

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, October 21, 2020**

5 **5:00 p.m.**

6 **Conducted Electronically**
7

8 **ATTENDANCE**
9

10 **Members Present:** Chair Chris Coutts, Craig Bevan, Sue Ryser, Jesse Allen, Bob Wilde,
11 Douglas Rhodes

12
13 **Staff Present:** CED Director Michael Johnson, Deputy City Recorder Heather Sundquist
14

15 **WORK MEETING**
16

17 In the absence of Chair Coutts, Commissioner Jesse Allen called the Work Meeting to order at
18 5:00 p.m. He read a statement regarding conducting the meeting from an anchor location.
19

20 **1.0 Planning Commission Business.**
21

22 **1.1 Review Business Meeting Agenda.**
23

24 The agenda items were reviewed and discussed.
25

26 CED Director, Michael Johnson reported that the first agenda item is related to a request from AJ
27 Rock, LLC for an ordinance and zone map amendment of approximately 21.5 acres of property
28 located at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard. The proposal is to utilize the City's Planned
29 Development District (PDD) ordinance and change the zoning designation from F-1-21 (Foothill
30 Residential) to PDD-2, a zoning designation prepared specifically for the subject property by the
31 applicant, within the guidelines of Chapter 19.51 of the City's Zoning ordinance.
32

33 Mr. Johnson shared the updated site plan and stated that between the native hillside and trail, newly
34 landscaped areas, and plaza space, open space will account for 53.9% of the total site. He noted
35 that parking information had not been changed but charts related to building coverage were added.
36 The site plan provided both pervious and impervious coverage, with the total building footprint
37 amounting to 18.9%, hardscape at 27.2%, and the landscape comprising 53.9% of the total site.
38 The lot sizes were currently unknown but the square footage of the footprint was included as part
39 of the update.
40

41 The written ordinance for the PDD-2 (Wasatch Rock Redevelopment) zone was shown to the
42 Commission Members. It included previous recommendations made by staff with redline
43 comments made by Chair Coutts following the last Cottonwood Heights City Planning
44 Commission Meeting. Mr. Johnson presented the following updates to the ordinance:
45

- 1 • Reiterate that the PDD-2 (Wasatch Rock Redevelopment) zone complies with the Gateway
2 Overlay District and the Sensitive Lands Evaluation & Development Standards (SLEDs);
3
- 4 • Permitted Uses section was updated to include open space and public facilities. These
5 cover plazas, trails, and trailheads proposed on the site. The trail will be usable by the
6 public. If a connection is made to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, there will be a public
7 easement;
8
- 9 • Development requirements state that parking for public uses, such as trail access, will be
10 permitted in surface parking lots;
11
- 12 • Clarification added about the open space percentage, which is 53.9%, as seen in the
13 Development Plan;
14
- 15 • Each phase of development will go to the Architecture Review Commission (“ARC”).
16 ARC will look at whether the project conforms to the PDD ordinance, the Development
17 Plan, City Design Guidelines, and site-specific design guidelines;
18
- 19 • Below Market Rate (“BMR”) provision may be amended. If the text amendment is
20 approved by City Council, updated numbers will be added to the ordinance. If it is not
21 approved, the number of BMR units will be modified to comply with City Code; and
22
- 23 • The development will be required to comply with the recently approved Outdoor Lighting
24 ordinance, subject to review and approval by the ARC.
25

26 Mr. Johnson reported that the technical manner in which the ordinance was written will not change
27 much in the future. It was reviewed and fine-tuned by the City Attorney, however, the actual
28 numbers and percentages were subject to change based on whether the BMR text amendment was
29 approved. Commissioner Wilde asked when the BMR text amendment would reach the City
30 Council. Mr. Johnson reported that it would be introduced to City Council on November 17, 2020.
31

32 Suggestions made by Chair Coutts related to the Development Plan were shared by Mr. Johnson.
33 The suggestions included:
34

- 35 • The number of signs along Wasatch Boulevard shall be limited and all signs shall be
36 thoughtful and intentional;
37
 - 38 ○ No more than 1 major monument sign A;
 - 39 ○ No more than 2 major monument sign B;
 - 40 ○ No more than 8 directional signs;
 - 41 ○ All bicycle lanes added to the site interior will be in addition to the existing bicycle
42 lane on Wasatch Boulevard;
43
- 44 • 10-foot berm along existing State Road Wasatch Boulevard and rounding corner up
45 existing Wasatch Boulevard (City Road); and
46

- Utility lines should be buried.

