

Highland City Planning Commission

June 8, 2010

The regular meeting of the Highland City Planning Commission was called to order by Planning Commission Chair, Melissa Wright, at 7:01 p.m. on June 8, 2010. An invocation was offered by Tim Irwin and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Jay Roundy.

PRESENT: Commissioner: Melissa Wright, Chair
Commissioner: Roger Dixon
Commissioner: Tim Irwin
Commissioner: Steve Rock
Commissioner: Jay Roundy
Alternate Commissioner: Christopher Kemp

EXCUSED: Commissioner: Abe Day
Commissioner: Kelly Sobotka

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

OTHERS: Christie Dalley, Scott Smith, Devirl (Ed) Barfuss, Charles Lambson, Deborah Kinjo, Richard Miller, Ryan Johnson.

PUBLIC APPEARANCES

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

3-617: AMENDMENTS TO ZONING CODE; CHAPTER 9 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE AND ZONE MAP – CODE AMENDMENT ~ PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Lonnie Crowell explained that there are two sections within the Highland City Development Code that define the process to Amend ordinances; both of these sections contradict Utah State Law. In 2005, the Utah State Legislature passed an amendment to the Utah Land Use Development Management Act requiring the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing for all land use code amendments. Staff would recommend deleting Chapter 3-617: Amendments to Zoning Code and amending Chapter 9: Amendments to Title and Zone Map to be consistent with Utah State Law.

Mr. Crowell noted that the amendment to Utah State Law in 2005 also specifically states that only one public hearing is required to Amend a Land Use Ordinance and that the public hearing

must be held before the Planning Commission; the Planning Commission then makes a Recommendation to the Legislative Body (the City Council).

A draft of the amended ordinance was presented to the Planning Commission for review. Staff included Chapter 10: Definitions to reflect the definition of terms as provided by Utah Code.

Melissa Wright opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m. and hearing no comment closed the public hearing.

Lonnie Crowell explained that a vicinity map is used to clarify the location of the property addressed in the application; the notifications mailed to residents within five-hundred feet of the property do not relate to the size of the vicinity map.

The Planning Commission and staff addressed typographical corrections.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved to Recommend that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance, as amended, Amending Chapter 9: Amendments to Title and Zone Map and Deleting Section 3-617: Amendments to Zoning Code of the Highland City Development Code to create consistency within the Highland City Development Code and to be consistent with Utah State Law. Motion seconded by Steve Rock. Those voting aye: Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Jay Roundy, Melissa Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

☞ **ARTICLE 4.8 OPEN SPACE DENSITY BONUS – CODE AMENDMENTS ~ PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

Lonnie Crowell explained that there are 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 approval 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 cannot 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 subdivisions. 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 addition, 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.

Melissa Wright opened the public hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Charles Lambson, resident of Highland Hills subdivision in Highland City, expressed his support of reducing the setbacks stating that the current setbacks would only permit him to construct a two-foot deck from the door on the second story of his home.

Richard Miller, also a resident of Highland Hills subdivision, echoed support of reducing the setbacks.

Ryan Johnson, Highland City resident, requested clarification regarding the 10³/25' combination on the side setbacks. Lonnie Crowell explained that a ten foot Public Utility Easement exists around each lot in Highland City, causing ten feet to be the minimum setback distance; the twenty-five foot setback is the minimum distance required between foundations or the minimum total of the side yard setbacks. Mr. Johnson asked whether 9½ feet would be approved. Lonnie Crowell noted that the Highland City Development Code does not permit Highland City Staff to grant a variance; however, a resident could apply for the Appeal Authority for a variance if there is a hardship that is unique to the lot.

Melissa Wright closed the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

A Commissioner questioned whether the ordinance is being amended to accommodate a need of the residents. Lonnie Crowell clarified that the ordinance is being reviewed to address the concerns in the Highland Hills subdivision, but also because the setbacks approved by the City Council for open space subdivisions must be defined in the Highland City Development Code.

A Commissioner commented that there are several two-story homes in the Highland Hills subdivision and inquired as to why staff suggests a fifteen-foot setback rather than a ten-foot setback. Lonnie Crowell reiterated that the first two phases of the Highland Hills subdivision were approved with ten-foot setbacks and staff received many complaints of encroachment into the open space. He cautioned that a ten-foot setback could have been the cause of the encroachment concern, although a twenty-five foot setback seems to be too large for smaller lots.

It was also clarified that a deck can be cantilevered into the setbacks (the setback is measured from the foundation); however, no part of the deck can intrude into the Public Utility Easement.

A resident commented that very few existing decks within the Highland Hills subdivision would violate a ten foot setback.

