

1                   **Highland City Planning Commission**  
2                                   **November 11, 2008**

3  
4 Present:

- 5 Commissioner: Jennifer Tucker  
6 Commissioner: Brent Wallace  
7 Commissioner: Tony Peckson  
8 Commissioner: Elizabeth Macfarlane  
9 Commissioner: Melissa Wright  
10 Commissioner: Roger Dixon  
11 Commissioner: Don Blohm

- 12  
13 City Administrator: Barry Edwards  
14 City Planner: Lonnie Crowell  
15 City Engineer: Matt Shipp  
16 City Planner: Carly LeDuc  
17 Secretary: Jill Stewart

18  
19 Excused: Kelly Sobotka, Abe Day  
20

- 21 Meeting convened at 7:00pm  
22 Pledge given by Don Blohm.  
23 Prayer given by Brent Wallace.  
24

25 **Item 1: Approval of Meeting Minutes for October 28, 2008**

26  
27 **Motion by Tony Peckson, Planning Commission to approve the Meeting Minutes for**  
28 **October 28, 2008, as amended.**

29  
30 **Seconded by Brent Wallace.**  
31 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

32  
33 **Item 2: Country French Plat “C” Subdivision ~ Final Recommendation**

34  
35 Lonnie Crowell explained that Patterson is requesting a 2 lot subdivision that will  
36 eventually contain 2 churches. They are showing the right in right out access. The  
37 applicant meets the requirements of the R-1-40 zone.

38  
39 Matt Shipp explained that the Commissioners are approving page CB1 in the agenda  
40 packet and the back page showing landscaping. The pages in the middle can be  
41 disregarded as they are construction drawings.

42  
43 Roger Dixon asked if both of these buildings are meetinghouses.

44  
45 Lonnie Crowell said the two pictures are identical.

1 Melissa Wright noted 3<sup>rd</sup> entrance is necessary, but wanted clarification as to if it was  
2 part of the plan. She also asked where the entrance will line up, whether it is with the top  
3 Normandy or the bottom Normandy.  
4  
5 Lonnie Crowell said that it will line up with the bottom Normandy.  
6  
7 Jennifer Tucker asked Matt Shipp about the 3<sup>rd</sup> entrance and if anything is being  
8 submitted stating they are going to put in the 3<sup>rd</sup> entrance.  
9  
10 Matt Shipp stated that is something Lonnie Crowell could probably address. He stated  
11 that staff has been working with Patterson to get that 3<sup>rd</sup> access.  
12  
13 Jennifer Tucker said the notes we have say either this is something that needs to be  
14 included now or needs to be tied to something that is developed in the future.  
15  
16 Lonnie Crowell said the condition says we recommend the applicant have a cross access  
17 easement on this. Another concern staff had is that this lot splits the right in right out  
18 access in half and we would prefer this portion be part of lot 2 and improved.  
19  
20 Jennifer Tucker asked as it is drawn now the entrance needs to be moved to the north?  
21  
22 Lonnie Crowell said that is an option, but we cannot require outside improvements and  
23 that is something they voluntarily agreed to.  
24  
25 Jennifer Tucker clarified that our two options are to move it or voluntarily improve the  
26 intersection now.  
27  
28 Lonnie Crowell said that is correct.  
29  
30 Brent Wallace addressed the matter of the two churches and the entrances/exits and asked  
31 Ken Berg to discuss the matter.  
32  
33 Ken Berg stated that as part of the real estate deal with the church on these two lots there  
34 is cost sharing of that right in right out drive. Patterson has agreed with the church to  
35 split that cost. Patterson has also been working with the city attorney and whatever they  
36 work out to give the city that reassurance.  
37  
38 Brent Wallace asked if we can put this in as a condition of approval.  
39  
40 Lonnie Crowell said staff would probably prefer a signed agreement before City Council  
41 approves this subdivision.  
42  
43 Barry Edwards explained that the Commissioners may want an ingress/egress easement  
44 as a condition of the recorded plat.  
45  
46 Brent Wallace asked if one of these will be a stake center.

1  
2 Ken Berg said the way the architect is presenting this now is that both buildings will be  
3 regular ward house chapels.

4  
5 Brent Wallace asked if there will be simultaneous meetings and whether there will be  
6 enough parking.

