

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

February 08, 2023

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on February 08, 2023 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Christine Anderson, Chris Christiansen, David Bird, Jenny Peay, Rodney Martin, Harold Dudley, Bruce Frandsen

Absent:

Staff Present:

Patrick O'Brien Development Services Director

Travis Van Ekelburg Senior Planner

Cody Opperman Planner 1

JJ Hsu Engineer

Susan Goebel-Canning Public Works Director

Melissa White Admin Assistant

Others Present: Susan Goebel-Canning, Bon Kirkpatrick, Nan Kirkpatrick

REGULAR SESSION

Christine Anderson led the “Pledge of Allegiance”

Roll Call

COMMON CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Minutes of the January 18, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Session.**

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Jenny Peay motioned to approve the minutes. David Bird seconded the motion.

Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
David Bird	AYE

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election of Planning Commission Chairperson.

Chris Christiansen motioned to approve Christine Anderson as the new Planning Commission Chairperson for 2023.

Jenny Peay seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion passed

Chairwoman Anderson expressed her gratitude and love of serving on the commission and accepted the nomination.

Bruce Frandsen entered the meeting.

2. Election of Planning Commission Vice Chairperson.

The Commissioners held a brief discussion and determined the best candidate for Vice Chairperson would be a member who had the experience and time allowance

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

to fill the role. It was agreed that all members of the Commission would qualify for the role, but ultimately Mr. Christiansen was the best candidate at this time. Mr. Christiansen stated that he feels honored to fill the role and has the capacity to do so at this time.

Harold Dudley motioned to approve Chris Christiansen as the new Planning Commission Vice Chairperson.

David Bird seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion passed

3. Recommendation on a proposed zone change for property located at approximately 96 N 350 W, from the R3-7500 Residential zone to the CC-2 (Central Commercial) Zone.

Travis Van Ekelenburg reviewed the background information for action item number 3: The applicant is applying for a zoning change for property located at approximately 96 N 350 W, from the R3-7500 Residential zone to the CC-2 (Central Commercial) zone. All parcels consist of 0.77 acres and the R3-7500 zoning would be replaced by the Central Commercial zoning (CC-2).

The proposed commercial zoning does not coincide with the current Land Use Map, resulting in a land use amendment to be done as well. The surrounding land uses of the area are all residential high density, general commercial, and design commercial. The surrounding zoning types are R3-7500, R4-7500, and CC-2.

The proposed zone change looks to leapfrog over another property to change the current zoning designation to CC-2. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to change the zoning of 350 West Street to achieve this zoning change but has not followed staff's recommendations and instructions to submit a land use map

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

amendment to support the zone change. Due to the leapfrogging, or spotted zoning, over the adjacent property staff and legal counsel does not recommend approval for the application of the zoning change to the CC-2 zone.

ADDITIONAL PROJECT CONDITIONS:

Approximately 14 additional feet from this parcel along the frontage of 350 W shall be dedicated to the City at no cost to the City as a condition of this zone map amendment. Right-of-way dedication for 350 W shall be shown on a subdivision plat that is submitted to the city for review within 60 days of the approved zone change or shall be deeded to the city by deed within 60 days of the approved zone change.

Mr. Dudley stated his understanding that there would be work by staff to put forth a land use map amendment in congruence with the zone change. He noted that the report states the zone change is not congruent with the land use, and he wanted to clarify why the land use map was not initiated.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the land use amendment request would need to come from the applicant. Mr. Sowby was informed of the process via email communication on January 5th 2023, and at this time the city has not received a land use amendment application. Mr. O'Brien reiterated that a zone change and land use amendment would be appropriate if neighboring properties were also changing, but as it is currently it would create an island. Based on discussions with the city's legal counsel, it is the staff's opinion that without it being congruent, it does fall into spot zoning.