ORIGINAL MOTION: Roger Dixon moved to Recommend that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending Section 3-4806: Open Space Density Bonus and Section 3-4808: Application Procedures for Open Space Bonus Subdivisions as follows:

3-4806: Open Space Bonus.

- (19) **Setbacks within the Open Space Density Bonus Overlay may determined by lot depth and lot frontage. Setbacks shall be consistent with the underlying zone unless a minimum of 80% of the lots within an approved Open Space Density Bonus subdivision meet the following dimensions; if 80% of the lots meet the following dimensions, then setbacks shall be as follows:**

FRONTAGE	DEPTH	SETBACKS		
		<i>Front</i>	<i>Rear</i>	<i>Side</i>
<90'	<110'	25'	15'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
90'-100'	<110'	25'	20'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
90'-120'	110'-130'	25'	25'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
110'-130'	130'-180'	30'	30'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
>130'	>180'	30'	30'	15'

3-4808: Application Procedures for Open Space Bonus Subdivisions.

(2) **Sketch Plan.**

(b) **Sketch Plan Requirements.**

- (iv) **The sketch plan shall show the proposed private residential space and proposed number of lots within contiguous areas and the total lot count with average, minimum, and maximum lot size. The sketch plan does not include lot lines, but will address building set-backs and roadway profile. All subdivisions shall be regulated by setbacks as defined in 3-4806 of this Code.**

Motion seconded by Christopher Kemp.

AMENDED MOTION: Tim Irwin moved to Recommend that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending Section 3-4806: Open Space Density Bonus and Section 3-4808: Application Procedures for Open Space Bonus Subdivisions as follows:

3-4806: Open Space Bonus.

(19) Setbacks within the Open Space Density Bonus Overlay may determined by lot depth and lot frontage. Setbacks shall be consistent with the underlying zone unless a minimum of 80% of the lots within an approved Open Space Density Bonus subdivision meet the following dimensions; if 80% of the lots meet the following dimensions, then setbacks shall be as follows:

FRONTAGE	DEPTH	SETBACKS		
		<i>Front</i>	<i>Rear</i>	<i>Side</i>
<90'	<110'	25'	10'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
90'-100'	<110'	25'	15'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
90'-120'	110'-130'	25'	20'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
110'-130'	130'-180'	30'	25'	12.5' or (10' min. 25' total)
>130'	>180'	30'	30'	15'

3-4808: Application Procedures for Open Space Bonus Subdivisions.

(3) Sketch Plan.

(b) Sketch Plan Requirements.

(iv) The sketch plan shall show the proposed private residential space and proposed number of lots within contiguous areas and the total lot count with average, minimum, and maximum lot size. The sketch plan does not include lot lines, but will address building set-backs and roadway profile. All subdivisions shall be regulated by setbacks as defined in 3-4806 of this Code.

Amended motion died for lack of a second.

VOTE ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION: Those voting aye: Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Jay Roundy, Melissa Wright. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

DEFINITION OF A FAMILY – CODE AMENDMENT ~ PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Lonnie Crowell explained that during the recent Legislative Session, the Utah State Legislature Adopted State Bill 45 defining a “family” as follows:

10-9a-505.5. Limit on single family designation.

- (1) As used in this section, “single-family limit” means the number of unrelated individuals allowed to occupy a unit in a zone permitting occupancy by a single family.
- (2) A municipality may not adopt a single-family limit that is less than:
 - (a) three, if the municipality has within its boundary:
 - (i) a state university; or
 - (ii) a private university with a student population of at least 20,000; or
 - (b) four, for each other municipality.

To be consistent with Utah State Law, staff recommends that the definition in the Highland City Development Code be amended to permit four persons rather than two (as seen below). Staff has also included suggested language at the end of the second sentence to provide for groups of

people that are legally considered to be treated as a “family”, such as residences for persons with a disability:

Highland City Development Code

10-102: Definitions (Amended: 3/2/04, 3/1/05, 6/7/05, 3/7/06, 8/1/06, 10/3/06, 5/15/07, 7/15/08) The following words, as used in this Title, shall have the meaning ascribed to them:

- (20) Family – Means persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, living together in a single dwelling unit and maintaining a common household. A family may include four, but not more than four, non-related persons living with the residing family. The term "family" shall not be construed to mean a group of non-related individuals, a fraternity, club or institutional group except as permitted by law.

Lonnie Crowell noted that the proposed ordinance is very similar to the current definition in the Highland City Development Code.

Melissa Wright opened the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

Ed Barfuss, Highland City resident, cautioned that many examples of case law refer to cities like New York City, Los Angeles, etc.; he requested that the Planning Commission consider court cases from traditionally conservative areas since Highland City is more conservative.

The Planning Commission discussed removing “living with the residing family” and “a group of non-related individuals” because these phrases are inconsistent with the intent of the recent amendments to Utah State Law.