7  
8 Ken Berg said each building has at least 211 parking spaces. That is within the  
9 parameter of what had been used in the past for churches of this size. He explained this  
10 should allow enough parking without having to park on the street.

11  
12 Brent Wallace asked if there has been any thought to having a light at that intersection.

13  
14 Ken Berg explained that no traffic studies have been done at this point to see if a traffic  
15 count warrants having a traffic light.

16  
17 Brent Wallace asked how many ingress/egress lanes are at that intersection.

18  
19 Ken Berg said it is one in and one out turning left or going straight and one turning right.  
20 There will be some stacking.

21  
22 Jennifer Tucker said that there has been some discussion among staff about the  
23 ingress/egress easement and instead of an easement we either need to require that an  
24 ingress and egress be moved into the existing property line or we need to move the line  
25 showing now into lot 2.

26  
27 Melissa Wright asked what legal documentation in the Planning Commission packet staff  
28 was referring to regarding the ingress/egress easement.

29  
30 Lonnie Crowell stated if the condition that Commissioner Tucker has just spoken of is  
31 implemented then none of this will matter. It is impossible for a city to require outside  
32 improvements, so the condition just spoken of is probably the best recommendation as  
33 opposed to the ingress/egress easement.

34  
35 Ken Berg said they will just amend the plat a few hundred feet which should take care of  
36 that whole intersection.

37  
38 **Motion by Elizabeth Macfarlane, Planning Commission to recommend that City**  
39 **Council grant Final Approval of the Country French Estates Plat C Subdivision as**  
40 **per the recommendations of staff and Planning Commission as follows:**

- 41  
42 **1. That the DEVELOPER shall be responsible to install all of the improvements**  
43 **with this development to the east property line along Highland Boulevard including**  
44 **parkway detail before occupancy will be given to lots 1& 2; and**  
45 **2. That the DEVELOPER shall be responsible to complete and construct the**  
46 **medians within Highland Boulevard from the south border of Plat C to the north**

- 1 property line, meaning the entire Boulevard section adjacent to Country French  
2 Estates Plat C before occupancy is permitted for lots 1& 2; and  
3 3. That the private driveway locations to the church buildings and assisted living  
4 facility be installed upon agreement with the City Engineer; and  
5 4. That the applicant strictly adhere to the Dust and Mud Prevention Plan; and  
6 5. That any easements shown on the title report should be clearly identified on the  
7 Final Plat; and  
8 6. That the applicant obtain from the City a demolition permit for any buildings to  
9 be removed; and  
10 7. That the applicant will need to complete the remaining requirements for the Final  
11 Plan per any Planning Commission requirements and per the checklist prior to  
12 submitting for Final Approval from the Planning Commission.  
13 8. That as a condition of approval for this subdivision a 3rd access and a cross  
14 access easement shall be required on the property to the south at the time that  
15 property develops.  
16 9. That the applicant include the entire portion of the central access (one-way  
17 ingress in and egress out) be included as part of this subdivision.

18  
19 **Seconded by Roger Dixon.**

20 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

21  
22 **Item 3: LDS West Campus Conditional Use Permit ~ Public Hearing and**  
23 **Recommendation**

24  
25 Lonnie Crowell explained that the only additional recommendations would be whether  
26 the Commissioners want any fencing around this, which is typical of church approvals in  
27 Highland and whether the accessory structure meets the minimum setbacks. Other than  
28 those the plan meets landscaping, parking, and all of the other requirements. Lighting is  
29 usually a typical concern as well.

30  
31 Roger Dixon asked if it is a conditional use for both lots.

32  
33 Lonnie Crowell said yes.

34  
35 Roger Dixon asked if we can just approve one.

36  
37 Lonnie Crowell said yes if that is what is preferred.

38  
39 Roger Dixon suggested that before the second building is built, we be sure that the access  
40 to the west is in.

41  
42 Lonnie Crowell said you can make that a recommendation. The City Council may or  
43 may not agree.

44  
45 Jennifer Tucker opened the public hearing.

46

1 No comments from the public.

2

3 Jennifer Tucker closed the public hearing.

4

5 Melissa Wright asked why we are clarifying again that we want the one way ingress and  
6 egress when that was stated with the subdivision approval.

