquirer – a report from a state that has been dealing with similar legislation

September 29, 2019

5 reasons why there’s a medical marijuana drought in Pennsylvania

Medical marijuana is the only medicine that helps Dalton Hunsberger with seizures, nausea and anxiety. But for two months, it’s been very difficult to find the medicine that treats the 21-year-old Perkasie man’s epilepsy and other symptoms. “When the dispensaries get it in, it’s gone within a couple of hours,” said Dalton’s mother, Charis Hunsberger.

Pennsylvania is in the grip of a medical marijuana drought, according to multiple dispensary owners from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh. Some dispensaries are rationing dried flower. At one

dispensary there's a seven-gram limit per patient per day. At another there's a 14 gram a day maximum, and yet another caps it at an ounce (about 28 grams).

"We're trying to help as many patients as possible in an equitable way so the people who get in first aren't the only ones who get it," said Mike Badey, CEO of Keystone Shops, a dispensary chain. "It's frustrating. It's also the perception of a shortage can exacerbate a shortage. It's like a run on the banks."

The Pennsylvania Department of Health, which oversees the nascent, highly regulated market, says the state's medical marijuana program is a victim of its own success.

"Any product shortages are the result of the ever-growing medical marijuana program," said Nate Wardle, a Health Department spokesperson. "As new dispensaries become operational, they must order their entire stock at once."

More than 60 state-approved cannabis retail shops are now operating across the commonwealth, catering to nearly 200,000 registered patients. Patients and patient advocates blame the state regulators for not anticipating the rising demand and making sure that there are enough marijuana growers to meet the demand.

"You wouldn't ever expect to go to a CVS and hear your medicine is three weeks out," said Oludare Odumosu, chief operating officer of Ilera Health, a grower that also runs three dispensaries in Southeastern Pennsylvania. Industry observers say that state officials' lack of expertise in regulating a fast-growing market are not limited to, or unique to, Pennsylvania.

Not all growers are growing

Heather Randazzo, a grower, feeds marijuana plants approaching the flowering stage at the Compassionate Care Foundation medical marijuana dispensary and cultivation center in Egg Harbor Township, N.J. Pennsylvania does not allow photographers, reporters — or even legislators — to enter grow facilities. Growers in the Keystone State can lose their permits if they allow unauthorized personnel inside.

The number of patients and dispensaries has exploded, but the number of growers has stayed the same. There should be 25 growers producing medicines. Yet more than two years after the first permits were granted, only 10 growers are producing.

In June 2017, the state awarded the first 12 permits to cultivators. But several weren't qualified. Some lacked the skills, or the financial wherewithal, to pull off a crop. At least one applied with the intention of flipping its license for a quick cash windfall

Agrimed LLC was the highest scorer in the state's highly competitive process. The Western Pennsylvania firm has not shipped a single speck of cannabis. Because of gross security lapses involving the disappearance of cannabis plants, the state has said it will not renew Agrimed's permit, but the regulator hasn't said whether it will reissue that permit to another grower. Another top scorer, Reading's Franklin Labs, chaired by former Gov. Wolf aide John Hanger, tried to flip

its permit for \$20 million soon after it was awarded. Both companies currently are controlled by the beleaguered marijuana company Harvest In. of Arizona

“Problems with the licensing processes tend to create cascading effects throughout the system,” said John Hudak, a senior fellow in governance studies at the Brookings Institution. “If you get it wrong at the outset, it won’t be the only challenge you face. Pennsylvania is dealing with that right now.”

In July 2018, the state awarded a second round of 13 permits. Each promised to be “operational” in six months. More than a year later, none of them is shipping marijuana.

Justin Moriconi, CEO of DocHouse LLC, apologized for the delay. Construction of his Pottsville growhouse may continue through March. “We’ve had plenty of setbacks,” Moriconi said. “We leveled a coal mine. We put a road in. We’re building a small city here.” DocHouse likely will not start shipping until June 2020, he said — almost two years since getting the permit.

It’s like a run on the banks. When there is flower in stock, people buy more than they would normally.

Mike Badey, Keystone Shops

For its part, the state has sent out sternly worded letters to the growers who aren’t producing yet. But it has no power to ensure the growers ship medicines. The state has deemed a handful of the second-round growers “operational” — meaning they’re capable of growing, not that they are shipping or generating revenues. “We know that once operationalized, it takes several months for medical marijuana plants to be grown and then processing has to occur,” Wardle said.

The state hasn’t always had to make excuses for its marijuana growers. Cresco Labs, an Illinois-based producer with a history of success in other states, was the first to ship product to dispensaries — only eight months after winning a permit. Terrapin and Standard Farms followed suit 30 days later.

