

Highland City Planning Commission

May 11, 2010

The regular meeting of the Highland City Planning Commission was called to order by Planning Commission Chair, Melissa Wright, at 7:00 p.m. on May 11, 2010. An invocation was offered by Tim Irwin and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Kelly Sobotka.

PRESENT: Commissioner: Melissa Wright, Chair
Commissioner: Abe Day
Commissioner: Roger Dixon
Commissioner: Tim Irwin
Commissioner: Steve Rock
Commissioner: Kelly Sobotka
Alternate Commissioner: Christopher Kemp

EXCUSED: Commissioner: Jay Roundy

STAFF PRESENT: City Planner: Lonnie Crowell
Secretary: Kiera Corbridge

OTHERS: Jess Adamson, Kathryn Schramm, Tom Butler, Scott Smith.

PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Melissa Wright invited comments from the public regarding items not on the agenda and no one chose to speak.

TOWN CENTER OVERLAY ZONE ORDINANCE – CODE AMENDMENT ~ PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Melissa Wright opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

Lonnie Crowell explained that on February 2, 2010, the City Council passed a resolution placing a moratorium on the Town Center Overlay Ordinance for the purpose of reviewing the text, clarifying perceived inconsistencies, and designating the Final Approval of projects to the City Council. The City Council requested that the Planning Commission carefully review the Town Center Overlay Ordinance and provide a recommendation for amendments to this ordinance. In subsequent weeks, the City Council and Planning Commission held two work sessions in which they discussed several concerns with the current ordinance. Members expressed that the moratorium should be lifted as soon as possible. It was suggested that the Planning Commission consider the main concerns identified during the March 30, 2010, work session, recommending

that the remaining amendments be addressed at a future date. Several of those items are as follows:

- Clearly define the approval process
- That the Planning Commission Grant Architectural Approval; the City Council Grant Final Site Plan Approval
- Improved communication between staff and the City Council, specifically regarding operation and policy process
- Parking for a residential use to be amended from 1.5 spaces per unit to 3.0 spaces per unit
- Residential density to be capped at 7.5 units per acre
- Building height to be a maximum of fifty-feet tall and three stories in height
- Consider requiring a Conditional Use Permit when residential uses are included

The City Council and Planning Commission members were provided an electronic copy of the Town Center Overlay code on which to comment; the edits and comments were then printed and distributed to the City Council and Planning Commission during the March 30, 2010, work session.

On April 13, 2010, the Planning Commission reviewed the draft ordinance, making corrections and recommendations. There were several scenarios proposed in which the developer could acquire additional density and/or multi-family options. Staff has also had discussions with City Councilpersons suggesting a “maximum number of units within the Town Center Overlay” rather than defining the specific density (currently 7.5 units per acre). Lonnie Crowell explained that the limitation of 7.5 units per acre was based on the Coventry “Transitional Housing Overlay” zone.

Lonnie Crowell added that it had previously been suggested to consider a performance based method for developers to acquire a higher density per acre. He noted that a performance based method can be seen as arbitrary; however, it may provide for a higher quality product. On April 27, 2010, the Planning Commission reviewed a proposed performance based ordinance and concluded that it was beneficial to continue with the ordinance as previously discussed.

On April 27, 2010, The Planning Commission requested a market study to determine a residential density that is economically feasible; determining a maximum number of units within the Town Center would allow the housing market to determine how the units would be built. Lonnie Crowell noted that structuring the Town Center ordinance with a maximum number of units rather than a specific density could allow for a development similar to Toscana at the Highlands; however, increased parking requirements, open space, driveway length, setbacks, and retail conversion requirements may mitigate many of the expressed concerns associated with a similar development. The Planning Commission requested a maximum number of 342 residential units in the Town Center (180 units would available including Toscana at the Highlands) and a maximum density of 7.5 units per acre for any given project.

Lonnie Crowell suggested that the Planning Commission may want to consider using a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) method to regulate mass within the Town Center rather than the number or dwelling units per acre; this common practice limits the amount of ground that a building will

incorporate when developing. The Planning Commission was provided information illustrating this concept as well as photographs and other information regarding development density.