7

8 Lonnie Crowell stated that staff feels it is very important.

9

10 Melissa Wright asked where exactly the accessory structure is on that corner and if it is  
11 120 feet or less.

12

13 Lonnie Crowell said how to handle that would be to make it a requirement to meet the  
14 code.

15

16 Don Blohm asked if fence material has been determined.

17

18 Jennifer Tucker said we have an option to refer them to the architectural review  
19 committee for the subdivision or we can suggest a recommendation.

20

21 Roger Dixon asked if the architectural review committee is still the developer.

22

23 Lonnie Crowell said yes, it is Ivory Homes.

24

25 Brent Wallace asked staff what has been approved recently for fencing material and if it  
26 will be satisfactory.

27

28 Lonnie Crowell stated that vinyl is very common and would be a good recommendation.

29

30 The Planning Commissioners discussed different options for fencing material, as well if  
31 the fence should be solid or partially open. The Commissioners also discussed whether a  
32 retaining wall will be needed.

33

34 Ken Berg said that the church would prefer a vinyl fence with the understanding that the  
35 fence will be a quality vinyl fence because the fence needs to withstand the snow loads  
36 and wind

37

38 Lonnie Crowell said the decision of fence material should really be based on what Ivory  
39 Homes would like to see.

40

41 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**  
42 **grant Approval of the Conditional Use Permit for the LDS West Campus Lot 2 as**  
43 **per the recommendations of staff and Planning Commission as follows:**

44

45 **1. That the site plan include a minimum of 35% landscaping; and**

- 1 **2. That the one-way access (ingress from north, egress to the south) on the**  
2 **southeast corner of this site be fully improved with the first phase of this project;**  
3 **and**  
4 **3. That the applicant work with the City Engineer to indicate “no parking” along**  
5 **Highland Boulevard along the front of the entire property in question (this may**  
6 **include painting the curb, installing “no parking” signs, both options, or possibly**  
7 **other options); and**  
8 **4. That the applicant install a six foot (6’) tan vinyl open space fence along the**  
9 **north property line that be applicably built to handle snow and wind loads in the**  
10 **area.**  
11 **5. That all accessory structures meet the minimum setbacks per the Highland City**  
12 **Development Code and that these structure be of similar material and color to**  
13 **that of the main structures; and**  
14 **6. That the dumpsters be fully enclosed within an masonry enclosure with a gate**  
15 **and that these be additionally landscaped where visible to traffic or adjacent**  
16 **residential property; and**  
17 **7. That all lighting be designed and shielded to be directed toward the ground and**  
18 **be directed away from all four property lines so that any lighting does not cross**  
19 **over the property lines; and**  
20 **8. That the architecture be consistent with the submitted elevations not exceeding**  
21 **35’ in height (not including the typical spires).**

22  
23 **Seconded by Melissa Wright.**

24  
25 **Motion by Brent Wallace, Planning Commission to amend the original motion to**  
26 **add #9 to staff recommendations stating that the LDS Church not construct a**  
27 **stake center on either lot.**

28  
29 Lonnie Crowell stated that if the motion only approves Lot 2 that there will not be  
30 an approved site plan or access from the north; they will not be able to construct  
31 those.

32  
33 Lonnie Crowell suggested that the Planning Commission could make a condition  
34 that the church has to come back for a Conditional Use Permit if they want to build a  
35 stake center.

36  
37 Brent Wallace stated that the church representative did not have a problem with his  
38 amendment that a stake center not be built on either lot.

39  
40 **Seconded by Roger Dixon.**

41  
42 **Those voting aye: Jennifer Tucker, Brent Wallace, Don Blohm Roger Dixon, and**  
43 **Melissa Wright. Those voting nay: Tony Peckson and Elizabeth Macfarlane.**

44  
45 **Majority vote, amendment carried.**

1  
2 **Substitute motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to recommend that**  
3 **City Council grant Approval of the Conditional Use Permit for the LDS West**  
4 **Campus as per the recommendations of staff and Planning Commission as**  
5 **follows:**  
6