The Health Department may deserve some blame for not ensuring that supply keeps up with demand, experts say. “At the end of the day, you’re not getting the most seasoned regulators,” said Daniel B. Rodriguez, a professor and former dean at Northwestern University’s law school in Chicago who studies the intersection of cannabis and law. “What you’re seeing is the regulation of a new technology, and many of the regulators in the states don’t anticipate what the consequences of the new technology are.”

Jon Cohn, CEO of AgriKind is one of the rare second-round growers that will be harvesting soon. He said several strains of marijuana are underway at his growhouse in Chester and should be shipping the first week of October. “We’ll be starting small because when you begin, you start with cuttings or seeds,” Cohn said. “So we’re creating mother plants right now and taking clones of them.”

More dispensaries

Statewide, the health department has “certified” or approved 67 marijuana outlets, up from 43 at the beginning of the year. About 60 of those retailers are open. Every dispensary must be stocked with a full complement of medicines — from flower to vape pens, concentrates to tinctures. Every time a new dispensary is launched, each has to contend with a smaller share of the limited marijuana supply.

At TerraVida Holistic Centers, president Chris Visco said she struggles to maintain enough inventory. “With one grower, I’ve gone from 150 pounds of flower a month down to 40 pounds,” said Visco. Until recently, it wasn’t unusual for TerraVida to have dozens of cannabis strains in stock. On Monday, there were only two varieties of flower.

Patient registrations skyrocket

There were 17 qualifying “serious medical conditions” when the program was launched in February 2017. Now there are 23. Recent additions include opioid-use disorder, anxiety, and Tourette’s Syndrome. When anxiety was added to the list in July, 3,000 new patients joined in less than two weeks. The most common reasons for enrolling as of June were chronic pain (50%), post-traumatic stress disorder (13.5%), neuropathies (8.6%), and cancer (8.4%).

“The uptick in patients outstripped the state’s projections,” said Odumosu of Ilera Health. “That’s all put a strain on supply across the board.”

Patient advocate Chris Goldstein said blaming patients for the shortage is misattributing the cause.

“It comes down to poor management,” said Goldstein, an organizer with NORML, the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws. The state, he said, should have expected growth in the number of patients and managed growers and dispensaries accordingly.

That’s a sentiment echoed by Charis Hunsberger, who buys Terrapin flower for her epileptic son. “If the state is going to treat it as medicine, they should be doing whatever is necessary so there isn’t a shortage,” she said.

Buds are in high demand, patients scared off vapes

When medical marijuana was first legalized, Pennsylvania law did not permit smokable flower. So, when legislators allowed it in August 2018, many growers were caught flatfooted: No one had hired skilled bud trimmers or planned for the necessary drying and curing rooms.

Flower is the most affordable and familiar form of marijuana available to patients, most of whom had never heard of some of the exotic concentrates. The concentrates typically fetch higher prices, even though they’re cheaper to make using parts of the plant — the leaves, stems, and stalks — that would otherwise be thrown away. That means concentrates are often highly profitable, up to 2.5 times greater than flower, experts say. That gives growers and processors an incentive to stay focused on non-flower products.

Patients also are switching to flower due to recent reports of a mysterious lung ailment linked to vaping. Dispensary owners in the Philadelphia region say sales of vaping cartridges and pens have fallen in the wake of the scare. In Massachusetts, where regulatory transparency is the norm, sales of vape products crashed 15% last month before all vape products — with and without intoxicating THC — were banned for the rest of the year. “Even though the growers assure us that there are no dangerous additives in their [vape] products, people are still very apprehensive,” said Rob Stanley of Restore Integrative Wellness in Philadelphia.

Officials at the health department couldn’t confirm or provide Pennsylvania sales data.

Mold, microbial spoilage, and failed harvests

Many of the state’s current growers - transplants from out west who earned their stripes in such states as Colorado and Nevada - weren’t prepared for the wide swings in humidity in Pennsylvania, especially in July and August, experts say. Rumors of destroyed crops are common. However, the Health Department wouldn’t confirm it or provide data on whether growers have cut back their shipments. “That information is protected by law,” said Health Department spokesperson April Hutcheson, adding that the department hasn’t been notified of any crops lost to mold.

It’s unfortunate that Pennsylvania has such tight restrictions on releasing cannabis data, said Hudak, the Brookings Institute expert on governance and cannabis. “The problem with a lack of transparency is that it creates layers of distrust that really rattle the system,” Hudak said. “Pennsylvania isn’t the only state with those restrictions, but with them you can’t generate trust or show the broader public how the system is working.” Yet sometimes, moldy product even appears on dispensary shelves.

Privately, growers acknowledge that mold is not uncommon, especially as some grower-processors didn’t anticipate the need for sophisticated curing rooms and air filtration devices.