Mr. Van Ekelenburg stated that the staff offers the opportunity for applicants to meet with the staff and are available to answer questions throughout the process. He confirmed that no changes have been made to the application and it remained the same as what was presented at the November 02, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. O'Brien stated staff had discussed the zone change with the property owners between the proposal and the existing CC-2 zone as requested by the Planning Commission to see if they were interested in coming on board as part of the multi-unit zoning change. Mr. Van Ekelenburg noted that the property owners, Nan and Bob Kirkpatrick, had met with staff and were at the meeting to discuss their opinion on the zone change.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Mr. Steve Sowby represents the applicants and he stated that they chose not to make the land use map amendment application because they do not have the authority to do it as they do not own the property where the amendment would occur. He stated that he spoke with city staff and was told neither the city staff nor Mr. Sowby's team could not initiate the land use map amendment. Staff clarified that the applicant could not apply to change another property owners land use but this did not prohibit an application to change the land use of their property.

Mr. O'Brien stated that for a zone change to remain in conformity with the city's land use plan, a land use amendment would be required for the same properties that are undergoing a zone change request; from a staff perspective it's difficult to recommend a zone change for approval if the underlying land use does not conform. He gave a hypothetical example of a property having residential land use and commercial zoning; they do not sit well with one another.

Mr. Dudley asked Mr. Sowby what made him feel he could not apply for a land use map amendment. Mr. Sowby stated they did not initiate the application because it was his team's understanding that they would be unable to apply for a land use map amendment or a zone change on behalf of the Kirkpatrick's property.

Mr. Sowby restated his findings from the November 02, 2022, Planning Commission meeting that fifteen other areas in the city have a stem, half street annexation, four areas in the CC-2 with spot zoning, and eight areas in the adjoining GC-2 zone that are already islands. Because of these areas, he does not feel his team is out of bounds in asking for the zone change as he has seen it done in the city before. He stated that it was his feeling that the city could recommend bringing in the parcel to the south [the Kirkpatrick's property] with a city-initiated land use amendment, similar to a city-initiated annexation. He also noted that there is a building on the northern parcel against 350 West that is already compatible with the CC-2 zone and they are trying to put the building in the right zone.

Nan Kirkpatrick stated that they currently own and reside on the property south of the proposed zone change, from 300 West through to 350 West. She asked the Commission to deny changing the zone from Residential to Commercial. Mr. Martin asked if there was any particular reason for their request of denial and if it affected the Kirkpatricks' financially or in any other way. Mrs. Kirkpatrick stated that their experience with the commercial property to the south, Good Earth, has been difficult as they have dealt with daily unintentional and intentional litter from the commercial property. She again asked that the Commission deny the zone change. She stated her

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

understanding that while their property was not in the discussion, it did have an impact on the discussion. Mr. Dudley asked if they were opposed to the land use changing. Mrs. Kirkpatrick clarified that they do not want the land use to change from residential to commercial.

Chairwoman Anderson questioned what the impact would be from a land use change on a property.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the land will inform what the future use can be and will impact the long-range vision for a community. As best as possible, it is best to plan the underlying land use range to be what is wanted for the future zoning for a property. There are situations where the current zoning may not match the land use, but the land use is meant to signify what the future use should be. Changing land use would signify what is wanted in the area in the future. If the land use in an area were changed to commercial, anyone could request to change the zoning as the land use signified the future intention.

Mr. Dudley and Mr. Martin clarified where the Kirkpatrick's property was located on the presentation map, as well as a few other properties. The Commission thanked the Kirkpatricks' for their time and thoughts on the matter.

Mr. John Heiner stated that it was his team's understanding from staff that without the Kirkpatrick's participation, the staff was not willing to support the change in the land use amendment which is why they did not move forward with an application. He stated that the property has been used for commercial for years, and when Mr. Dustin Pyne purchased the property, it was his understanding that it would not be an issue to change the zoning to commercial. Mr. Heiner stated that his team attempted to reach out to the Kirkpatrick's many times without success. In his experience land use proposals are started by the city and staff. He stated his surprise that there was a suggestion from staff for a land use amendment from Main Street to Pacific Drive as he feels that change would not be made in his lifetime.

