

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES MARCH 4, 2020

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on March 4, 2020 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Present: John Woffinden
Chris Christiansen
Geoff Dupaix
Harold Dudley
Ryan Hunter
Christine Anderson

Absent: Rebecca Staten
Rod Brocious

Staff Present: Adam Olsen, City Planner
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner
Ben Hunter, Engineer
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant
Scott Sensanbaugher, Public Works Director

Also Present: Kirt and Joyce Yingling, Robert Bates, Kathy and Kevin McDonald, G.H. Kuefner, Jeanne Runolfson, Laurel Shelley, Valerie Searle, Leon Adamson, Sariah Batt, Jacquelyn Thorn, Carla Nielsen, Kathie Adamson, Debra Aston, Susan Scott, Kaden Gubler, Danny and Charlotte Hutchinson, Jennifer Harrison, Buck Swaney and 5 others

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Woffinden welcomed everyone and those present recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chairman indicated that he would allow 30 minutes for comments on item 2.

2. Discussion on the Northampton House Historic Building Conservation Project, located at 190 West 300 North in the R-2-7,500 Residential Zone-Historic Building Overlay

Mr. Olsen stated that this item was discussed 2 weeks ago. The property owner has listened to commissioners' comments and recommendations and would like to address the commission tonight after making some changes. Commissioners took a few minutes to read Mr. Yingling's written proposal and a letter from Mr. Thorn which Mr. Olsen handed out to commissioners.

Mr. Kirt Yingling, property owner, displayed a graphic of his proposal. His prior plan was to build townhomes on the perimeter of the property. The current proposal involves using the existing

APPROVED MINUTES

1 structure to make senior living units, he thinks that this is a better plan aesthetically. The units will
2 utilize existing entrances into the building and spaces such as the chapel. This plan would provide
3 2 different kinds of senior use that would be finished in different phases. The active 55+s and
4 independent senior living would come first with services such as medical care offered on-site by
5 third parties. The assisted living would be the final phase. The high density of this project is
6 required to be able to have a community structure.

7 Chairman Woffinden asked what he would need to add onto the existing building, and if he still
8 planned to do the seismic upgrade.

9 Mr. Yingling stated that the residential units would be attached to the original building, and
10 residents would enter using the existing entrance to get to the living units. The seismic upgrade is
11 very expensive and is kind of a wild card, it may not be doable. This is why it may be desirable to
12 have a mixed-use designation, there are different seismic requirements for different uses. He is
13 hopeful to be able to do the upgrade.

14 Chairman Woffinden expressed his view that it will cost a fortune to build this plan.

15 Mr. Yingling replied that the senior independent living doesn't require as much as the assisted
16 living, that phase would come before the assisted living. He added that on the second-to-last page
17 there is an example of how to make the design compatible in aesthetic detail, the American Fork
18 library is a good example of a historic building that has had an aesthetically compatible addition.

19 Ms. Joyce Yingling added that this is a more challenging plan than building townhomes around
20 the edge of the property. There aren't many economically feasible options for this property. They
21 believe that this is the best plan, their backup plan is to remove the building and build duplexes on
22 the property. They believe that this plan of senior living is a better option for the neighborhood.
23 The neighbors are concerned about density and traffic, but they don't believe that the 55+ will
24 have the same effect on traffic as younger families in duplexes. The current business as a reception
25 venue also generates a lot of traffic. They believe that senior active and assisted living will actually
26 decrease traffic. Declining property values are also a concern of neighbors. However, if they can
27 do this well, they feel it will do nothing but improve the property values. Property values would
28 probably be more negatively affected by duplexes.

29 Chairman Woffinden pointed out that it's not the city's responsibility to guarantee any property
30 owner's viability, and that the city can't save every historic building.

