

# APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 8, 2021

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on September 8, 2021, at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 pm.

Present: Chairman John Woffinden  
Rod Brocius  
Christine Anderson  
Jenny Peay  
Bruce Frandsen  
Chris Christiansen  
Harold Dudley

Absent:

Staff Present: Rebecca Andrus, City Engineer  
Wendelin Knobloch, Planner  
Ben Hunter, Engineer  
Lisa Halversen, Administrative Assistant

Others Present: Jordi & Coraima Berrett, Roger Dudley, David Brotherson, Scott & Julie Fambrough, Dale Christiansen, Josh Bushman

Chairman Woffinden led the "Pledge of Allegiance."

1. Hearing, review and action on the preliminary plan and final plats for Greenwood Creek Plats A and B located in the area of 900 North 640 West in the R-1-9,000 Residential zone

Mr. Knobloch stated that Greenwood Creek proposes 41 lots on 19.59 acres, with an overall density of 2.1 du/ac. The property was recently annexed and given zone designations of R1-9,000 and PF (Public Facilities). The area zoned PF was designated for a future open space/trail corridor along the Mitchell Hollow. The subdivision plat recognizes this open area/trail corridor. Open space for the trail corridor was also provided with the Mitchell Springs subdivision to the west. A trail will ultimately be constructed, connecting 700 North to 1120 North, and continue north into the Highland City trail system. Access to Greenwood Creek is provided off 800 North, 640 West 860 North and 900 North. All lots meet or exceed the requirements of the R1-9,000 zone.

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Anderson asked where the trail will connect to the park. Mr. Knobloch answered that the trail  
2 will connect to the Mitchell Hollow park next to the equestrian center. A little further to the north  
3 is the Highland City boundary.

4 Mr. Hunter indicated that the trail will be graded but not asphalted yet. When it is fully constructed  
5 it will tie into the back yards of the lots adjacent to the trail. All the infrastructure requirements  
6 will be met. City staff will do a third-party review on the geotechnical report which has not yet  
7 been received.

8 Ms. Peay asked if this proposed development meets the required standards, Mr. Hunter affirmed.

9 Ms. Anderson asked about the trail grading and when the city would follow through with paving.  
10 If it's not asphalted soon, it will need to be graded again at some point.

11 Mr. Hunter has spoken with Camden Bird of the Parks Department and they don't have a timeline  
12 for finishing that trail. It will tie into existing city property in the northwest corner as shown in the  
13 master plan. The Parks Department will be in charge of building it out.

14 Ms. Anderson replied that there have been issues with residents in the area encroaching on city  
15 property in the past with landscaping, etc. She hopes that the city will pave it as soon as possible  
16 so we don't have that conflict.

17 Mr. Hunter acknowledged her concerns. He stated that any improvements will likely need permits,  
18 staff can check at that time to ensure that there aren't any encroachments.

19 Chairman Woffinden added that he doesn't want to see those problems continue or happen again.  
20 He added that the developer needs to be aware of the wetlands in the area.

21 Mr. Hunter stated that the developer has assured the city that the wetlands won't be impacted.

22 Mr. Brocius asked about an intersection that he feels is problematic. Has a variance been  
23 approved for 1000 West and 640/680 North since it is not a 90-degree angle and the variance is  
24 greater than 10 degrees? Also, if there is a variance, how do commissioners know about this? He  
25 feels it is a safety issue. He is concerned that the turn is more than 90 degrees and there is no  
26 signage warning people of the turn. He believes it will be a safety hazard for any pedestrians in  
27 the area.

28 Mr. Hunter stated that he doesn't have a lot of safety concerns about pedestrians right in this area  
29 because of its status as a local road with low traffic volumes.

30 Mr. Christiansen asked if there will be fencing along the trail.

31 Mr. Hunter stated that there are no code requirements for a fence. Some people don't want one,  
32 some might, but there are no code requirements. It will be at the discretion of the homeowner.