Mr. Johnson discussed the grading plan and noted that the PDD ordinance states that a 10-foot berm is required between public streets and parking areas. The applicant proposed landscaping and gabion walls to visually obstruct the surface parking area from the public street, rather than a 10-foot berm. With the grade change between the proposed parking area and Wasatch Boulevard, the vertical impact of the landscaping would be comparable to a 10-foot berm. Mr. Johnson reported that the ARC recommended the gabion wall treatment.

Commissioner Wilde asked about outstanding issues with the proposal. Mr. Johnson reported that the staff memo detailed all outstanding issues but staff felt that the proposal was ready to move forward to the City Council. One of the issues pertained to a comment from the Public Works Department and the City Engineer who needed additional analysis of the projected impact of stormwater runoff on the existing City infrastructure. The Public Works Director was comfortable forwarding the proposal to the City Council as long as the information is gathered before final approval is granted. Another outstanding issue had to do with the portion of the primary access point that encroaches on the City of Holladay's right-of-way. Mr. Johnson stated that it must be properly approved and reviewed but felt this could be done while waiting for a decision from City Council.

Mr. Johnson reported that the City Engineer and the contracted Geological Hazard Consultant requested additional slope stability analysis, specifically where the apartment project is proposed to be located. The review was completed after the last Planning Commission Meeting and was currently under review by the Geological Hazard Consultant. Mr. Johnson noted that many geologic and engineering studies had been performed and reviewed. Staff did not believe that all technical analyses needed to be completed at this point but it would need to be done before anything is built. At each phase of development, the applicant will be required to complete all necessary studies. No phase will be approved for vertical construction until additional trenching, soil samples, and foundation analysis have been completed.

Staff recommended that emergency access onto SR-190 (Wasatch Boulevard) become a temporary access point that can be used by the development. Mr. Johnson noted that there will be a meeting between the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") and the applicant next week to continue discussions. The additional access will alleviate concerns from the adjacent neighborhood to the north regarding traffic coming through the northern intersection. Having two intersections will spread out that traffic. Mr. Johnson reported that when the southern gravel pit property begins redevelopment, a full intersection will connect to the site, and temporary access will no longer be necessary.

Commissioner Bevan was unsure about using the existing grade instead of a 10-foot berm. The purpose of the berm was to block the view of the parking lot from Wasatch Boulevard. Commissioner Bevan had concerns about whether the proposed landscaping and gabion walls would be able to do that. Commissioner Allen agreed and felt there would likely be some visibility. However, he noted that there would be a substantial landscape barrier. Commissioner Bevan liked the idea of gabion walls and substantial landscaping but noted that what constituted a substantial landscape could vary dramatically from person to person. Mr. Johnson reported that everything

1 would go to the Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”) for approval and they will ensure
2 there is appropriate coverage.

3
4 Chair Coutts joined the meeting and assumed the Chair.

5
6 Commissioner Allen asked Chair Coutts about her suggestions for the Development Plan. He
7 wondered how the proposed number of signs was been determined. Chair Coutts explained that
8 the specific numbers were up for discussion but she felt there were too many signs for the scale of
9 the development. Commissioner Mills agreed and believed that the number of signs should be as
10 minimal as is reasonable. He noted that the area was the entrance to Cottonwood Heights City and
11 the canyons. Chair Coutts stated that it is a highly visible location and is a gateway to the City and
12 should look different from other commercial developments. There was discussion regarding sign
13 ordinances in the City.

14
15 Commissioner Bevan shared concerns related to wording in the Development Plan. He noted that
16 the line, “utility lines should be buried,” left room for interpretation. Burying powerlines was a
17 costly project and Commissioner Bevan did not feel it was wise to leave the task open for
18 interpretation. Mr. Johnson stated that stronger language could be used.