The Planning Commission has been presented a draft of the proposed Town Center Overlay ordinance incorporating comments made during previous meetings.

Jess Adamson, Highland City resident, stated that people move to Highland because of the community that it has become. He explained that the R-1-40 Zone was all that existed when Highland City was established; the R-1-20 Zone was later created to accommodate the developments with smaller lots that had been approved by Utah County. Mr. Adamson stated that even when the Open Space Bonus Density Zone was created, the density never exceeded 1.5 homes/units per acre. Mr. Adamson stated that the approval of Toscana at the Highlands with 22.5 homes/units per acre is not conducive with what the founders of Highland City had envisioned; he attributed the “mistake” to the creation of the Flex Use Zone. Jess Adamson questioned whether the City Council understood the capacity of residences in the Town Center Flex Use Zone, stating that Councilpersons appeared confused when presented with Toscana at the Highlands. Mr. Adamson emphasized his desire to give the Planning Commission and City Council the option to review each development rather than providing developers the opportunity to submit plans that simply meet the ordinances. He stated that “public hearing” and “conditional use” should not be perceived as negatives.

Mr. Adamson noted that the additional density of Toscana at the Highlands, and any future residential development, increases the load on the Public Safety Department.

Jess Adamson stressed the need for Highland City Officials to become familiar with Highland City’s history to determine the future vision for the city.

Melissa Wright closed the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

The Planning Commission discussed whether it would be advantageous for a Planning Commissioner and/or City Councilperson present at the Development Review Committee meetings. Several Commissioners expressed concern that comments made by a Planning Commissioner or City Councilperson during the meeting could give the developer/applicant the impression that the legislative body feels the same. Other Commissioners suggested that having a member of the Planning Commission and/or City Council would be beneficial in terms of communication. Lonnie Crowell noted that the purpose of the Development Review Committee is to determine whether the application complies with the Highland City Development Code; no decisions or approval or denial are made. The Planning Commission consensus was to separate the Development Review Committee from the Planning Commission and City Council.

A Commissioner relayed the following calculations:

- There are 252 units still available between Highland Village, Coventry at the Highlands, and Toscana at the Highlands
- If the density is set at 7.5 units per acre, 112 additional units could be developed within the remaining property in the Town Center

- According to the average household of 4.5 persons would mean over 1,500 additional residents in the Town Center

This Commissioner stated that permitting a density of 7.5 units per acre is too dense and observed that the Highland City General Plan often references the rural and open feel of the city. It was suggested that if commercial businesses don't want to locate in the Town Center, Highland City should consider developing a "special destination" node; recreation center, movie theater, etc. It was noted that Alpine City residents have been opposed to the height of the proposed performing arts center and that maybe Alpine City would consider collaborating with Highland City in constructing the performing arts center in the Highland Town Center.

A Commissioner noted that the Highland City Center core is not likely to develop retail in the near future, creating a need for the Flex Use Zone; if additional residential is not constructed, it may be an extended period of time before the Town Center is developed as commercial/retail.

Jess Adamson expressed his opinion that Highland City Officials are too anxious to develop the Town Center, stating that commercial development is based on supply and demand; the property in the Town Center should remain available for when the demand for additional commercial development increases.

The Planning Commission discussed removing residential development from the list of permitted uses within the Town Center Overlay Zone. Commissioners referenced moderate/high density housing in neighboring cities and discussed the benefits and disadvantages of permitting additional residential development within the Town Center Overlay Zone. It was suggested that residential elements be removed from list of permitted uses in the Town Center Overlay Zone. Commissioners expressed concern that eliminating residential development altogether may deter developers from submitting something unique for the Town Center. Lonnie Crowell noted that a developer could present a plan for development, allow the Planning Commission and City Council to review, and then the ordinances could be amended accordingly.

A Commissioner noted that if residential developments are removed from permitted uses within the Town Center, Toscana at the Highlands would become a non-conforming use; a new district/zone would need to be established to account for Toscana at the Highlands.

Commissioners expressed concern that a developer would not propose a use that is not permitted by the ordinance, suggesting that it be made clear that Highland City would be open to unique proposals. Another Commissioner stated that this is the Planning Commission; the intent is to plan what is best for Highland City.