- 7 1. That the site plan include a minimum of 35% landscaping; and
- 8 2. That the one-way access (ingress from north, egress to the south) on the  
9 southeast corner of this site be fully improved with the first phase of this project;  
10 and
- 11 3. That the applicant work with the City Engineer to indicate “no parking” along  
12 Highland Boulevard along the front of the entire property in question (this may  
13 include painting the curb, installing “no parking” signs, both options, or possibly  
14 other options); and
- 15 4. That the applicant install a six foot (6’) tan vinyl open space fence along the  
16 north property line that be applicably built to handle snow and wind loads in the  
17 area.
- 18 5. That all accessory structures meet the minimum setbacks per the Highland City  
19 Development Code and that these structure be of similar material and color to  
20 that of the main structures; and
- 21 6. That the dumpsters be fully enclosed within an masonry enclosure with a gate  
22 and that these be additionally landscaped where visible to traffic or adjacent  
23 residential property; and
- 24 7. That all lighting be designed and shielded to be directed toward the ground and  
25 be directed away from all four property lines so that any lighting does not cross  
26 over the property lines; and
- 27 8. That the architecture be consistent with the submitted elevations not exceeding  
28 35’ in height (not including the typical spires); and
- 29 9. That a stake center not be constructed on either lot.

30  
31 **Those voting aye: Jennifer Tucker, Brent Wallace, Tony Peckson, Elizabeth**  
32 **Macfarlane, Roger Dixon, and Melissa Wright. Those voting nay: Don Blohm.**  
33

34 **Majority vote, substitute motion carried.**  
35  
36

37 **Item 4: Rocky Mountain Existing Power Pole Relocation Conditional Use Permit ~**  
38 **Public Hearing and Recommendation**  
39

40 Carly LeDuc explained the ordinance requires the power companies to come in when  
41 they are altering any power poles; this is mainly done to notify surrounding owners of  
42 any changes. There are 3 power poles that Rocky Mountain Power is working on. Staff  
43 recommendations include that they meet the height requirements, but there are no city  
44 ordinances or state or federal laws on height requirements on power poles, so that  
45 recommendation can be taken out.

1  
2 Jennifer Tucker opened the public hearing.

3  
4 Chad Ambrose, employee of Rocky Mountain Power, explained that this is a project that  
5 started about two years ago. It is a twelve mile reconductory project where we are  
6 increasing the volts from 46,000 to 138,000 volts. The objective is to provide reliability,  
7 but also to provide capacity to the Utah valley customers. The section we are talking  
8 about is approximately 1.1 miles. Without this final section we will not be able to create  
9 a loop B to our distribution substations. What we are doing in the 1.1 miles is upgrading  
10 voltage, replacing poles wood for steel, and we have three steel poles that are in concern.  
11 The north pole is the one new pole that is in question.

12  
13 The Planning Commissioners used design boards that Rocky Mountain Power had  
14 brought to review what the power poles will look like. The single pole, concrete  
15 foundation bolted in power pole will be the design used.

16  
17 Jennifer Tucker closed the public hearing.

18  
19 **Motion by Melissa Wright, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**  
20 **grant Approval of the Conditional Use Permit for Rocky Mountain Power to**  
21 **relocate power poles located at approximately 4600 West and 11000 North as per**  
22 **the recommendations of staff and Planning Commission as follows:**

- 23  
24 **1. That the applicant contact the Utah Department of Transportation to verify the**  
25 **relocation of the poles not to hinder the master expansion plan of SR-92.**  
26 **2. That Rocky Mountain Power adhere to the Highland City Dust and Mud**  
27 **Prevention Plan and ordinance with regard to dirt and debris on Highland City**  
28 **roads; and**  
29 **3. That construction activity be limited to the hours of 6:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m.**

30  
31 **Seconded by Brent Wallace.**

32  
33 **Motion by Elizabeth Macfarlane, Planning Commission to amend the original**  
34 **motion to state that the power poles be limited to the single pole design with**  
35 **concrete foundation.**

36  
37 **Seconded by Melissa Wright.**

38  
39 **Unanimous vote, amendment carried.**

40  
41 **Unanimous vote, original motion carried.**

42  
43 ~~**CANCELLED - Item 5: Planning Commission Chapter 2-Code Amendment**~~  
44 ~~**Public Hearing and Recommendation**~~

1 **Item 6: Front Yard Landscaping Section 3-4107 & 3-4207 - Code Amendment ~**  
2 **Public Hearing and Recommendation**

3  
4 Carly Leduc explained the current front yard landscaping ordinance is not very detailed  
5 and we have had residents and potential residents that do not maintain their landscaping  
6 for the duration of the property life.

7  
8 Melissa Wright brought to staff's attention some grammatical changes under the  
9 maintenance section in which how the code should read. The Planning Commission  
10 discussed these changes and they are listed below in the motion.