19
20 The Planning Commission continued to discuss the 10-foot berm. Commissioner Bevan felt that
21 a specific number or measurement should be tied to the gabion wall to ensure appropriate coverage.
22 Mr. Johnson reported that the applicant would be able to address height and grading questions
23 during the Business Meeting. Chair Coutts wondered if there had been objections to a berm.
24 Commissioner Bevan liked the idea of the landscaping and gabion walls rather than a berm but did
25 not feel that the current proposal was tall enough. Mr. Johnson noted that the ARC would look at
26 the landscaping and make sure that it acts as a good visual barrier. If there is a 10-foot obstruction
27 with the landscaping and gabion walls, it would serve the same purpose as a berm.

28
29 Commissioner Wilde believed that the ARC had already approved the configuration. Mr. Johnson
30 reported that supplemental Design Guidelines had been approved by the ARC. He noted that the
31 ARC recommended the gabion wall landscape treatment. Chair Coutts did not feel that the gabion
32 wall was tall enough. Commissioner Ryser wondered if the Planning Commission needed to
33 recommend a specific height or if they could simply add a line-of-sight request to the ordinance.
34 Mr. Johnson stated that whatever the Commission is comfortable with would be appropriate. The
35 ordinance could recommend a combination of landscaping and gabion walls to obstruct the line-
36 of-sight or the ordinance could recommend a 10-foot vertical barrier between Wasatch Boulevard
37 and the property.

38
39 Commissioner Bevan wanted to ensure that the ARC signed off on the proposal before it goes to
40 City Council. Commissioner Ryser asked whether the proposal needed to go back to the ARC.
41 Mr. Johnson reported that the ARC approved the General Concept Site Plan and the Site Design
42 Guidelines. Each phase would go through the ARC for a review of details related to landscaping,
43 architecture, and materials. There was discussion regarding the various phases of the project.
44 Chair Coutts wondered when the main road would be constructed. Mr. Johnson reported that the
45 road would be part of the Phase 1 development.

1 Commissioner Allen asked when the developers were planning to put in the trails. He was working
2 on another project with a zoning ordinance that required developers to put in some of the public
3 amenities first. Commissioner Allen commented that it could be difficult to front the funds for
4 those public amenities. Mr. Johnson believed that building the groundwork for the trail would be
5 part of Phase 1 but suggested clarifying that with the applicant during the Business Meeting. Chair
6 Coutts believed the trail development was tied to occupancy. Mr. Johnson and Commissioner
7 Allen felt that would make sense.

8
9 The Commissioners discussed affordable housing. Commissioner Allen felt it was important to
10 incentivize affordable housing. He noted that he had been vocal at the last Planning Commission
11 Meeting because he believed that 20% of the units should be provided at an 80% AMI rate if the
12 amendment passed. He felt that 10% was too low. Commissioner Allen noted that the document,
13 Staff Report Update Memo – October 7, 2020, listed BMR units as an outstanding item but did not
14 specifically mention the percentage. It stated: “the applicant’s current proposal of providing 10%
15 of units at 80% AMI does not comply with the current ordinance.” Mr. Johnson noted that the
16 Planning Commission recommended that the amendment allow 80% AMI with the number of units
17 set at 20% or 50% AMI with the number of units set at 10%. He stated that this aligned with staff’s
18 preliminary draft language. That amendment would be moved forward and recommended to the
19 City Council.

20
21 Commissioner Allen noted that there is an outstanding item in the staff report related to the
22 geologic engineering hazards. Mr. Johnson stated that public comment was received and
23 distributed to the Planning Commission. The person who made the comment felt that all site
24 engineering should be completed prior to a zone change. This would include digging out
25 foundations for each building, trenching, clearing every building location, doing a soils analysis,
26 and performing geotechnical work at each footprint. Staff did not feel that those steps were
27 necessary at this point in the project. The current focus was on clearing the site, addressing any
28 issues, and determining how those issues would be mitigated. Language was built into the
29 ordinance to specify that studies would be required at each phase of development. If one of the
30 proposed buildings required substantial changes, the ordinance would need to be amended.

31 32 **2.0 Adjournment**

33
34 ***Commissioner Wilde moved to adjourn. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. The motion***
35 ***passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

36
37 The Work Session adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

1 to fill the vacant District 2 seat. Jessica Chappell would be joining the Planning Commission after
2 a recommendation is made on the PDD.