Mr. O'Brien refuted Mr. Heiner's point and clarified that staff did not make the recommendation of a land use change from Main to Pacific Drive. He stated the subdivision north of the properties in question would be the furthest staff would consider. Mr. Dudley clarified that the suggestion to amend the land from Main Street to Pacific Drive was suggested by a City Council member in attendance at the November 02, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Mr. Heiner stated the property has been a commercial property for years. Somewhere along the way the city approved that, and although the zone did not change, it has been used for commercial development for years. He can appreciate that the Kirkpatricks' would be concerned, especially their experience with Good Earth. He asked for the Commissions support and approval.

Mr. Dustin Pyne thanked the Kirkpatrick's and stated his hope to be a good neighbor and his hopes to be a positive influence in the community in American Fork. The background of the studio on the property is that it operated as a ballet studio. It is a 5,000 square foot building with two studios, one on the first floor and one in the basement. The Kirkpatrick's gave a brief history of the property and stated that Joseph and Jacqueline Colledge bought it from the Fagens, and the Fagens used to own the home that Tim Miskimen now lives in. Prior to the dance studio being built, it was all horse property. The Colledge's built the dance studio in the 80's.

Mrs. Kirkpatrick stated her opinion that the dance studio creates issues in the area such as inadequate parking when there are large events at the studio. She does not feel it is realistic to add more businesses to the area.

Mr. Dudley asked Mr. Pyne what his plans were for the property if the zone change goes through. Mr. Martin asked if the zone change was approved if the main change would be to provide correct parking for the existing building. Mr. Pyne stated there would be additional parking and two new additional buildings put in. One would be a storage garage for the theater company, and one would be an offsite office for his Chick-fil-a business that would include a few additional units to help pay the mortgage with businesses such as insurance agencies. He feels the office buildings would be an improvement to the area and he hopes to clean up the property and make it more usable. The office units will be one level as there is not enough parking spaces to support multi-level units. Mr. Heiner stated that with large warehouse space and small office units, there will not be a lot of traffic produced in the area.

Mr. Sowby stated that if the Commission gave a favorable recommendation his team would be happy to apply for a land use amendment.

Mr. Pyne asked if there is a legal non-compliance, could the contingent properties not be considered spot zoning? Mr. O'Brien stated it would be legally non-conforming with the existing zoning. This means they wouldn't be able to change the structure without needing to meet existing zoning. Staff would need to research if it is a legal non-conforming use, or if it is an illegal use.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Ms. Peay stated that she would be interested to know if the dance studio was approved with a conditional use permit and if that is the reason it was approved as-is. She also noted that even if American Fork City deemed that lot as a non-conforming lot, it doesn't mean that it gives priority or precedence that would say the city would continue to do so.

Chairwoman Anderson asked if the Commission has the ability to recommend approval on a lot that is connected only by a road.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he had consulted with the city attorney and her answer was no. She is looking at it from a more legal and technical perspective, which is why he consulted with her to get an answer he could not provide, and because of that, staff went with her recommendation of no.

Mr. Martin asked if there were examples of spot zoning that had been referenced earlier in the meeting. Mr. O'Brien stated that it would not be considered spot zoning where there is CC-2 and GC-2 core areas that are supposed to be centrally located in other areas. They are not necessarily three or four lots that are consolidated together, but multiple blocks. There is a CC-2 zone on the west end and the east end of the CC-1 zone. Similarly, there are GC-2 zones scattered throughout the city in strategic locations because it's meant to be supportive to commercial. He feels the zone change is leapfrogging a property to get additional units, and the zones Mr. Sowby referenced were strategically located masses of development throughout the community that the council and previous Planning Commission members would have done at different points in time. Mr. Van Ekelenburg noted that when a property is rezoned, it is for that specific property and should not be leapfrogged, or cherry-stemmed, to one down the street.