It was clarified that institutional groups permitted by law would be Residences for the Disabled, Residential Rehabilitation and Treatment Facilities for the Disabled, Residential Facilities for Elderly Persons, and other facilities protected by State or Federal Laws.

MOTION: Steve Rock moved to Recommend that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending 10-102(2): Family in the Highland City Development Code as follows:

Highland City Development Code

10-102: Definitions (Amended: 3/2/04, 3/1/05, 6/7/05, 3/7/06, 8/1/06, 10/3/06, 5/15/07, 7/15/08) The following words, as used in this Title, shall have the meaning ascribed to them:

- (20) Family – Means persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, living together in a single dwelling unit and maintaining a common household. A family may include any number of related persons and up to four, but not more than four, non-related persons. The term "family" shall not be construed to mean a fraternity, club or institutional group except as permitted by law.

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

*****By virtue of a motion being made, the public hearing regarding the definition of a family has been closed.*****

☞ CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE 2, PLANNING COMMISSION – CODE AMENDMENT ~ PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 8)

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.

Mr. Crowell noted that concerns revolving the around Open Meetings Law (“Sunshine Act”) resulted in a delay of Recommendation to the City Council; this item has returned to the Planning Commission for Public Hearing and Recommendation.

Melissa Wright opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m. and hearing no comment closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission discussed the appropriate level of permission a Commissioner should obtain prior to entering private properties. Commissioners observed that the property owner or developer may not be available to give permissions. A Commissioner reemphasized the concern that the ordinance may appear as a “broad brush approval” for Commissioners to enter upon any property at any time. The Planning Commission decided to add language to planning applications indicating that applicant/property owner will grant permission to access the property.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved to Recommend that the City Council Adopt an Ordinance Amending Chapter 1, Article 2, Planning Commission per the following Recommendations:

- (1) That 2-205(3) read: “The Planning Commission, its members and employees, in the performance of its functions, may enter upon any land at reasonable times to make examinations and surveys as permitted by the application.”**

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

☞ TOWN CENTER OVERLAY ZONE ORDINANCE – CODE AMENDMENT ~ RECOMMENDATION (AGENDA ITEM 9)

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 purposed 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 discussed in previous meetings.

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 be available, in addition to Toscana at the Highlands) and a maximum density of 7.5 units per acre for any given project.

Staff suggested that the Planning Commission may also consider using a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) method to regulate mass within the Town Center rather than the number of 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.

On May 11, 2010, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and reviewed the draft of the proposed Town Center Overlay ordinance that included comments and corrections from previous meetings. During this meeting, the Planning Commission concluded to remove the sections of the ordinances listing residential dwelling units as a permitted use within the Town Center Overlay Zone, resulting in a new district detailing Toscana at the Highlands.

The Planning Commission also discussed the restrictions on farmer's markets within the Town Center; the Commission may desire to further discuss this portion of the ordinance.

Mr. Crowell noted that concerns revolving the around Open Meetings Law ("Sunshine Act") resulted in a delay of Recommendation to the City Council; this item has returned to the Planning Commission for final review and Recommendation.

Commissioners expressed hesitation about removing the option to build residential dwelling units within the Town Center. The Planning Commission discussed the benefits and disadvantages to permitting additional "high-density" residential developments in Highland City's center, such as the additional impact on the Public Safety District; meeting the requirement for moderate-income housing; and that residential units are still available in Toscana at the Highlands, Highland Village and Coventry at the Highlands. A Commissioner shared that the Highland City General Plan seems to portray a low density city.

Lonnie Crowell indicated that constructing retail or commercial businesses on the property would likely be a developer's first choice, and that developing residential with retail on the ground floor is just another option. He gave examples of live-work situations, such as an attorney's office or insurance office, which would be ideal for the Town Center. Mr. Crowell also stated that the ordinance as presented is more restrictive than when Toscana at the Highlands was approved; a residential development would not be capable of such high density according to the ordinance as amended.

A Commissioner noted that allowing residential dwelling units within the Town Center Overlay Zone simply provides additional options to a developer; if only retail is permitted within the Town Center Overlay Zone, the property may remain vacant for years to come.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved:

- 1. That 3-4704(1)(d) read as follows:**

- (d) **Town Center Residential.** The number of residential units within the Town Center Flex District area defined by the Town Center Land Use Map located in the Commercial Design Standards shall not exceed three-hundred forty-two (342) units for the Town Center Overlay Zone and project density shall not exceed twelve (12) dwelling units per acre (du/ac) for any given development.
 - (i) **Town Center Mixed Use Residential (TCMUR).** The number of residential units within the TCMUR shall not exceed 22.7 units per acre or 162 units total.
 - (A) **If significant changes to the existing site plan and/or use are proposed within this district, the maximum density shall revert back to 12 units per acre.**

Motion seconded by Roger Dixon. Those voting aye: Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp; those voting nay: Steve Rock, Melissa Wright. Jay Roundy chose to abstain. The motion passed with a majority vote, 3:2.