33 Ms. Peay brought up the issue of cohesion in fence styles along the trail and asked if it would look  
34 better if it was all the same style and not chopped up into different sections and types of fencing.

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Knobloch and Mr. Hunter agreed that a uniform style would look better, but there is no code  
2 specification that requires that. It would be up to the city council to approve and appropriate funds  
3 for that.

4 Chairman Woffinden felt that a fence will probably be necessary there, and there are many styles  
5 of fencing.

6 Ms. Anderson said that she thinks it will be hard to get a uniform fence, the homeowners will  
7 probably put in quality fencing and it will be fine.

8 Mr. Roger Dudley, civil engineer, represents the developer, Mr. David Brotherson, who is also the  
9 developer of Lakeview Farms. He stated that these will be roughly 1/3 acre lots, there has been a  
10 lot of response and interest from neighborhood to the east. He feels this will be a positive  
11 development. The Mitchell projects were required to dedicate a portion of their land for the trail.  
12 This development delineated the wetlands up front, most of the land in this area is wetlands.  
13 Creating a trail requires mitigation of some wetlands. They intend to be sensitive to this issue.

14 He added that fences are addressed in the CC&R's. Fences are not required, but if they choose to  
15 put one up they will be required to do a see-through black wrought iron fence. He feels that this  
16 will be the safest choice since the trail is long. Mr. Dudley thanked city staff for their work, they've  
17 worked on this project for 8 months and intend to develop consistent with city ordinances. They  
18 have done traffic work with Hales Engineering, etc.

19 Mr. Dudley added that the trail is scheduled to go on to the south as it gets developed and ultimately  
20 terminate at 750 North. He agrees that if the city could find funding it would be ideal to finish the  
21 trail quickly.

22 Mr. Jordi Barrett, of Hales Engineering, discussed the 1000 North 640 West intersection. There  
23 have been concerns expressed by residents about the residential driveway directly across from the  
24 intersection and associated potential safety hazards. This driveway is almost directly adjacent to  
25 the planned road which is ideal as mentioned in the code. But to mitigate any concerns, they  
26 proposed a striped crossbar and a solar powered flashing stop sign to draw attention to the stop.  
27 The second concern was dealing with the offset of intersections to the north at 960 North. There  
28 is a 150 ft offset between the intersections, there will be low traffic volumes, and the offset will be  
29 a "positive "offset, which is most desirable because left turns don't conflict with each other. He  
30 added that the development meets the minimum requirements for a minor collector road, and there  
31 is no minimum required for a local street so they are more than meeting the requirements.

32 Mr. Brocious asked about differing requirements in different sections of the code.

33 Mr. Hunter stated that there are three different sections of applicable code. In code regarding  
34 recommended street spacing, 150 ft. are recommended if there is any offset. Between the three  
35 different code sections staff will follow whatever is most stringent.

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Anderson asked about the solar powered stop sign, she is curious if residents would be  
2 comfortable with that blinking outside their windows.

3 Chairman Woffinden stated that he has seen similar signs on 1100 North on the way to Pleasant  
4 Grove, he believes they have been done well and get drivers' attention.

5 Mr. Brocious doesn't know how the stopbar would be beneficial to the driveway.

6 Mr. Berrett wants to put a stopbar and make it visible, it will be an attention-getter.

7 Ms. Anderson asked why we would need that, is it because of the driveway across the street?

8 Mr. Berrett affirmed and said that the property owner expressed concerns about safety. They  
9 proposed that to put their minds at ease.

10 Mr. Brocious added that if they put a stopbar at that intersection it will have to be located behind  
11 the intersection quite a bit. He thinks that this mitigation would be more appropriate at the other  
12 intersection with the additional angle.

13 Chairman Woffinden pointed out that the purpose of the stopbar is to protect pedestrians in a  
14 crosswalk, there won't be a crosswalk here.