Mr. Fransen asked Mr. Sowby if he had examples of cherry-stemming for zone changes. Mr. Sowby stated he had given two examples in the November 02, 2022, Planning Commission meeting. He stated that one could look at a map and see fifteen locations where it had happened.

Chairwoman Anderson stated that she is in favor of the idea of allowing surrounding areas of the C-2 zone to switch to commercial. In this case, she does not like the fact that it connects with a roadway and it also overlooks the rights of the current residents. She is not ready to recommend approval.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Mr. Christiansen stated his opinion that the changes should be made strategically as the Commission looks at the plat map and the overall general plan, and not make changes for specific projects.

Mr. Bird stated he agreed with Chairwoman Anderson regarding the rights of the Kirkpatrick's, but also feels it was important to respect the rights of Mr. Pyne. He respects Mr. Pyne's project and thinks it would be a good asset to the community.

Mr. Christiansen noted that Mr. Pyne's rights stemmed from when he purchased the property and what rights existed at that point in time. He has rights to residential but not commercial. He may have non-conforming rights to the building, but he cannot change his rights at will.

Mr. Martin noted that more of these situations are going to arise as the years go by and American Fork grows. It is his opinion that the commercial zone will extend north and south of Main Street in the coming years. He feels the rezoning will happen regardless, even if it is not perfect. It is his opinion that people will not be building houses right next to Main Street and the Commission should make decisions to improve the properties in that area.

Mr. Pyne stated his understanding of doing due diligence when buying a property. He stated he would not have bought the property if he knew he would be held up in meetings. He did his due diligence and felt comfortable moving forward with the purchase of the property. He stated his inability to be able to do high density housing with the current zoning as they do not have the frontage. He stated that he is not in the farming business, and he may need to sell the property which may result in a monetary loss. He would like to see American Fork move forward and progress and feels that changing the zone to commercial would be a positive move for the community.

Ms. Peay asked Mr. O'Brien for clarification on the procedure for a land use map amendment. Mr. O'Brien stated that when an application for a land use map amendment or zone change is received it goes through a review process and is then added to the next available Planning Commission agenda. Land use and zoning changes are statutorily required to have a public hearing and with that comes a 10-day state required public notice. We follow the State noticing requirements as outlined in LUDMA, but also within our own code. The city attorney advised a land use amendment before the zone change. Surrounding property owners were notified

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

of this zone change. Ms. Peay stated that the property owners should be notified of a land use map amendment should it be initiated.

Chairwoman Anderson stated that there may have been planning practices in the past that do not need to be repeated. She believes that the CC-2 zone will need to expand and voiced her favor of that change. She stated she is uncomfortable with setting a precedent that properties can be skipped, or leapfrogged, to expand on the other side of properties and would like to see the expansion go radially.

Mr. O'Brien stated his opinion that expansions should be Planning Commission or City Council driven and not applicant driven to ensure all expansions are well thought out.

Mr. Dudley stated his belief that the city needs to move forward in situations like this and look at expanding its general commercial north and south along Main Street as appropriate. He felt that the project had not progressed since the meeting on November 02, 2022, and questioned why the city had not initiated a land use amendment.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that the City Council would need to initiate a full-scale land use amendment on behalf of the city. Mr. Sowby reiterated that his team did not initiate the land use amendment for their property due to the roadblocks discussed earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Christiansen stated that the Planning Commission was the recommending body for the land use amendment. He suggested that the Planning Commission deny this and send it to the City Council to give them the ability to address the issue with an interest in expanding the land use. Mr. Heiner stated that there needs to be a method to address the challenges that arise in circumstances like this, or properties may continue to sit without development.

Mr. Franson agreed with Mr. Christiansen and stated that the City Council needs to take a deep look at the land use along Main Street as he believes commercial will continue to grow. He feels that this is an opportune time to put this issue in front of the City Council as it has not been addressed in this way for many years.