11  
12 Jennifer Tucker opened the public hearing.

13  
14 No comments from the public.

15  
16 Jennifer Tucker closed the public hearing.

17  
18 **Motion by Melissa Wright, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**  
19 **grant Approval of the Front Yard Landscaping Section 3-4107 & 3-4207 Code**  
20 **Amendment as per the recommendations of staff and Planning Commission with the**  
21 **following changes:**

- 22  
23 **1. That the wording "pools and fountains" be changed to "water features"; and that**  
24 **2. The wording be changed to "Prompt replacement will be required in the event**  
25 **that the landscaping falls below the minimum landscape requirements of this code";**  
26 **and**  
27 **3. That the words "existing remaining" be removed.**

28  
29 **Seconded by Don Blohm.**

30 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

31  
32 **Item 7: Public Park Definition Chapter 3 Section 4.1 & 4.2 - Code Amendment ~**  
33 **Public Hearing and Recommendation**

34  
35 Jennifer Tucker opened the public hearing.

36  
37 No comments from the public.

38  
39 Jennifer Tucker closed the public hearing.

40  
41 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked for clarification on why we need this; she said she  
42 understands we are back to the issue of open space and the open space problems, but  
43 needs some more clarification.

44  
45 Barry Edwards explained we are trying to clean up our ordinance as we go with the  
46 anticipation of a lot of different uses.

1 Elizabeth Macfarlane asked if this changes anything to do with open space.

2  
3 Barry Edwards said no.

4  
5 **Motion by Roger Dixon, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**  
6 **grant Approval of the Public Park Definition Chapter 3 Section 4.1 & 4.2 Code**  
7 **Amendment as per the recommendations of staff.**

8  
9 **Seconded by Brent Wallace.**

10 **Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

11  
12 **Item 8: Sign Ordinance - Awning Signs Chapter 3.7- Code Amendment ~ Public**  
13 **Hearing and Recommendation**

14  
15 Carly LeDuc clarified that this ordinance is specifically for awning signs; this is not for  
16 awnings that are being used for architectural enhancement. She explained that Brent  
17 Wallace took many pictures of awning signs at the Gateway Mall and those pictures are  
18 included in the packet. She stated that the only thing changed in the ordinance was the  
19 section pertaining to stripes, which had previously allowed 5 inch stripes.

20  
21 The Commissioners reviewed and discussed their opinions of the different pictures of  
22 awning signs.

23  
24 Brent Wallace stated his concern as to why awning signs are not allowed as the primary  
25 sign.

26  
27 The Commissioners discussed this matter, but came to no definitive conclusion at this  
28 time.

29  
30 Jennifer Tucker opened the public hearing.

31  
32 No comments from the public.

33  
34 Jennifer Tucker closed the public hearing.

35  
36 Brent Wallace asked if a business would have to have at least 2 awning signs with the  
37 way the code is currently written.

38  
39 Lonnie Crowell said that is currently how the code is written. A business would have to  
40 have a pan channel sign as their primary sign and then have at least 2 awning signs in  
41 order be allowed any awning signs.

42  
43 Melissa Wright asked about allowable percentages of the lettering versus the background  
44 of an awning sign. She thought in the previous meeting they had decided to allow 60%  
45 lettering and 40% background.

1 Lonnie Crowell explained that determining the percentages is up to the Planning  
2 Commission.

3  
4 Roger Dixon stated his concern about #1, on page 34 of the packet, under location that  
5 we should be very careful that where we say awning signs we mean signs and where we  
6 say awnings we mean awnings.

7  
8 Carly LeDuc said that can be clarified.

9  
10 Brent Wallace asked if there is a maximum amount of square footage a building can use  
11 for advertising. He said that will limit the amount of area that can be used.

12  
13 Lonnie Crowell explained that the ordinance does not say that. It is determined by the  
14 type of sign.

15  
16 Roger Dixon stated that he does not see why we are requiring that the primary sign be  
17 pan channel. He asked for input from the other Commissioners on this matter.

18  
19 Melissa Wright asked what is meant in the ordinance by awning signs only being allowed  
20 in designated areas; does that mean the doors and windows.

21  
22 Carly LeDuc said no, there is a designated sign area that is included within the  
23 architecture of a development.