15

## 16 **Public Hearing Opened**

17

18 Mr. Scott Fambrough is the owner of the driveway across the street. He has contacted the  
19 Engineering Department with his concerns and was told by Engineering staff that it was not in  
20 accordance with code but it was the best alternative. He pointed out the section of code that  
21 requires a minimum of 50 ft. residential spacing, his driveway has only 20 ft. He thinks there is  
22 another way to situate the road that he feels would better comply with code.

23 Ms. Julie Fambrough showed commissioners a picture of how the property is situated, they  
24 would be backing up into traffic. They have two children with disabilities and are concerned  
25 about their safety. They do not want a blinking sign in front of their house, they don't feel that  
26 this would alleviate the problem. If the developer would just straighten the road out so it wasn't  
27 right in front of their driveway that would be a good solution and would follow code. They  
28 realize that development will come into the area, they just want to make sure it comes in right  
29 and in compliance with the code.

30 Chairman Woffinden pointed out that the blinking stop sign isn't facing their house and would  
31 be 100 ft away.

32 Ms. Anderson acknowledged their frustrations, she said that the way the road is on the plan  
33 provides full visibility. The city code lines things up as much as possible to promote visibility.

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 She liked the horseshoe set-up of this plan because the only people going in and out are the  
2 neighbors.

3 Mr. Fambrough is concerned that the road will become a major through street for people going to  
4 Costco.

5 Chairman Woffinden asked Mr. Dudley to address the possibility of moving the road. Would the  
6 developer consider that?

7 Mr. Dudley said that changing the road would impact Lot 1. He does not agree with the assertion  
8 that it doesn't meet code. He quoted a section of code that states "whenever possible, driveways  
9 or side streets should be aligned directly opposite from driveways or side streets on the opposite  
10 side of the main road." The idea of 50 ft spacing doesn't apply here, there are 18 homes nearby  
11 which have the very same configuration. This issue isn't anything new, staff feel it is better to  
12 see what is coming down the road. He questions the 50 ft. recommendation, what does that refer  
13 to? Where you put your driveway on the one side of the street doesn't dictate where any other  
14 driveways are on the other side of the street.

15 Mr. Josh Bushman, area resident, is impacted by this plan. The center of the road points directly  
16 at his front door. He wondered if the 50 ft. recommendation is code that needs to be followed or  
17 not?

18 Mr. Knobloch asked if Code 15.01.1850 is what is being referred to and he displays this section  
19 to commissioners that references 50 ft. recommended residential spacing.

20 Mr. Bushman says his property meets the 50 ft. recommendation, but the Fambroughs only have  
21 23 ft. He thinks he will have challenges backing out of his driveway. He stated that Engineering  
22 staff also told him that this development is not compliant with code.

23 Ms. Andrus stated that her remarks were being a little misrepresented, she clarified that she told  
24 him that the proposed development didn't meet the 50 ft. recommendation but that was only a  
25 recommendation and didn't mean it wasn't in compliance with code.

26 Ms. Anderson says there are a lot of constraints on the developer to make the neighborhood  
27 work. If they change the road, other lots are impacted. It's not a simple change.

28 Mr. Bushman said that with Mr. Dudley's amount of experience, he could certainly take a look at  
29 this.

30 Chairman Woffinden asked Mr. Hunter about the code section referencing 50 ft. recommended  
31 residential spacing.

32 Mr. Hunter showed the disputed code, the code section states that these are recommendations.  
33 He explained that the intent is to try and help so that when you have two homes next door to each  
34 other it will reduce the potential hazard of backing into each other. The applicant has showed  
35 that there are many instances where driveways line up directly with the street. Even though these

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 are only recommendations, staff feels that the larger lot sizes are helpful and we feel it's ready to  
2 move to Planning Commission.

3 Ms. Fambrough asked where people would park. There are currently a lot of people that use their  
4 driveway to turn around. There is a lot of wildlife in the area and it is a popular spot.

5 Mr. Bushman said that there have been a couple breaches of the fence and he asked developer to  
6 spend some time to make sure the water flow isn't blocked and area is cleaned up.