31 Ms. Yingling replied that they don't expect the city to guarantee anything. It is the owners that
32 have to take the risk of financing the property and securing tenants. They are not asking for
33 guarantees. If the city values the preservation of historic buildings, it has to be able to make
34 economic sense. It is very expensive, but they are willing to tackle the project and put themselves
35 financially on the line to maintain it. This building is 117 years old and needs to be stabilized. If
36 it's not particularly valuable to the city, they will take it down and build more modern housing.
37 They need to know how the neighbors and commission want them to proceed.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Laurel Shelley, neighbor, asked if the units would be single-level, and if seismic upgrades
2 would have to be done before people can move in. She indicated that no one has reached out to
3 neighbors for input. She would like to maintain a residential neighborhood.

4 Mr. Yingling replied that the units would be 2 above-ground levels and a basement level, with
5 elevators. He affirmed that seismic upgrades would be required before tenants could move in.

6 Ms. Susan Scott lives two houses down and said there are lots of people that come to help or visit
7 assisted living centers. She has a hard time backing out of her driveway now, and fears that a lot
8 of additional traffic will make it worse. She wishes that offices and boutiques could be an option.

9 Ms. Valerie Searle lives nearby, was married in the chapel, understands that something needs to
10 happen, but isn't sure this is the best option. She doesn't agree that there will be less traffic with a
11 55+ development.

12 Ms. Jackie Thorne, neighbor, is also representing her father who sent a letter to commissioners.
13 She is concerned and wants to see an environmental impact study done. She loves the park and
14 elementary school nearby and is concerned that more traffic would make walking difficult.

15 Mr. Kaden Gubler lives behind Northampton House. He agrees that it is a beautiful building, he
16 has talked about having his children's weddings there, he thinks that there are other ways to be
17 economically feasible. He also noted that it is a dangerous intersection that has had many
18 accidents.

19 (No name stated) loves the building, has been in every room, wants to save it if possible. The
20 intersection to the south and west is dangerous to get across. More traffic will be a concern from
21 a safety standpoint.

22 Ms. Deborah Astin, neighbor, notices that cars frequently run the nearby stop sign. She asked the
23 owners if they would consider selling the building.

24 Ms. Yingling replied that it has been for sale previously, but people don't want to tackle the costs
25 of bringing it up to speed.

26 Mr. Ryan Hunter encourages the Yinglings to reach out to the neighbors. He said that having
27 community involvement will be an important element in an eventual solution.

28 Ms. Anderson added that an upgrade of some sort will be needed, and will probably affect traffic.
29 Everyone should understand that if the owners choose to do something that fits within the code,
30 the neighbors will need to adjust. She doesn't feel that the higher density fits the code, and she
31 thinks that there is probably significant traffic from events the way it currently is used.

32 Mr. Dupaix thinks there is a possibility that this plan could work, but is concerned with seismic
33 upgrades. These are not optional and may be a show-stopper. He's seen these types of retrofits
34 work. As property owners they have rights to change the property within code requirements. He's
35 open to a plan, but there's more work that has to be done, he's not ready to greenlight it. He's not
36 sure that duplexes are the only other viable option.

APPROVED MINUTES

Chairman Woffinden asked about possibly enlarging the venue while keeping the same use and having bigger events. He thinks that seismic upgrades would be prohibitively expensive.

Ms. Yingling replied that they have met with restaurant consultants, who have advised that they don't really have the ability in this community to make a restaurant, fine dining doesn't fit in Utah County. This has been an ongoing discussion for years. They can reach out more to the neighbors.

Mr. Christiansen said that the owners have done their homework. He is more open to this plan, he likes where it's going aesthetically. But he also recognizes the concerns of the neighbors. He's not sure additional time or meetings will change minds.

Mr. Dupaix asked why the proposed units are two-story, have they considered spreading out more and keeping it single-level?

Mr. Yingling said it would cost more to build single-level, and this keeps it tied tightly to the building. If units aren't attached, they are more likely to be appurtenant structures.

Chairman Woffinden stated that the density doesn't fit the zone, and he feels that this is a more involved issue than can be solved here.

Mr. Robert Bates, long-time neighbor, says that ball games in the summer bring lots of traffic and car accidents. The city may need to put a traffic light up, he makes that suggestion. He also asks for more lighting.