A Commissioner questioned whether the Police Chief and Fire Chief have calculated the impact additional residences in the Town Center would have on the Public Safety Department. Mr. Crowell stated that Police Chief Kip Botkin and Fire Chief Craig Carlisle submitted letters addressing the additional impact during the approval of Toscana at the Highlands.

A Commissioner requested additional information regarding the organization of the Landscaping, Lighting and Parking Maintenance Governing Board. Lonnie Crowell indicated that the board is part of the Development Agreement for developing in the Town Center and would be formed when the entire Town Center was complete. The Planning Commission discussed the need for a Landscaping, Lighting and Parking Maintenance Board in contrast to having Highland City Staff enforce requirements. A Commissioner observed that it may be self-regulating as it seems in a business owner's best interest to have a well maintained business front.

MOTION: Jay Roundy moved:

1. **That 3-4702(4) read: Flex Use. "Flex use shall mean a property whose use may include Attached High Density Residential Uses, Live-work Uses, Office Uses, Retail Uses or any combination of the four.;" and**
2. **That 3-4702(9) Landscaping, Lighting and Parking Maintenance Governing Board be deleted.**

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

A Commissioner observed that an "earthtone palette" could be interpreted to be a variety of colors and shades.

MOTION: Roger Dixon moved:

1. That 3-4713(3) Architectural Elements be reworded for increased clarification; and
2. That 3-4713(3)(e)(i) read: “A building front shall be any building façade parallel to a right-of-way and located within thirty (30) feet of that right-of-way. With the exception of exposed wood/timber architectural elements, fifty percent (50%) of a building façade on the ground floor shall be a high quality architectural rock, brick, or stone.”; and
3. That 3-4725(1) and 3-4725(2) be deleted.

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

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

1. That all corresponding tables and maps be amended consistent with the above changes.

Motion seconded by Tim Irwin. Those voting aye: Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Jay Roundy, Melissa Wright; those voting nay: Steve Rock. The motion passed with a majority vote, 5:1.

∞ **PLANNING COMMISSION FUTURE BUSINESS, QUESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ~ DISCUSSION** (AGENDA ITEM 10)

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:

FUTURE ITEMS OF BUSINESS TO CONSIDER

- **Amendments to Ordinances Addressing Fences**
- **Master Plan State Training School Property** – Located south of Lone Peak High School. Will be considered after the alignment of the East-West Corridor is determined.
- **Amendments to the Open Space Bonus Density Subdivision Ordinance** – Amending to create a more productive and user friendly ordinance.

CONTINUED/ONGOING ITEMS TO CONSIDER

- **Review of the Highland City General Plan**
- **Amendment to the Permanent Sign Ordinance** – Per the request of the Highland City Merchants Committee and results of the Merchant Sign Survey.

- **Planning Commission Final Approval and Recommendation of the Buhlers Ranch Subdivision** – Nineteen-lot subdivision located at approximately 5879 West 10400 North in Highland.

The Planning Commission discussed the process of reviewing the Highland City General Plan. Each Commissioner was assigned to read the executive narrative of a section and give a fifteen-minute report on that section in future Planning Commission meetings:

- June 22 - Introduction and Background Element - Roger Dixon
Land Use Element - Jay Roundy
- July 13 - Transportation Element - Matthew Shipp
Environmental and Natural Systems Element - Tim Irwin
- July 27 - Economic Element - Christopher Kemp
Affordable Housing Element - Steve Rock
- August 10 - Community Design Element - Lonnie Crowell
Parks, Recreation Facilities and Trails Element - Roger Dixon
- August 24 - Senior Housing Element - Kelly Sobotka/Abe Day

A Commissioner requested that a Multi-Year Improvement Program be added to the list of Continued/Ongoing Items to Consider.

 **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR MAY 11, 2010, AND MAY 25, 2010 (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

MOTION: Roger Dixon moved to Approve the Meeting Minutes for May 11, 2010, as amended. Motion seconded by Tim Irwin. Those voting aye: Roger Dixon, Tim Irwin, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Jay Roundy. Melissa Wright chose to abstain. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

MOTION: Jay Roundy moved to Approve the Meeting Minutes for May 25, 2010, as amended. Motion seconded by Steve Rock. Those voting aye: Roger Dixon, Christopher Kemp, Steve Rock, Jay Roundy, Melissa Wright. Tim Irwin chose to abstain. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

 **ADJOURNMENT**

Roger Dixon moved to adjourn. Seconded by Tim Irwin. Unanimous vote, meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.