7

## 8 **Public Hearing Closed**

9

10 Mr. Christiansen pointed out that this table in the code is causing much confusion, he felt that it  
11 is imperative to understand what the disputed table is actually recommending. The table lists  
12 recommended spacings between LIKE objects, i.e. street to street, driveway to driveway, and not  
13 between each other, such as a street to a driveway. He believes that the project is consistent with  
14 the recommendations.

15 Chairman Woffinden agreed.

16 Ms. Anderson said that she was once in the residents' position as a mother trying to protect her  
17 family and community, she empathizes with them. She lives just north of the temple and her  
18 front door used to face an open field but the area has filled in now. She understands that there are  
19 concerns about appropriateness and property values with any new development. On the other  
20 hand, the property owner has the right to develop their property within bounds. She appreciates  
21 the residents coming and commenting.

22

23 **Mr. Christiansen moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plan for Greenwood**  
24 **Creek Plats A and B, with the findings as outlined and subject to any findings, conditions**  
25 **and modifications listed in the engineering report.**

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

27

28	<b>Chairman Woffinden</b>	<b>Aye</b>
29	<b>Christine Anderson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
30	<b>Jenny Peay</b>	<b>Nay</b>
31	<b>Bruce Frandsen</b>	<b>Nay</b>
32	<b>Chris Christiansen</b>	<b>Aye</b>
33	<b>Harold Dudley</b>	<b>Aye</b>
34	<b>Rod Brocious</b>	<b>Nay</b>

35 **The motion passed.**

36

# APPROVED MINUTES

1  
2 **Ms. Anderson explained that she voted “aye” because she believes that visibility when**  
3 **backing out is more important than the lack of spacing.**

4  
5 **Mr. Brocious explained that he voted “nay” because he does believe a solution could be**  
6 **reached with another scenario.**

7  
8  
9 **Mr. Christiansen moved to recommend approval of the final plat of Greenwood Creek**  
10 **Plats A and B, with the findings listed in the staff report, and subject to any findings,**  
11 **conditions and modifications found in the engineering report.**

12  
13 **Ms. Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

14		
15		
16	<b>Chairman Woffinden</b>	<b>Aye</b>
17	<b>Christine Anderson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
18	<b>Jenny Peay</b>	<b>Nay</b>
19	<b>Bruce Frandsen</b>	<b>Nay</b>
20	<b>Chris Christiansen</b>	<b>Aye</b>
21	<b>Harold Dudley</b>	<b>Aye</b>
22	<b>Rod Brocious</b>	<b>Nay</b>

23 **The motion passed.**

- 24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 2. Hearing, review and action on an amendment to Section 17.4.608.6.B.e.(5) of the  
31 American Fork City Development Code to strike the timing requirement for completion  
32 of office/retail project components in the TOD zone

33  
34  
35 Mr. Knobloch informed commissioners that the Council recently approved an amendment  
36 allowing clustering of commercial uses on streets other than 200 South within the TOD “mixed  
37 use core” area. Clarification was given that the 25% equivalent requirement may be clustered  
38 into one building or dispersed in separate buildings throughout a residential project.

39 The Code currently reads: *For buildings within the Mixed-Use Core sub-district, all buildings*  
40 *abutting 200 South shall have an equivalent of 100% ground floor area designated for office*  
41 *and/or retail use (Table 6E-Building Use). For all buildings within project areas abutting streets*  
42 *other than 200 South, an equivalent of 25% ground floor area shall be designated for office*  
43 *and/or retail use (Table 6E-Building Use). The 25% equivalent may be satisfied collectively in*

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 *one building or dispersed throughout the project area in various buildings. Delivery of the*  
2 *office/retail use shall occur no later than at completion of 75% build-out of any residential*  
3 *portions of the project area.*

4 The applicant, representing The Kelton Apartments (for which the above text was recently  
5 amended to allow clustering of the commercial component), requests the timing element be  
6 removed, and in its place read: *Delivery of the 25% equivalent office/retail use is not required to*  
7 *be constructed concurrently with the residential component”.*

8 Effectively, this proposed amendment would eliminate the requirement to provide a commercial  
9 component in a multi-family residential development within the Core area. Staff is opposed to  
10 this amendment request and proposes a negative recommendation to the Planning Commission.