Mr. Martin asked what can be done as a recommending body to ensure that the City Council will consider changing the land use to the north and south of Main Street.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Mr. O'Brien stated that this discussion would help address the issue. Ms. Peay clarified that the Commission was only approving the rezoning.

Mr. Martin stated that he feels Mr. Pyne's project could help the City Council understand the issue that the city is facing and what they will be facing in the near future. Mr. Pyne stated he is a trailblazer. He stated he has no issue going to Mayor Frost and the council members and explaining what his experience has been trying to get through this committee. He felt it would be easier to be able to go to with an approval and tell them what it took to get to this point. He stated his opinion that the process is difficult and there could be steps to make the process easier.

Chairwoman Anderson stated her hopes that the discussion would help the city to see that there is a problem that needs to be addressed, and that it could lead to growth. She felt a good move by the city would be to change the underlying land use in areas like this so that it would allow for future change to commercial, as commercial expands, without changing the zoning of residents who do not want to be in commercial.

Harold Dudley motioned to recommend approval of the Zone Change to Central Commercial (CC-2) Zone, for the properties located in the area of 96 N 350 W, subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications found in the Staff Report, or recommended by the Fire Marshall

David seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Christine Anderson	NAY
Chris Christiansen	NAY
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	NAY
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion was approved

- 4. Recommendation on an ordinance creating section 17.5.136 of the American Fork City Municipal Code relating to rock crushing and providing an effective date for the ordinance**

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Travis Van Ekelburg reviewed the background information for action item number 4: Rock crushing provides basic road and building material by reducing the size and changing the classification of the material. This process, while important, has the potential to emit small dust particles which degrade air quality and can pose risk to those who are in the affected area.

Ms. Susan Goebel-Canning stated that she did not believe that there were any specifics on the code that existed other than that American Fork City did not want to have any rock crushing activities in city limits. There are proposed parameters that allow a certain limited amount of rock crushing to occur. Public Works collects concrete and asphalt throughout the year while they are repairing roads. They have stockpiled it and rock crushed it, and there are protocols that will water and keep the dust particles down. From there they asked how they could allow others that meet a certain criteria to also fall into that category within the PF or Industrial zones. There were parameters set up to allow them to do the rock crushing activities safely.

Mr. Christiansen questioned if the city has consulted the Utah State Code as there was a section that addressed this specifically. Ms. Goebel-Canning stated that they had consulted with the state and that they do have an exemption permit and they said that they wanted this to meet this exemption.

Mr. Bird asked if the rock crushing was happening anywhere specific in the city or if it was addressing future needs. Ms. Goebel-Canning stated that in the past it has been done by Art Dye Park during the winter months. In the future the stockpile may move to a PF or Industrial zone.

Mr. Christiansen stated Utah code 17-41-402 (6)(a) that addresses regulating and changing this as a restriction:

17-41-402 (6)(a) A county, city, or town may not:

- (a) Adopt, enact, or amend an existing land use regulation, ordinance, or regulation that would prohibit, restrict, regulate, or otherwise limit critical infrastructure materials operations, including vested critical infrastructure materials operations as defined in Section 10-9a-901 or 17-27a-1001

Mr. Christiansen stated a municipality is not allowed to regulate critical infrastructure materials, which are produced when rocks are crushed. Mr.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

Christiansen wanted to make sure the city had looked at the code and addressed that specifically. Mr. O'Brien clarified that based on the state code, the city code could not be amended.

Mr. Christiansen stated that he would abstain from the vote as he has a conflict of interest. He asked that staff review the code to ensure the state code was addressed before the code text amendment was adopted.

Rodney Martin motioned to table the proposed code text amendment of the American Fork Municipal Code, creating Section 17.5.136, relating to the rock crushing, and providing an effective date for the ordinance, and instruct the staff to consult the State Code to see where they may better clarify what they are trying to accomplish to ensure the city is in conformity with the State Code.