“Many growers here have not been subjected to full summer conditions,” said Cohn of Agri-Kind. “Mold is something that growers are likely checking themselves. It is possible that if they found moldy crops, they destroyed them as they should.” Mold is something that growers are likely checking themselves. It is possible that if they found moldy crops, they destroyed them.

Experts say that managing a growing environment is a complicated task, especially when you’re producing for patients who could get severely ill or die if they inhale mold, microbes, or other toxins. “With each air change in a grow room to reduce oxygen levels, the humidity goes to high — and mold often results,” said Scot Ziskind, a Philadelphia-based mechanical engineer who consults with marijuana growers about environmental issues as far away as Hawaii. “Air changes occur at least four times an hour. Maintaining temperature is also an issue.”

RECOMMENDATION

Staff suggests that a hold-steady approach should apply, as legislative action is changing rapidly, and it is too early to act in a meaningful manner. The Planning Commission may also want to suggest that updates and clarifications are provided directly from the State of Utah to ensure South Ogden is well-informed and prepared to act as needed.

STAFF REPORT



SUBJECT: Discussion on Hard Surface Driveways and Whether They Should Be Required
AUTHOR: Mark Vlasic
DEPARTMENT: City Planner
DATE: October 10, 2019

BACKGROUND/SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS

This is a continuation of discussions held during the September Planning Commission meeting regarding whether residential driveways are required to be paved, and it was indicated that Section 10-17-5 of the city code requires that all parking lot driveways must be paved, and that this has been interpreted to apply to residential-type driveways as well:

Section 10-17-5: PARKING LOT DESIGN AND MAINTENANCE

B. Parking Lot Standards: Every parcel of land used as a parking area, including driveways, shall be paved with an asphalt or concrete surface.

The City Code currently does not require a building permit for constructing a driveway, but does require a permit if installing, widening, or re-pouring the driveway approach.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the September discussions, staff recommends that Section 10-17-5 be modified as follows. Note that blue text is additions to the existing ordinance and red strikethroughs are deletions.

10-17-5: PARKING LOT AND DRIVEWAY DESIGN AND MAINTENANCE:

B. Parking Lot and Driveway Standards

Every parcel of land used as a parking area, including driveways or driveway shall ~~be paved with an asphalt or concrete surface. Public lots shall have bumper guards or curbs where needed, as determined by the building official, to protect adjacent property owners or persons using a sidewalk. Catch basins and drains shall be provided to collect surface drainage of all paved areas at a minimum rate of one inch (1") an hour rainfall. Surface drainage is not allowed across pedestrian walkways.~~ meet the following requirements:

Hard surface paving is required for all off-street parking, driveway, maneuvering, loading, and storage areas for vehicles.

1. Materials: Parking and driveway paving materials for commercial or multi-family developments shall consist of an asphalt or concrete surface. In addition, single family homes may use decorative pavers comparable in strength and performance to concrete or asphalt. No soft surface materials such as gravel, crushed stone or soil shall be permitted.
2. Compliance: If the dimensions or location of existing gravel/soft surface driveways is modified, the parking/driveway must be brought into conformance with these regulations.
3. Drainage: Parking and driveway drainage shall comply with all applicable storm water drainage standards, regulations and requirements. For multi-family residential and all other non-residential project types, catch basins and drains shall be provided to collect surface drainage of all paved areas at a minimum rate of one inch (1") an hour rainfall. Surface drainage is not allowed across pedestrian walkways.
4. Permits Required: Building permits for parking and driveway installation and paving are required prior to commencing construction. A permit to work in the public right-of-way must also be obtained when installing a driveway approach or modifying an existing approach.
5. Public lots shall have bumper guards or curbs where needed, as determined by the building official, to protect adjacent property owners or persons using a sidewalk.

Staff recommends that a permit be required for all driveway installation projects from the date that the modifications are adopted, as this will provide an opportunity for enforcement of all new violations. Staff recommends that the permit be provided free of charge in a manner that is easy and automatic, perhaps utilizing an on-line application process.

The application process should also disseminate guidelines, references and details for the proper installation of driveway materials (asphalt, concrete and unit pavers), and typical construction details/specifications for each (asphalt, concrete and unit pavers).

If the Planning Commission agrees with these changes or any variation, staff recommends that a date is established for a public hearing.



MINUTES OF THE SOUTH OGDEN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2019
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL –6:15 pm

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair Raymond Rounds, Commissioners Scott Amos, John Bradley, Jeremy Howe, Mike Layton, Jerry Jones, and Steve Pruess

STAFF PRESENT

Assistant City Manager Doug Gailey, Planner Mark Vlastic, and Recorder Leesa Kapetanov

OTHERS PRESENT

Brandon Thompson, Reese Schone, Rich Schone, Corey Bramwell

Note: The time stamps indicated in blue correspond to the audio recording of this meeting, which can be found at:

http://www.southogdencity.com/document_center/Sound%20Files/PC190912_1816.mp3 or requested from the office of the South Ogden City Recorder.