11 Ms. Anderson asked if there would be anything to guarantee that commercial would ever be  
12 constructed if this amendment were to pass.

13 Mr. Knobloch said no, if the commercial requirement was consolidated onto a separate lot, it  
14 could just sit vacant or be sold off.

15 Chairman Woffinden expressed his concerns that once space is allowed to be residential, it will  
16 be very difficult to ever switch it to commercial. He feels that this amendment defeats the whole  
17 purpose of mixed-use in the core of the TOD.

18 Ms. Peay said that taking this component out allows the developer to get out of the requirements,  
19 she believes that the developer should have a vested interest in delivering the commercial  
20 product.

21 Chairman Woffinden said that commissioners have the option to agree to the change, table it, or  
22 deny it. If they recommend denial, it still goes to the city council who may not agree with the  
23 commission’s recommendation. He pointed out that the city council approved the parking  
24 requirement that was only 1 when it should have been 2.25 for a recent development.

25 Mr. Frandsen can’t see any compelling reason to approve this change.

26 Chairman Woffinden stated that this is the whole reason for the TOD. If we would have wanted  
27 just a bunch of high-density apartments that would have been easy.

28 Ms. Anderson said originally the code required the commercial to be built concurrently, but we  
29 compromised. This amendment removes the compromise altogether. She feels like tabling it  
30 doesn’t make much sense, it might make more sense to deny with an explanation for why so  
31 council knows how we feel.

32 Mr. Dudley believes that zoning requirements were meant for health, safety and welfare issues,  
33 not market issues and economic development. He also understands what the city wants to see in  
34 the TOD. He understands that this code amendment would be a bad idea from that perspective.



# APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ms. Anderson said that it might take some patience to wait for a developer who will bring the  
2 commercial that the city wants. The other option is to give in and end up with a half- or no-  
3 commercial development.

4 Mr. Brocious expressed agreement with previous comments and said that the city has been  
5 willing to compromise. Once they reach the 75% level for residential there should be enough  
6 support for commercial, he thinks that 75% is a good number. At first the commercial  
7 requirement was supposed to be parallel to the residential development, but it's been cut back.

8 Ms. Anderson feels that we're being lenient at 75%, she thinks that commercial could actually be  
9 a draw for the area.

10 Mr. Dale Christiansen, representing the developer of Kelton Apartments, thanks commissioners  
11 for their time and consideration. He wanted to clarify a couple of things. First, the development  
12 is a multi-family rental project. The entire development is taking place at one time. There is no  
13 such thing as being 75% built out, it's either zero or 100%. The developer believes in the TOD,  
14 multi-use concept. They have no disagreement with the city on this point. Their request is not  
15 based on a desire to abandon the property, they just want to put it to best use. The question is  
16 what is the best use and timing? They are moving ahead with 240 units and total site  
17 development. Within the TOD classification there are a broad array of possible office and  
18 commercial uses. In market-driven economies, we don't know yet what the best use will be. If  
19 we are forced to build it, we narrow options and opportunities. We want to be able to have  
20 commercial driven by the market. We understand the requirement of commercial and retail, but  
21 we want it to be the best use. As we've spoken to companies about the space, they ask what we  
22 envision there. We don't want to eliminate the requirement of commercial development, we just  
23 don't want to limit it to a time frame that limits the types of opportunities.

24 Ms. Anderson asked when would they build the commercial if this amendment were approved?

25 Mr. Dale Christiansen said that they would build when they have a tenant.

26 Ms. Anderson replied that you can follow the market today as well as you can in three years.

27 Mr. Dale Christiansen said that they aren't in the business of sitting on land, they are just asking  
28 for more flexibility.