Mr. Yingling added that the current business generates a lot of traffic on weekends. He can try to tweak the plan, but doesn't want to waste a lot of time because the density probably won't change by much.

Mr. Dudley stated that if the proposed change is within the density requirements of the ordinance, he will be supportive. If the owner approached residents, they would probably be supportive, but the owner needs to work through this. If it would require change to current land use or zoning, he's not automatically opposed, but the owner needs to have the support of those most impacted. He feels like the neighbors want to keep the building, and would be willing for some change, but issues have to be worked out with the neighbors. No one wants the building to go away, but there needs to be more work done outside of this commission. The commission can't fix the issues, the Yinglings need to continue to meet with staff and neighbors.

3. Hearing, review and action on the preliminary plan for the AF 10 Combined Project located in the area of 780 West 620 South in the PR-3.0 Residential Zone

Mr. Olsen stated that the Planning Commission approved a preliminary plan for the AF 10 Subdivision at its December 4, 2019 meeting. The proposal consisted of 47 lots/units with an overall density of 3.9 du/ac. Since the time of initial approval, the applicant has eliminated 17 lots/units; consolidated an area where a majority of those 17 lots/units were proposed and

APPROVED MINUTES

identified it as Lot 203 on a revised preliminary plan. The overall density has been reduced from 3.9 du/ac to 2.5 du/ac.

AF 10 Subdivision proposes a combination of both a Conservation Subdivision PUD and Low Density Attached Housing PUD. 30 lots/units are proposed, two lots having existing homes. Access is provided off 620 South. An open space area exists at the southern portion of the subdivision, to be dedicated to the City. Additional common area is proposed around the attached/townhome units, south of 700 South. Conservation subdivisions within the PR-3.0 zone require 25% open space. The subdivision meets this requirement.

Mr. Ben Hunter has no concerns from the Engineering Division, everything engineering-related stays the same.

Mr. Ken Berg, civil engineer, said that this shows that there is a lot of interest in this area, and a user wanted a large lot.

Ms. Anderson asked where frontage to lot 203 will be, Mr. Berg indicated that it would be accessed along 800 West.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plan for the AF 10 Subdivision, with the finding listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications listed in the Engineering report.

Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Nay

The motion carried.

4. Review and action on a Memorandum of Understanding for the Lake City Row Development (Vest Annexation Property), located in the area of 620 South 860 East

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Olsen stated that the overall concept plan for Lake City Row was approved by the City
2 Council on November 26, 2019. The overall concept plan provides development parameters and
3 grants vesting for a mixed-use development on approximately 90 acres located in the vicinity of
4 620 South 860 East.

5 The applicants request approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) prior to submission
6 of individual site plans. The draft MOU addresses the following: (1) Road Infrastructure;
7 specifically, construction and reimbursement of 620 South, and provision of transit stops along
8 860 East for a future regional transportation/transit loop, (2) Water Infrastructure; specifically,
9 limitations in the number of allowed units until upgrading of water delivery infrastructure, and
10 (3) Parking; specifically, allowance of shared parking provided certain minimum ratios are met.
11 These ratios are called out in a table within the MOU. Staff has reviewed the draft MOU and
12 now brings it before the Planning Commission for review and recommendation. The MOU will
13 then proceed to Council.

14 Mr. Olsen added that earlier today he sent out an updated MOU, this was reviewed by
15 administration and legal and they had input on some of the issues in the version he sent out last
16 week, for example, a parking study. The red-line version separates this out and addresses roads
17 and parking. Under no circumstances will parking drop below 1.8 parking spaces per unit. Other
18 items are reimbursement for construction of major roadways and buildout of some units before
19 upgrades to some water lines. The city attorney wanted to be here but could not, he will try to
20 answer any questions from commissioners. This has been vetted by legal counsel and
21 administration.

22 Mr. Ben Hunter said that the Engineering Division hasn't had much to do with this process, they
23 have no further input or concerns.