A briefing session was held before the planning commission meeting in the conference room adjacent to the council chambers and was open to the public. The recording for the briefing meeting can be found by clicking this link:
http://www.southogdencity.com/document_center/Sound%20Files/PC190912_1735.mp3

I. CALL TO ORDER AND OVERVIEW OF MEETING PROCEDURES

Chair Raymond Rounds began the meeting at 6:16 pm by calling for a motion to open.

00:00:00

Commissioner Pruess moved to open the September 12 planning commission meeting, followed by a second from Commissioner Bradley. Commissioners Pruess, Layton, Amos, Jones, Bradley, and Howe all voted aye.

The Chair indicated the first item of business would be a public hearing and called for a motion to enter into a public hearing. 00:00:44

Commissioner Howe moved to enter into a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Amos. All present voted aye.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

To Receive and Consider Comments on the Proposed Hilltop Gardens Subdivision

- Staff Overview 00:01:09
- Call for public comments 00:02:18
- There were no comments. Chair Rounds called for a motion to close the public hearing 00:02:55

Commissioner Bradley moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

III. ZONING ACTIONS

A. Discussion and Recommendation on the Hilltop Gardens Subdivision Located at 3792 Grant Avenue

- Discussion by Planning Commission 00:03:20
- Motion 00:07:28

Commissioner Jones moved this action be approved subject to adherence to the engineer's report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Howe. The chair asked if this was being recommended to the City Council; staff answered that it was. The chair stated that a yes vote was to recommend the subdivision be approved to the City Council. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

City Recorder Kapetanov then pointed out that since this was a new subdivision, it did not need to be approved by the City Council and that the Planning Commission should actually approve it.

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the subdivision subject to adherence to the engineer's comments. Commissioner Howe again seconded the motion. All present voted aye.

B. Discussion and Recommendation on the Regency at Crossroads Lot 9 Subdivision Amendment Located at 1452 Ridgeline Drive

- Staff overview 00:09:47
- Motion 00:12:02

Commissioner Bradley moved to recommend approval of the amendment of the Regency at Crossroads Lot 9 Subdivision. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Amos. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

IV. SPECIAL ITEMS

A. Discussion on Allowing Manufacturing Use in City Center Core Subdistrict and Set Date for a Public Hearing

- Staff overview 00:12:30
- Discussion 00:19:43
- Direction to staff 00:25:36

B. Discussion on Cannabis Pharmacies and Where They Should Be Allowed in the City

- Staff overview 00:31:07
- Discussion 00:39:37

C. Discussion on Hard Surface Driveways and If They Should Be Required

- Staff overview 00:50:41
- Discussion 00:55:50

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- Update on General Plan by Assistant City Manager Doug Gailey
01:05:11
- Discussion on gravel in parking strips
01:06:24
- Approval of submitted engineering for 5035 Burch Creek Dr.
01:08:46
- Staff report on Staff Review Committee projects
01:12:29
- Discussion on cancelling October meeting
01:14:14
- Vote to cancel October meeting
01:14:57

Commissioner Layton moved to cancel the October Planning Commission meeting, followed by a second from Commissioner Pruess. The voice vote was five votes in favor and one vote against the motion. The motion passed.

- Update on other projects in the city
01:15:26

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Approval of August 8, 2019 Meeting Minutes

- Motion 01:18:10

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the August 8, 2019 Meeting Minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Amos. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Brandon Thompson, co-applicant to allow manufacturing in City Center Core Subdistrict

01:18:33

Note: Commissioner Jones had to leave the meeting at 7:49 pm during Mr. Thompson's comments.

Based on Mr. Thompson's comments, the commissioners held another vote to hold the October meeting instead of cancelling it.

Commissioner Howe moved to hold the October meeting. Commissioner Amos seconded the motion. The voice vote was four ayes and one nay. The motion stood.

01:43:04

Commissioner Bradley moved to hold the October meeting on October 17. There was discussion on several dates, but no one seconded to the motion. The motion died.

01:45:26

VIII. ADJOURN

Chair Raymond Rounds called for a motion to adjourn.

01:48:38

Commissioner Howe moved to adjourn, followed by a second from Commissioner Layton. The vote to adjourn was unanimous.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the South Ogden City Planning Commission Meeting held Thursday, September 12, 2019.


Leesa Kapetanov, City Recorder

Date Approved by the Planning Commission