29 Ms. Anderson pointed out that they had to write the code to apply to everyone, not negotiate with  
30 each developer. It's there and guaranteed and clear. Even if you would build it and not abuse the  
31 code, it would be hard to police others.

32 Mr. Dale Christiansen said that if there's a tenant or an opportunity, it will happen. The area is  
33 quickly expanding but lacks infrastructure to help drive the commercial uses. It hasn't matured to  
34 that point yet, it will take people living there to be able to support commercial use.

35 Chairman Woffinden asked "if we take the timing requirement out, and nothing is built but  
36 residential, how does the city ensure that they will get the commercial?"

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Dale Christiansen said that the commercial will be built in 2 buildings. One will be built  
2 immediately, the other will be built when they have a tenant. As the market matures, someone  
3 will want that corner as it is the most prominent one in the development.

4 Mr. Frandsen pointed out that the wording of the code was changed at the developer's request  
5 not too long ago. He clarified that they are talking about the south side of 200 South, or around  
6 250 South. As Mr. Frandsen reads it, they could go in and build 74.99999999 % of residential  
7 and never have to build commercial. Is this the correct interpretation? He added that the  
8 developer can already do what they're here asking for. They're not tied to anything commercial  
9 until they hit 75% buildout.

10 Mr. Dale Christiansen responded that they could do that but it wouldn't make economic sense to  
11 let land just sit there waiting for a commercial component. The market demands multi-family in  
12 this housing shortage, we want to deliver those products. He reiterated that they believe in the  
13 concept of the TOD.

14 Mr. Brocious clarified that if proposed amendment is approved, would property formerly slated  
15 for commercial use be converted to residential use?

16 Mr. Dale Christiansen denied that any commercial use would be converted to residential.

17 Mr. Chris Christiansen said that the developer can't build all of the 75% residential component  
18 first, they can only build up to 75% of the 75% of the development that is residential in use  
19 before the commercial trigger kicks in.

20 Mr. Frandsen agreed that they can currently build 75% of 75% which would leave vacancy.

21 Mr. Dale Christiansen is open to other ways of making sure we deliver on our promise to deliver  
22 commercial, we just believe in market-driven solutions.

23 Ms. Anderson wanted to be very clear for the record, this struggle is the very reason the code  
24 should not have been changed to allow the commercial to be in another building. Because we  
25 allowed it to be separate, this developer is being forced to build to fit one tenant. Mixed-use  
26 should have meant that the ground floor would be stalls that would be usable by many tenants.

27 Mr. Frandsen asked the developer what they are willing to do as far as assuring the city of  
28 commercial development.

29 Ms. Anderson added that we can't change the code for everything that comes in the door, but  
30 something needs to be figured out.

31 Chairman Woffinden says this will affect every developer that comes into the area.

32 Mr. Chris Christiansen stated that this has become a "chicken and the egg" problem where the  
33 dilemma is whether residential will drive commercial or commercial will encourage residential.