A Commissioner expressed concern regarding the lack of transition between Toscana at the Highlands and surrounding commercial development.

A Commissioner asked Jess Adamson what he recalls was the original intent for the Town Center. Mr. Adamson stated that the "heart" of Highland City was naturally the intersection of SR-92 and SR-74; Highland City Officials desired to establish a heart with a residential element (Highland Village and Coventry at the Highlands), a civic element (Highland City Offices,

Library, and PSD Buildings), and a commercial element beyond that of the intersection. The city officials held a charette to plan and design the property in the Town Center with streets, building pads, etc. Jess Adamson then shared his opinion that the Flex Use Zone was designed as an incentive for the Town Center to be developed.

Lonnie Crowell noted that every city general plan is required by law to provide for moderate income housing. He explained that if a city denies an application for development of moderate income housing due to the lack of a designated zone, the applicant can appeal to a court and the judge would determine where moderate income housing will be located. A Commissioner questioned if Toscana at the Highlands fulfills this requirement; Mr. Crowell implied that it does not fill the requirement, however it does contribute.

Commissioners reiterated the desire to remove the residential element from permitted uses within the Town Center Overlay Zone. A Commissioner cautioned the Planning Commission not to overreact to the density of Toscana at the Highlands. It was noted that removing the residential element would simply slow down the development of residential uses, not restrict the development of commercial or retail.

A Commissioner voiced the opinion that the residences in Toscana at the Highlands would be pleasant for a small or young family; the units are a comfortable size and children would likely take advantage of the amenities (pool, parks, club house, etc.)

MOTION: Christopher Kemp moved that 3-4716: Residential Uses be removed from the Town Center Overlay Zone and that a new district be created for Toscana at the Highlands. Motion seconded by Kelly Sobotka. Those voting aye: Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Kelly Sobotka, Melissa Wright; those voting nay: Abe Day, Roger Dixon. The motion passed with a majority vote, 5:2.

Lonnie Crowell noted that several of the residential requirements of the Town Center Overlay Ordinance could act as a safeguard in the event that Toscana at the Highlands is not completed as approved.

The Planning Commission and staff addressed typographical and formatting corrections.

MOTION: Roger Dixon moved that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending the Town Center Overlay Zone as amended and with the following Recommendations:

- 1. That 3-4716: Residential Uses be removed; and**
- 2. That a new district be created for Toscana at the Highlands; and**
- 3. That 3-4702(3) Development Review Committee read as follows: The Development Review Committee consists of the Public Works Director, Community Development Director, Fire Chief, and Police Chief. A member of each utility company with utilities located within Highland City boundaries shall also be noticed and invited to attend.**

Motion seconded by Tim Irwin. Those voting aye: Abe Day, Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Kelly Sobotka, Melissa Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

☞ **CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE 2, PLANNING COMMISSION – CODE AMENDMENT ~ PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

Lonnie Crowell explained that Chapter 2, Article 2: Planning Commission of the Highland City Development Code is outdated. The draft presented to the Planning Commission includes comments from previous meetings and grammatical/formatting corrections made by Commissioner Roger Dixon.

Melissa Wright opened the public hearing at 8:31 p.m. and hearing no comment closed the public hearing.

A Commissioner expressed concern that requiring Planning Commissioners to obtain permission from the owner of any property being reviewed may be excessive; circumstances may make obtaining permission impossible (such as an out-of-state owner). Lonnie Crowell noted that the Highland City Municipal Code permits the Planning Commissioners to survey the property without prior notice. A Commissioner emphasized the desire that Planning Commissioners be courteous and expressed hesitation at removing the requirement for Commissioners to obtain permission to enter the properties. It was suggested that upon application submittal, applicants acknowledge that the properties may be surveyed by the reviewing bodies (Planning Commission and/or City Council). The Planning Commission requested that staff add clarification to all applications indicating that the Planning Commissioners and City Councilpersons may enter the property without prior notice.