3
4 Mr. Johnson stated that the staff report, staff memo, and recommendation were the same as at the
5 last Planning Commission Meeting. The following new pieces of information had been submitted
6 and were posted on the project website:

- 7
8 • Updated Site Plan that shows a more detailed land use table, shows square footages and
9 percentages of open space, and includes information on the landscape, hardscape, and
10 building footprints;
11
- 12 • The additional Slope Stability Analysis report had been received and was currently under
13 review by the geological hazard consultant; and
14
- 15 • Planning Commission Recommended Changes to Proposed PDD Ordinance with redline
16 changes and additions.
17

18 Staff recommended approval with the conditions set forth in the staff report. The conditions related
19 to outstanding issues included the following:

- 20
21 • Proper analysis of storm drain infrastructure impact and assessment of needed system
22 upgrades shall be completed and reviewed by the City Engineer;
23
- 24 • Resolution of outstanding engineering items and satisfactory completion of additional
25 geologic hazards reports and implementation of the recommendations of those reports must
26 be reviewed and approved by the city's Development Review Committee (DRC).
27 Additional recommendations or findings may be incorporated into the written ordinance to
28 ensure compliance;
29
- 30 • The proposed text amendment to the affordable housing provision shall be concluded, and
31 proposed affordable housing for this project shall comply with any ordinance amendment
32 that is granted by the City Council;
33
- 34 • If completion of the outstanding issues and additional geologic hazards/geotechnical
35 studies results in substantial changes to the proposed Development Plan, further review
36 and consideration by the Planning Commission may be required; and
37
- 38 • Subject to approval by the Utah Department of Transportation, the identified emergency
39 access onto SR-190 (Wasatch Boulevard) shall be utilized as a secondary regular access
40 for the property until the development on the adjacent property results in an improved and
41 permanent shared access point.
42

43 Mr. Johnson reported that one written comment was submitted and would be made part of the
44 public record.
45

1 The applicant, Adam Davis, and his partner at Rockworth Companies, Tom Henriod, were present
2 and available to answer questions. Mr. Davis felt that many of the comments raised had been
3 adequately addressed over the last couple of weeks. Mr. Henriod stated that he would be happy to
4 respond to any questions the Commissioners related to the development.

5
6 Chair Coutts opened the meeting to public comment. There were no public comments. The public
7 hearing was closed.
8

9 Chair Coutts thanked the applicant for updating the site plan with the square footages and
10 percentages. She felt it gave the Planning Commission a better idea of what the development
11 would look like. Chair Coutts noted that there had been language adjustments made in the written
12 ordinance. It included staff recommendations as well as redline changes from the Planning
13 Commission. Chair Coutts discussed following the redline changes made to the ordinance:
14

- 15 • Reiterate that the PDD-2 (Wasatch Rock Redevelopment) zone complies with the Gateway
16 Overlay District and the Sensitive Lands Evaluation & Development Standards
17 (“SLEDS”);
18
- 19 • Permitted Uses section was updated to include open space and public facilities. These
20 cover plazas, trails, and trailheads proposed on the site. The trail will be usable by the
21 public. If a connection is made to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, there will be a public
22 easement;
23
- 24 • Development requirements state that parking for public uses, such as trail access, will be
25 permitted in surface parking lots;
26
- 27 • Clarification added about the open space percentage, which is 53.9%, as seen in the
28 Development Plan;
29
- 30 • Each phase of development will go to the Architecture Review Commission (“ARC”).
31 ARC will look at whether the project conforms to the PDD ordinance, the Development
32 Plan, City Design Guidelines, and site-specific design guidelines;
33
- 34 • Below Market Rate (“BMR”) provision may be amended. If the text amendment is
35 approved by City Council, updated numbers will be added to the ordinance. If it is not
36 approved, the number of BMR units will be modified to comply with City Code; and
37
- 38 • The development will be required to comply with the recently approved Outdoor Lighting
39 ordinance, subject to review and approval by the ARC.
40

41 Chair Coutts noted that there had been a lot of discussions related to the BMR text amendment.
42 Housing was becoming unattainable for many residents of Cottonwood Heights and she felt it was
43 important that all developments meet affordable housing needs. The Planning Commission
44 suggested moving forward with a scaled approach to affordable housing to ensure that developers
45 can obtain financing. The scale would benefit both parties as it makes affordable housing a priority
46 rather than a burden. Mr. Johnson noted that specific numbers and percentages would be updated
47 in the written ordinance when a decision is made by City Council on the BMR text amendment.