34 Ms. Anderson says this will be a very high traffic area.

# APPROVED MINUTES

- 1 Mr. Frandsen asked again what a possible solution is to present to the city to satisfy the city?
- 2 Mr. Dale Christiansen suggested maybe a deed restriction or a bond, etc.
- 3 Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Knobloch what kind of options they have besides changing the code?  
4 She asked if the code can be satisfied as it is and they can make other changes elsewhere?
- 5 Mr. Knobloch says it's either a yeah, nay or table as the procedural item is before you. This  
6 discussion could happen at the city council where they have other tools. Development  
7 agreements can be signed but involve legal costs and risks. Such a discussion would need to  
8 happen in a different venue.
- 9 Mr. Frandsen agreed that there needs to be a different solution, but that's down the road.
- 10 Ms. Anderson says this shows the flaw of the amendment we made, it opens up confusion and  
11 difficulty and it's unfair to the developer. Any change wouldn't affect this development, it's  
12 already vested with the rules that existed, but we need to find a solution and then fix the code.  
13 She clarified that Mr. Knobloch is saying that to entertain another option you would have to  
14 strike the code as it is now.
- 15 Mr. Knobloch says this would be a question for the city attorney. He doesn't believe it's possible  
16 to add something to the proposal, it hasn't been noticed and advertised as such.
- 17 Chairman Woffinden discusses the various options available to commissioners and the  
18 consequences of approval, denial and tabling.
- 19 Mr. Dale Christiansen requests either approval or denial so they can move ahead to city council  
20 as soon as possible.
- 21 Ms. Anderson would like to have a work session on this matter before it goes to city council.
- 22 Mr. Knobloch said it would likely show up on council agenda 2 weeks from next Tuesday.
- 23 Mr. Dale Christiansen says the bottom line is that they want to work through this and they are  
24 under construction timelines. They are not trying to get out of their commitments, they are  
25 willing to discuss it at a work session.
- 26 Ms. Anderson stated that this is the city's mess and we need to get it figured out.
- 27 Ms. Peay said a work session would give them insight to make a better solution.
- 28 Ms. Anderson asked what the best tool is to make sure they can be involved in a solution, is that  
29 tabling?
- 30 Mr. Knobloch reminded commissioners that if council makes a change in the language of the  
31 code, it will come back before the commission for a recommendation.

32

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 **Public Hearing Opened**

2 No comments received.

3 **Public Hearing Closed**

4

5 There was discussion between commissioners about the ramifications of denying vs. tabling the  
6 proposal.

7 Mr. Chris Christiansen proposed a work session that includes city council and the planning  
8 commission where this issue and related discussions can be held.

9 Mr. Frandsen suggested that this may be a good vehicle to resolve the issues and have more  
10 insight and tools.

11

12 **Ms. Peay moved to recommend that the proposed amendment be tabled.**

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

14	<b>Chairman Woffinden</b>	<b>Aye</b>
15	<b>Christine Anderson</b>	<b>Nay</b>
16	<b>Jenny Peay</b>	<b>Aye</b>
17	<b>Bruce Frandsen</b>	<b>Aye</b>
18	<b>Chris Christiansen</b>	<b>Aye</b>
19	<b>Harold Dudley</b>	<b>Nay</b>
20	<b>Rod Brocious</b>	<b>Nay</b>

**The motion passed.**

22  
23 **Ms. Anderson explained her vote, saying that she would vote to deny.**

24

25 3. Other Business

26

27 Chairman Woffinden told commissioners that the city is still looking for a replacement for Adam  
28 Olsen.

29 Mr. Knobloch told commissioners that the APA Conference is this week if anyone is interested.

30

31 4. Site Plan Committee Report

32

# APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Knobloch reviewed the items for the upcoming Planning Commission meeting to be held on  
2 Wednesday, September 22, 2021. It will likely be a shorter meeting with a couple of zoning and  
3 land use amendments.

4

5 5. Review and action on the minutes of the August 18, 2021 Planning Commission Regular  
6 Session

7

8 **Ms. Anderson moved to recommend approval of the minutes of the August 18, 2021**  
9 **Planning Commission Regular Session.**

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

11	<b>Chairman Woffinden</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
12	<b>Christine Anderson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
13	<b>Jenny Peay</b>	<b>Aye</b>
14	<b>Bruce Frandsen</b>	<b>Aye</b>
15	<b>Chris Christiansen</b>	<b>Aye</b>
16	<b>Harold Dudley</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
17	<b>Rod Brocious</b>	<b>Abstain</b>

**The motion passed.**

18

19

20

21 6. Adjournment

22

23 **Ms. Anderson motioned to adjourn.**

24 **Mr. Brocious seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**

25

26 Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.

27

28

29

30

31   
32 Lisa Halversen

33 Administrative Assistant