MOTION: Abe Day moved to Recommend that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending Chapter 1, Article 2, Planning Commission as Amended. Motion seconded by Tim Irwin. Those voting aye: Abe Day, Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Kelly Sobotka, Melissa Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

☞ **ARTICLE 4.8 OPEN SPACE DENSITY BONUS – CODE AMENDMENTS ~ DISCUSSION (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

Lonnie Crowell explained that there concerns beginning to surface within the Highland Hills subdivision resulting from the required setbacks. The setbacks for the final two phases of the Highland Hills subdivision are greater than those required for the first two phases; Plat A and Plat B were approved with a ten foot rear yard setback while Plat C and Plat D are required to meet a twenty-five foot rear yard setback. The rear yard setbacks were changed due to issues that arose from the smaller ten foot setback, including encroachment onto publicly owned open space by some property owners; however, requiring larger setbacks on smaller lots reduced the available space for a home footprint. The concern with less available space is that the footprint/house plans were originally approved by the City Council and the approved only

permitted the developer/builder to use each plan ten times within the subdivision. The change in the rear setback has resulted in home footprints and plans that can not provide for the second-story decks that are necessary to meet the requirements of the International Building Code; a deck of any dimension constructed on the back of these homes will encroach into the setback as currently written. If the ordinance is amended to reduce setback limits, the City Council may then consider amending the conditions of approval to permit these homes/decks to be constructed.

Utah State Law requires that zoning allowances and restrictions be specifically defined within each municipality's Land Use Ordinance (Development Code) in order for those allowances or restrictions to be considered. The Highland City Development Code presently restricts all open space subdivisions to the same setbacks as those required for properties within the R-1-40 Zone; lots in the R-1-40 Zone are typically much larger with greater frontages than those in open space subdivisions. The Highland City Development Code should be Amended to reflect the setbacks that have been permitted for various open space subdivision. The Highland City Development Code does not specify the setbacks that were originally or presently approved for the Highland Hills subdivision, or other open space subdivisions; consequently, this does not provide the City Council the opportunity to re-consider or amend these restrictions for anything other than those setbacks defined within the R-1-40 Zone.

Mr. Crowell noted that Mayor Ritchie has created an Open Space Committee (Chaired by Councilperson Scott Smith) which will be addressing concerns such as the maintenance and development of the open space, however this process may not resolve the issues stated above; the ordinance may need to be Amended again following the Open Space Committee review.

The Planning Commission may consider a smaller setback based upon a mathematical formula for the open space subdivisions; the options for reduced setbacks need to be justified based upon physical evidence to avoid being arbitrarily created. In additions, these setbacks need to be spelled out in the Highland City Development Code in order for the City Council to approve them and for Staff to enforce them. The Planning Commission was provided with a draft amendment for consideration (Lonnie Crowell noted a correction in the draft regarding the greater-than/less-than symbols).

A Commissioner questioned why properties with a larger frontage would be required to meet a larger setback. Lonnie Crowell explained that properties with larger frontage should be able to construct a wider home whereas properties with a small frontage have to construct a deep, narrow home to obtain the same square footage; therefore, causing conflict with the increased rear yard setbacks.

A Commissioner inquired about irregularly shaped lots or lots that are not consistent with the remainder of the subdivision. Lonnie Crowell indicated that he intends to add language specifying that eighty percent of the lots in the subdivision must meet the requirements for the setbacks to apply.

It was noted that if the setbacks were not adjusted in open space subdivisions, many residents in open space subdivisions would need to apply for the Appeal Authority to construct any structure

on their lot. Lonnie Crowell explained that the Appeal Authority is regulated by law and can only grant a variance there is a hardship created by the lot.

Commissioners questioned the negatives of setting a standard setback of fifteen feet. Lonnie Crowell explained that previous years, builders would construct a home that filled the entire permissible area of the lot. While that may not be a concern to the resident, neighboring residents would often complain. Kiera Corbridge noted that homeowners often don't understand that an extension of the home (deck, addition, etc.) will also need to comply with the setbacks; homes would be constructed fifteen feet from the property lines and residents still would not be able to have a deck. Lonnie Crowell stated that the definition of a deck could be changed. A Commissioner observed that an exception could be made for decks; however, it would likely result in large, intrusive decks that would be constructed to the ten foot public utility easement.