24 Mr. Dupaix asked Mr. Sensanbaugher about the situation with the city's water needs, how do
25 these changes affect this?

26 Mr. Sensanbaugher said that this is a major concern of his, he spoke with David Bunker and did
27 more modeling with John Schiess and said that they're OK with approving this development
28 with the caveat that the city needs to firmly commit to building water lines that will bring more
29 water from up north by the high school, along Main Street and south by the freeway and to this
30 area. The city is at full capacity and needs to build more water lines now. He stated that design
31 for the water line in front of the high school along 600 and down to Main Street is complete and
32 it is ready for funding. The line in 200 South in the TOD area is 75-80% designed and is
33 scheduled to be finished in May. Design work on lines in the middle began approximately a
34 month ago. Every segment is either being designed or is finished with design. Funding options
35 are being discussed now. The state infrastructure bank is being looked at. David Bunker has
36 visited with city council members, there is no formal decision but they seem to be on board. Mr.
37 Sensanbaugher stated that if the city commits now to building those lines and getting funding
38 and beginning construction, he will be comfortable recommending these projects. But there has
39 to be a firm commitment to that, if we don't build them then we will have big problems. Every

APPROVED MINUTES

one of these developments will have a problem. The issue will be the velocity in the pipes, we will have enough pressure but water modeling says that with full build-out, there will be peak day of 5 and peak hour velocities of 13 feet per second. You don't want to go over 5 feet per second, or this can create catastrophic failures. He is OK with having a level of 5 feet per second being violated for a small amount of time. From here forward, on every engineering report for every proposed development, a statement regarding velocity warnings will be included. Bigger lines have to be put in. He will stress this to the city council.

Ms. Anderson asked how his analysis of the water situation should affect the commissions' work?

Mr. Sensanbaugher replied that there is some risk, but he won't tell them how to vote. The risk is acceptable to him if we are building the bigger lines. He reiterates that this is an important "If." If he starts to feel that building the lines might not be a sure thing or that we'll have to wait for 2-3 years, he will be changing staff recommendations to denial. We're not there yet, he feels confident that the city will commit to build the lines, they are all currently under design or finished with design.

Mr. Buck Swaney, the developer for Lake City Row, expressed appreciation for staff and administration. The main reasons for the MOU is that there are more applications waiting in the wings, this MOU precedes and manages expectations for Lake City Row. The project will have different parking arrangements, there will be lots of studio and 1-bedroom apartments. He also suggested changing water measurement units to be consistent from units to erc's.

Mr. Sensanbaugher said that this should be passed along to legal, he doesn't have a problem but doesn't think that's his call to make that change.

Mr. Swaney says that the MOU is written to multiple parties but maybe should be tightened to just the parties signing the document who are assuming obligations.

Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the Memorandum of Understanding, subject to agreed-upon changes to wording in the agreement.

Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion carried.

APPROVED MINUTES

5. Hearing, review and action on amendments to the General Plan by providing a recommendation on the 2020 Transportation and Trails Master Plan and Impact Fee Facility Plan

Mr. Ben Hunter said that the Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed general plan amendments for the transportation element of the general plan. These updates reflect current development needs related to public infrastructure. These updates are consistent with the long-term planning and engineering goals for the City and are not detrimental to the general health, safety and welfare of its citizens.

Mr. Dupaix asked about roadway cost tables and referenced the Vineyard Collector. He felt the table should make clear that it's a joint city/UDOT jurisdiction, and maybe should separate out state financial burdens as opposed to city costs and clarify who is bearing these costs. The costs shown of \$19 million for State Street at 500 East aren't accurate, American Fork infrastructure is comparable to downtown Salt Lake City and it will be a lot more than that.

Mr. Ben Hunter says they haven't included any financial impact from state projects, just the city's portion.

Chairman Woffinden adds that council was discussing impact fees in their previous meeting.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Ryan Hunter moved to recommend approval of the General Plan Amendment for the transportation element and impact fee plan.

Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion carried.

6. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 15.01.1840 of the American Fork City Municipal Code

Mr. Ben Hunter stated that with additional roadway classifications, this an update to include all roadway classifications, adds TOD classifications not previously included. The Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed code text amendment.

APPROVED MINUTES

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Dupaix moved to recommend approval of the code text amendments to the roadway classifications.

Mr. Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion carried.

7. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 15.01.1880 of the American Fork City Municipal Code

Chairman Woffinden said that this item has been removed from the agenda.

8. Hearing, review and action on amendments to Section 15.01.1410 of the American Fork City Municipal Code

Mr. Ben Hunter indicated that the Public Works Department at the request of the Water Division has looked at modifying the 1" culinary water meter detail to provide clarification and direction to those that install new water meters. This is additional detail requested by contractors. The Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed code text amendment.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of the code text amendment.

Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye

APPROVED MINUTES

Harold Dudley

Aye

Ryan Hunter

Aye

The motion carried.

9. Hearing, review and action on various amendments to Section 15.01 and Section 17.9 of the American Fork City Municipal Code

Mr. Ben Hunter told commissioners that the city requires the posting of an improvement assurance and warranty to ensure the timely construction of required public infrastructure. These revisions are to provide clarification to applicants on the processes and procedures of posting an assurance/warranty, requesting a release of assurance/warranty, duration of assurance/warranty periods, etc. The Engineering Division recommends approval of the proposed code text amendment.

Ms. Anderson asked if proposed changes came from the legal counsel.

Mr. Ben Hunter replied that staff is on the front line of working with bonds, the proposed changes come from staff and are reviewed by legal counsel.

Mr. Ryan Hunter asked if we can delay vote until they are sure it has been reviewed by legal counsel.

Mr. Ben Hunter stated that it would be fine to delay, and staff will make sure that they have legal approval.

Public Hearing Opened

Public Hearing Closed

Mr. Ryan Hunter moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plan for the code text amendments, subject to legal review and approval, with the finding listed in the staff report and subject to any findings, conditions and modifications listed in the Engineering report.

Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden

Aye

Chris Christiansen

Aye

Christine Anderson

Aye

Geoff Dupaix

Aye

Harold Dudley

Aye

Ryan Hunter

Nay

The motion carried.

APPROVED MINUTES

10. Other Business

Mr. Olsen indicated that Rebecca Staten has stepped down from the commission, they will need to get another commissioner. He asked for suggestions. A resident from the south side would be great.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Olsen for the dinner in February.

11. Site Plan Committee Report

Mr. Knobloch reviewed the upcoming Planning Commission items, these include the developments moving through TRC. The next agenda is quite long, the meeting will be held on March 18. There are quite a few projects that are ready to move forward. He doesn't anticipate much comment on most of them. Ms. Anderson said that she will be gone.

12. Review and action on the minutes of the February 19, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Session

Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the February 19, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Session.

Mr. Dupaix seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	Aye
Chris Christiansen	Aye
Christine Anderson	Aye
Geoff Dupaix	Aye
Harold Dudley	Aye
Ryan Hunter	Aye

The motion carried.

13. Adjournment

Mr. Dupaix moved to adjourn.

Mr. Ryan Hunter seconded the motion. All concurred.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.



Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

American Fork Planning Commission

March 4, 2020

Agenda Item Number Two:

I request that the Planning Commission consider the following in its discussion on the issue at hand.

First, the property owner purchased the property knowing that it is and was an historic structure. Now however the owner is requesting an allowance to build a row of residential units adjacent to this historic structure without an illustration or limitation with regard to appearance of what these units could possibly look like and/or how they could conform to the existing historic structure. Any such construction shall impact the nature and character of the site and the entire neighborhood. Allowing new, modern construction immediately adjacent to an historic structure is like having an Armani suit, and putting a plastic poncho over it. You still have the beautiful suit, but you are completely distracted by the cheap poncho (and under this discussion, you don't even know what the poncho could look like).