Jenny Peay seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion was tabled

5. Review and action on a Site Plan application for the DBN Tax Project, located at 34 West 100 North, in the Central Commercial (CC-1) Zone.

Patrick O'Brien reviewed the background information for action item number 5: The applicant is applying for a Site Plan approval for DBN Tax Project, for a new commercial development in the CC-1 Zone, located in the area 34 W 100 N. The proposal consists of 1 lot intended for commercial development. The entire development parcel consists of approximately 0.47 acres.

Due to the development being in the CC-1 zone, the Planning Commission is the approval body for the Site Plan.

Action was previously taken on this, and the project was recommended to be tabled.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

The issues previously raised have not been addressed.

PROJECT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. Outstanding DRC comments still need to be addressed.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the applicant has not resubmitted new plans, and when meetings were set up to discuss their project, the applicant did not show up to the meetings. All previous staff comments still stand. The Planning Commission is the approving body and if they deny the project, the applicant can appeal to the City Council. Mr. O'Brien feels that the items that need resolved can be addressed with the applicant. He stated that there are no variances allowed in the CC-1 zone, although there are certain exceptions that exist in the fire code that would have helped the applicant meet the Fire Marshall's requirements.

Mr. Hsu reviewed the outstanding comments to be addressed:

1. Per Sec 17.12.214 Nonconforming building or structure. A building, or structure, or portion thereof which does not conform with the current setback, height or other zoning regulations applicable to the structure, but which legally existed before the effective date of the now controlling regulations.
2. Per Sec 17.1.502 Nonconforming Uses May Be Extended Within Same Building – Limitations Nonconforming uses within a building may be extended through the same building in which said nonconforming use is located provided: That no structural alteration of the building is proposed or made for the purpose of the extension. For purposes of this code, the addition of a solar energy device to a building shall not be construed as a structural alteration. That such increase or extension is required to comply with an order to improve issued by a health or safety official acting in his official capacity.
3. Per sec 17.4.401 CC-1 Zone- "D-Special provisions"
4. Per American Fork Sensitive Lands- groundwater monitoring station maybe required
5. Per 15.01.1900- commercial driveway is 26 ft
6. Per 15.01.1850 Commercial access spacing for minor collector road is 150'.
7. Per American Fork storm water technical manual - Retain storm water on-site Require providing existing and proposed grades at property lines

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

8. Per 17.12.214, 17.1.502, and 17.4.401. This access needs to be closed. If the West Lane could not meet the city code.
9. If want to access the West Lane, they need to meet the following: 1. Dead end streets, per code 15.01.100 shall be a cul-de-sac. 2. Additional 45 ft of ROW along the West Lane needs to be provided.

Rodney Martin motioned to table action on the Site Plan application for the DBN Tax Project, located at 34 W 100 N, in the Central Commercial (CC-1) Zone, and instruct the developer to work with staff to solve the issues that have been brought up and instruct staff to not put this item on the agenda until such a time as those concerns have been resolved.

Bruce Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
David Bird	AYE

The motion was tabled

OTHER BUSINESS

Upcoming Projects

Mr. O'Brien stated that the city code 1-17 will be fully rewritten with a priority of chapters 15 and 17. The staff will set up consultations to solicit feedback from the Planning Commission on how to address problematic issues. The code rewrite will be taken on by Chereilyn Egner's law office.

A new staff member will be introduced at the next meeting.

Mr. O'Brien thanked Mr. George Schade for all of his help with the IT work over the past year and a quarter.

APPROVED MINUTES

01.18.2023

An in-house Planning Commission training will be coming up in the Summer to train on the state code and state requirements.

Mr. David Bird was appointed as a full voting member by Mayor Frost recently, so there are two alternate roles available for the Planning Commission.

The staff welcomes feedback, recommendations, and questions from the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT

Harold Dudley motioned to adjourn the meeting. Chris Christiansen seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 8:51

Melissa White

Administrative Assistant II

The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the commissioners, public and staff.