A Commissioner noted that athletic courts could be constructed within the ten foot public utility easement when letters of permission from the utility companies are provided at time of building permit. Lonnie Crowell warned that the letters of permission do not relinquish the utility companies' right to the easement; if a utility company needed to access the easement, it could result in a cost to the homeowner to replace/repair the structure located in the easement. The Commissioner questioned the authority of the utility companies to have an inalienable right to the easements. Mr. Crowell explained that the Highland City Development Code requires that all lots be recorded with a ten foot public utility easement surrounding the property and noted that the utility companies require the easement to provide services.

It was noted that decks can be cantilevered over the setbacks; setbacks are measured from the foundation. However, no part of the deck can intrude into the Public Utility Easement around the lot.

Lonnie Crowell stated that when a ten foot rear setback was allowed in the past, residents occasionally encroached onto the open space; encroachment (trampolines, swing sets, landscaping, etc.) makes it difficult for the public to enjoy the open space.

A Commissioner questioned whether adjusting the setbacks in open space subdivisions will affect the quality requirements of open space subdivisions. Lonnie Crowell noted that if the developer can still obtain points by increasing the setbacks; the concern is that the setbacks approved in established open space subdivisions are not outlined in the Highland City Development Code.

A Commissioner suggested limiting decks in open space subdivisions to be no more than ten feet from the main residence. It was noted that ten feet may be too restrictive, as many lots could have much larger decks (ex: lots in Canterbury North have enough property to have a deck that is one-hundred feet wide).

Scott Smith, City Councilperson and Chair of the Open Space Committee, stated that he has been pushing for the setback adjustments. The Open Space Committee is evaluating all eighteen established open space subdivisions and their specific issues. He noted that residents in Highland

Hills and other open space subdivisions with smaller lots would like to follow the codes and would appreciate more flexibility.

☞ **HIGHLAND CITY GENERAL PLAN REVIEW ~ DISCUSSION** (AGENDA ITEM 8)

Lonnie Crowell explained that the Highland City General Plan was update on February 18, 2009, after a two year process, consisting of five neighborhood meetings, two transportation meetings, and twenty-six other various meetings. Every resident was mailed an invitation to each neighborhood meeting. All meetings were advertised on the Highland City website, in the Highland City building, and the newsletters mailed with monthly bills during the entire process, as well as a link to a website created specifically for the General Plan Update process.

Mr. Crowell noted Utah State Law requires that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and make Recommendations to the City Council for Amendments to the General Plan and that the City Council also hold a public hearing before Considering any Amendments.

Lonnie Crowell added that each Highland City resident was mailed a survey at the beginning of the General Plan Update process. The survey was created by the City Council with assistance from a hired Consultant, Landmark Design, Inc., and received a twenty-eight percent response.

Landmark Design, Inc., using Sub-Consultants such as InterPlan Co. (Transportation Engineering) and Wickstrom Economic and Planning Consultants (Economic and Affordable Housing), prepared maps and other data and coordinated/moderated the open houses and public meetings for the General Plan Update process.

Commissioners clarified that the intent of the review is to familiarize the Planning Commission with the Highland City General Plan. It was agreed that the Planning Commission Chair, Melissa Wright, assign individual Commissioners portions of the Highland City General Plan and that each Commissioner would then summarize their portion during the next Planning Commission Meeting.

☞ **PLANNING COMMISSION FUTURE BUSINESS, QUESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ~ DISCUSSION** (AGENDA ITEM 9)

The Planning Commission has requested a list of possible upcoming Planning Commission Items. Items are typically placed on the Planning Commission Agenda as soon as the applications are submitted; the follow items are exceptions:

- **Planning Commission Final Approval and Recommendation of the Buhlers Ranch Subdivision** – Nineteen-lot subdivision located at approximately 5879 West 10400 North in Highland.
- **Amendment to the Permanent Sign Ordinance** – Per the request of the Highland City Merchants Committee and results of the Merchant Sign Survey.