Second, what analysis of the potential physical and aesthetic impacts to the site and the surrounding neighborhood will be completed regarding this request? Will, for example, a traffic analysis be completed to illustrate the impacts to the roadways and traffic circulation of the area? Many parents pass by this property on their way to pick up their children at the local elementary school.

Will an Environmental Impact Report be required to examine potential impacts from such issues as new noise from the complex, air pollution to the surrounding area from the new vehicular traffic generated, on site and area wide water drainage impacts, light pollution to the surrounding neighborhood, aesthetic impacts (requiring an architectural review by the City to assure consistency with the historic structure), etc. And what about impacts to emergency services to accommodate a seniors only restricted community? Services addressing such needs as ambulance/medical emergencies, fire or police services, costs to the City to enforce the age restrictions that would need to be applied to the property to keep it a 55+ senior only facility. Further, what other in-house or applicant submitted analysis will be required to be provided to illustrate the need, versus simply the desire, for this development?

Will there be a requirement that these "seniors only" units actually be built to address the needs of seniors? Will the units be required to be senior friendly regarding interior features such as lever door handles, sink and bathing facilities for handicapped individuals, handicapped ramps, flush door sills, one story construction, enclosed

garages with direct entry into the individual units, washer and dryer hook-ups within the individual units, etc.? Will there be passive and/or active recreational opportunities provided on site to address seniors? Will there be on site staff to address the needs of the seniors? A facility restricted to only individuals 55 years of age or older should be built to a higher set of standards for those individuals' comfort than for a development open to the general public.

Third, and most importantly, the property owner is asking to be allowed to build these residential units because he/she cannot profit from the property as it is. I do not believe that it is the role of the Planning Commission or the City of American Fork to assure that a property owner must make a profit from their land. The owner knew, or at least should have known in completing their due diligence review/analysis, when they purchased the property what they were buying and the limitations derived therefrom. Now, having made this purchase with full knowledge of these limitations, he/she wants the City to absorb the impacts of the new residential units simply to assure that he/she can make a profit (a profit potentially most significantly at the local neighborhood's expense).

Consider this example, if I were to purchase the historic Tabernacle down the street, knowing that it is an historic structure and knowing of its aesthetic character and historic importance to the area, would the City be obligated to allow me to build a strip mall in its parking lot simply to assure me of being able to both pay my mortgage and make a profit from this land? I submit that such actions are not the role of the Planning Commission nor the City.

Will the property owner be required to provide an Economic Impact Analysis to demonstrate the economic hardship he/she is claiming? If such an analysis is to be completed, such analysis should be required to illustrate all potential fiscal impacts to the City and to the specific neighborhood where it shall be located. It should also show what benefits to the community, and specifically to the affected neighborhood, will be derived from this complex. Mitigation Measures (Conditions of Approval beyond the "Standard Conditions") should be applied to assure the mitigation of the identified impacts. A condition must be applied that requires the property owner to record in the title of the land an age applicable restriction which can be enforced by the City.

Further, the fundamental question of will the community profit from these new residential units as much as the property owner if this request is granted must be answered. Will such benefits take the form of street improvements (desperately needed in this area), park improvements in the area, enhanced recreational programs for neighborhood seniors or youth, improvements to a local community center, improvements to local schools from an enhanced property tax base, improvements to a local library serving this neighborhood, etc.?

Further, does City Ordinance or State Law governing the actions of a Planning Commission allow the Commission to make land use decisions based upon the property owner's desire, or even potentially need, to make a "profit" from their land? Will this same right and privilege, if granted here, then be afforded to all property owners surrounding the property in question or throughout the city? Will surrounding property owners be allowed to add second or third residential units (even senior only units) to their single family residential properties so that they too can pay whatever mortgage they knowingly entered into for their property and still make a profit? I suspect that no they will not be allowed such consideration.

Please consider these comments and the potential impacts to this neighborhood in your discussion of this request.

Sincerely submitted,

J. Thorn (a local resident)