1
2 Chair Coutts believed that the developers provided details about what the development will look
3 like. She stated that the AJ Rock, LLC team will continue to work with the ARC to make sure
4 that each phase of the development is cohesive. Chair Coutts brought up outstanding issues related
5 to the proposal. She noted that a lot of work had been done regarding the geological and
6 geotechnical engineering hazards. Any outstanding issues would be addressed as the development
7 continues. Chair Coutts mentioned that the site itself had a lot of issues and it was looked at closely
8 every step of the way.

9
10 Commissioner Wilde asked Mr. Henriod if the powerlines will be buried. Mr. Henriod did not
11 believe that Rocky Mountain Power will allow a development of this size to have overhead
12 powerlines. He noted that during his career, he had never seen Rocky Mountain Power use
13 overhead lines. Mr. Henriod brought up the landscape buffer, which was discussed during the
14 Work Session. He reported that the landscape buffer was intended to obscure the view from SR-
15 190. He noted that the ARC liked the idea of the gabion walls and the two proposed gabion walls
16 will be three feet tall. Part of the Cottonwood Heights City PDD ordinance is a full landscape
17 plan. Mr. Henriod stated that a full landscape plan was created and is substantial. He believed a
18 10-foot berm was impractical and noted that they did not want to hide the development. While the
19 parking lots should be obscured, Mr. Henriod felt it was important that the actual buildings be
20 visible.

21
22 Commissioner Allen asked if proforma numbers had been run with 20% of the units being at an
23 80% AMI rate. Mr. Henriod confirmed that they had. He stated that they are not in favor of a unit
24 percentage higher than what they had proposed. He noted that the City of Cottonwood Heights
25 does not have a lot of programs in place, such as Tax Increment Financing (“TIF”) programs or a
26 Housing Authority. If those programs were in place, there would be more room for flexibility.

27
28 Commissioner Allen noted that geologic and geotechnical engineering was not 100% complete
29 and wondered how the developers felt about the information they had been provided with thus far.
30 Mr. Henriod stated that they were extremely confident and were working with two geotechnical
31 engineers identified as Gordon Geotechnical Engineering and Western GeoLogic. They were also
32 working with GeoStrata through the City. The recent Slope Study Analysis reassured Gordon
33 Geotechnical Engineering that their original findings were correct. They believed the site was
34 suitable for the intended uses. Mr. Henriod shared that they were still waiting on GeoStrata to
35 finishing reviewing the data.

36
37 Commissioner Allen asked if there were updates on the traffic intersection improvements with the
38 City of Holladay. Mr. Henriod stated that he had spoken with Holladay City Planners, Paul Allred,
39 and Jonathan Teerlink as well as the Public Works Department. Since the development is still at
40 the rezone level, it does not currently require a technical review of the right-of-way. They would
41 coordinate the right-of-way when the construction drawings are underway. Commissioner Allen
42 wondered if there needed to be a public process in the City of Holladay. Messrs. Henriod and
43 Johnson both believed a public process would not be necessary.

44
45 Questions were raised by Commissioner Allen about improvements for public trail amenities.
46 Mr. Henriod reported that the trails in and around the multi-family apartment in Phase 1 will be

1 installed as part of Phase 1. Commissioner Allen asked if the trails to the east, up the hill, were
2 included in Phase 1, which Mr. Henriod confirmed. Commissioner Bevan asked if the trails were
3 tied to occupancy. Mr. Johnson stated that the trails were public improvements and will require a
4 development bond. The improvements would need to be installed before the bond is released back
5 to the developers.

6
7 Commissioner Wilde believed it was appropriate to forward the proposal to City Council. The
8 Planning Commission discussed wording for a motion. Mr. Johnson believed the motion should
9 specify that the landscape buffer must block the line-of-sight between parked vehicles and vehicles
10 on the right-of-way, subject to ARC approval. He also felt it was important to mention that
11 powerlines must be buried and that the trail in the hillside development is part of Phase 1.
12 Commissioner Mills asked if the motion would include the recommendations made by Chair
13 Coutts in the written ordinance. Mr. Johnson confirmed that it would.