- **Master Plan State Training School Property** – Located south of Lone Peak High School.
- **Review of the Highland City General Plan**
- **Amendment to the Open Space Bonus Density Subdivision Ordinance** – Amending to create a more productive and user friendly ordinance.
- **Amendment to the Definition of “Family” in the Highland City Development Code** – Utah State Law was recently amended regarding the definition of a family to include not less than four people, requiring Highland City to amend the existing definition.
- **Amendments Regarding Setbacks in R-1-40 and R-1-20 Zones** – Subdivision setbacks will be spelled out in the ordinances.
- **Ordinances Addressing “Model Homes” - Conditional Use in R-1-40 and R-1-20 Zones** – Review requirements of a Model Home.
- **Amendments to Chapter 3-617: Amendments to Zoning Code and Chapter 9: Amendments to Title and Zone Map**

The Planning Commission reviewed the upcoming items and discussed the priority order.

It was suggested that review of the ordinances addressing fencing in Highland be added to the list.

A Commissioner observed that the construction of the East-West Corridor road may make the State Training Property very desirable and suggested that the property be master planned prior to proposed development. Kathryn Schramm, Highland City resident and City Council member, asked to speak, stating the Planning Commission should not plan the property because it does not belong to Highland City. She noted that the property is school trust land devoted to earning money for the schools and must be sold at “top dollar”. Mrs. Schramm stated that she does not see the property being given to Highland City, nor does she see Highland City being able to purchase the property in the near future, and suggested that master planning the school trust property be a lower priority. It was noted that property not owned by Highland City can be master planned; although, Lonnie Crowell suggested waiting until the final layout of the East-West Corridor road is determined. Mr. Crowell also mentioned a phone call he had received indicating that a developer may be interested in trading property with the state in order to develop the property south of Lone Peak High School.

Commissioners expressed the desire to resume the review of the wall and window sign ordinances; however, there was some disappointment that the business owners/merchants have not appeared to show interest in amending the ordinances when invited to Planning Commission meetings. Kathryn Schramm shared her opinion that Highland City merchants have not attended meetings because they may not have employees who can manage the stores while the owners attend meetings. Lonnie Crowell noted that multiple meetings have been scheduled at various times throughout the day to try to accommodate the merchants and that each business owner has individually been invited to Planning Commission meetings. Mr. Crowell stated that Staff had received no response to these invitations; however, a recent mailed survey was returned by thirty-three percent of the merchants.

A Commissioner suggested that the City Council consider creating a resolution regarding the definition of a “Traditional Family”.

Commissioners expressed concern that the restrictions on model homes are unnecessary; model homes are designed to help sell homes and are especially important during difficult economic times.

The Planning Commission and Staff agreed that the priority order of the future items is as follows:

1. Amendments to Chapter 3-617: Amendments to Zoning Code and Chapter 9: Amendments to Title and Zone Map
2. Amendment to the Definition of “Family” in the Highland City Development Code
3. Ordinances Addressing “Model Homes” - Conditional Use in R-1-40 and R-1-20 Zones
4. Amendment to Ordinances Addressing Fencing
5. Amendment to the Permanent Sign Ordinance

Master Planning the State Training School Property and Amendments to the Open Space Bonus Density Subdivision Ordinance would be ongoing items.

☞ **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR MARCH 9, 2010, AND APRIL 27, 2010 (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

Commissioners questioned the language of a motion regarding the revocation of a permit to operate following a fourth violation; the motion stated that the revocation of the permit would occur following the fourth denial to permit city officials to inspect the facility, whereas the Commissioners recalled that the discussion indicated the permit revocation would follow any fourth violation within a twelve month period.

MOTION: Roger Dixon moved to Table/Continue the Approval of the Meeting Minutes for April 27, 2010, pending further research regarding the intent of a motion. Motion seconded by Steve Rock. Those voting aye: Abe Day, Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Melissa Wright. Kelly Sobotka chose to abstain. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

A Commissioner noted that the Planning Commission has reviewed and edited the ordinances addressing Residences for the Persons with a Disability, Residential Rehabilitation and Treatment Facilities for the Disabled, and Residential Facilities for Elderly Persons with conscious regard for Highland residents as well as the residents within the facilities.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved to Table/Continue the Approval of the Meeting Minutes for March 9, 2010, pending review of the content of the meeting. Motion seconded by Kelly Sobotka. Those voting aye: Abe Day, Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Kelly Sobotka, Melissa Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

 **ADJOURNMENT**

Tim Irwin moved to adjourn. Seconded by Abe Day. Unanimous vote, meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.