14
15 The Commissioners discussed the number of signs. Commissioner Allen worried if it was
16 appropriate to have a specific number included in the recommendation. He supported limiting
17 signage but worried about specific numbers. Chair Coutts had tried to use language that was not
18 overly specific. Serra Lakomski showed the Planning Commission the latest version of the Sign
19 Plan. Chair Coutts felt that the south end of the plan included heavy signage. Ms. Lakomski noted
20 that some of the directional signage would be included in the trail system for wayfinding.
21 Commissioner Allen suggested looking at the existing Sign Ordinance.

22
23 According to Chapter 19.82.030, Section E, “A multi-use building may have one monument sign
24 facing each street or highway on which the building has frontage.” Mr. Johnson noted that Chapter
25 19.51 (Planned Development District) requires that signage comply with the City Code. The draft
26 ordinance also refers back to the zoning ordinance. He felt that everything was tied together as
27 written. Mr. Johnson felt that the Sign Code mitigated a lot of issues seen in other cities. He
28 commented that the content of the signs was not subject to review but the design and architecture
29 would go to the ARC at each phase of development. Chair Coutts felt that the specific signage
30 numbers in the written ordinance should be removed.

31
32 There was discussion about an appropriate line-of-sight for the landscape buffer. The
33 recommendation from the ARC was from vehicle headlights but Chair Coutts felt it could be higher
34 than that. Commissioner Bevan did not object to seeing the roof of a car but did not want
35 headlights shining out. Chair Coutts confirmed that the necessary language is in the Design
36 Guidelines. She asked if the Planning Commission was recommending a bond related to the trail
37 development. Mr. Johnson reported that he made a note related to Phase 1. From there, the
38 developer would follow the standard development process to either build the trail or bond for it.
39 This would ensure that the project is completed.

40
41 ***Commissioner Wilde moved that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of***
42 ***approval to the City Council for PDD-19-01, subject to the following conditions:***

- 43
44 ***1. The matters identified in the ‘Outstanding Issues’ section of the Staff Report***
45 ***shall be adequately addressed and reviewed by City staff:***
46

- i. *Proper analysis of storm drain infrastructure impact and assessment of needed system upgrades shall be completed and reviewed by the City Engineer;*
 - ii. *Resolution of outstanding engineering items and satisfactory completion of additional geologic hazards reports and implementation of the recommendations of those reports must be reviewed and approved by the city's Development Review Committee (DRC). Additional recommendations or findings may be incorporated into the written ordinance to ensure compliance;*
 - iii. *The proposed text amendment to the affordable housing provision shall be concluded, and proposed affordable housing for this project shall comply with any ordinance amendment that is granted; and*
 - iv. *If completion of the outstanding issues and additional geologic hazards/geotechnical studies results in substantial changes to the proposed Development Plan, further review and consideration by the Planning Commission may be required.*
2. *Subject to approval by the Utah Department of Transportation, the identified 'emergency access' onto SR-190 (Wasatch Boulevard) shall be utilized as a secondary regular access for the property until the development on the adjacent property results in an improved a permanent shared access point;*
 3. *Landscape buffer must block the line-of-sight between parked vehicles and vehicles on the right of way, subject to ARC approval;*
 4. *Powerlines must be buried, subject to Rocky Mountain Power jurisdiction; and*
 5. *Trail and open space on the hillside section of phase one improvements are subject to City Development procedures.*

Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Rhodes-Nay, Commissioner Mills-Aye, Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed 5-to-1. Commissioner Ryser was not present for the vote.

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Approval of Planning Commission Minutes.

1 • **September 2, 2020, Planning Commission Minutes**

2
3 *Commissioner Wilde moved to approve the September 2, 2020, Planning Commission Minutes.*
4 *Commissioner Mills seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of*
5 *the Commission.*

6
7 **5.0 ADJOURNMENT**

8
9 *Commissioner Mills moved to adjourn. Commissioner Rhodes seconded the motion. The*
10 *motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

11
12 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, October 21, 2020*
3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: December 2, 2020