24  
25 Roger Dixon stated that he thinks awning signs should be allowed on 2<sup>nd</sup> stories.

26  
27 Tony Peckson said that he is very conflicted on this issue. If we do approve this item  
28 allowing awning signs, we should allow the primary sign to be an awning sign and not  
29 worry about the pan channel sign. He stated that when a sign is removed a pan channel  
30 sign leaves a lot more damage than an awning sign and is more visible.

31  
32 Lonnie Crowell said he agrees about a pan channel sign leaving more visible effects.

33  
34 Melissa Wright said that if we do allow an awning sign to be their primary sign that we  
35 require it to be lit.

36  
37 Jennifer Tucker said it should be externally lit.

38  
39 **Motion by Brent Wallace, Planning Commission to recommend that City Council**  
40 **grant Approval of the Sign Ordinance, Awning Signs Chapter 3.7 Code Amendment**  
41 **as per the recommendations of staff and with the changes from the Planning**  
42 **Commission as follows:**

43  
44 **1. That in code section 3-711 the sentence “Awning signs shall not be installed as the**  
45 **primary wall signage for any business, but complimentary to an existing and**  
46 **approved pan channel sign” be removed; and**

- 1 **2. That in #2 of the staff recommendations 4 feet be changed to 3 feet; and**  
2 **3. That under the section regarding colors, add the wording extreme colors,**  
3 **including fluorescent colors; and**  
4 **4. There be up to 40%/60% allowed for awning signs, 40% being trademarks or**  
5 **lettering and 60% being neutral or negative space; and**  
6 **5. That the requirement for 2 awning signs be eliminated.**

7  
8 **Seconded by Tony Peckson.**

9  
10 **Motion by Roger Dixon to amend the original motion to strike the last sentence in**  
11 **paragraph 1 on page 34.**

12  
13 **Motion failed due to lack of second.**

14  
15 **Motion by Roger Dixon to amend the original motion to include that awnings signs**  
16 **may be allowed only over the primary entrance for 2<sup>nd</sup> story businesses.**

17  
18 **Motion failed due to lack of second.**

19  
20 **Motion by Melissa Wright to amend the original motion that if an awning is a**  
21 **primary sign, it be externally illuminated by approved architectural lighting fixture**  
22 **standards.**

23  
24 **Seconded by Elizabeth Macfarlane.**

25  
26 **Those voting aye: Melissa Wright, Elizabeth Macfarlane, Roger Dixon, Tony**  
27 **Peckson. Those voting nay: Brent Wallace, Don Blohm, & Jennifer Tucker.**  
28 **Majority vote, motion carried 4-3.**

29  
30 Melissa Wright brought up the concern about maintenance of the sign and the business  
31 getting a permit for the sign.

32  
33 Barry Edwards stated that the Planning Commission will probably want to include  
34 something about the permit expiring. Three years seems like an adequate amount of  
35 time.

36  
37 Discussion ensued among staff and the Commissioners regarding the issue of a permit  
38 and the inspection of the sign that staff may complete.

39  
40 **Motion by Roger Dixon to amend the original motion to add under #7 titled**  
41 **“applications”, that the permit for awning signs expires after 3 years.**

42  
43 **Seconded by Brent Wallace.**

44 **Unanimous vote, amendment carried.**  
45  
46

1 **Original motion:**

2 **Those voting aye: Brent Wallace, Tony Peckson, Elizabeth Macfarlane, Roger**  
3 **Dixon, & Melissa Wright. Those voting nay: Jennifer Tucker & Don Blohm.**  
4 **Majority vote, original motion carried 5-2.**

5  
6  
7 **Item 9: Sign Ordinance - Temporary Signs Chapter 3.7- Code Amendment ~ Future**  
8 **Business**

9  
10 Jennifer Tucker explained that Lonnie Crowell gave us some background information to  
11 review before we approach this item at a future meeting.

12  
13 Lonnie Crowell explained that the ordinance is inconsistent. Staff, City Council, and  
14 Planning Commission gets contacted on a regular basis about the inconsistencies.

15  
16 Jennifer Tucker stated that this is a very tough thing to address. We will definitely want  
17 to read up on and be prepared.

18  
19 Lonnie Crowell said this will be an ongoing item that we discuss when we do not have a  
20 lot of items on the agenda.

21  
22 Jennifer Tucker told the Commissioners to compile questions or concerns on how this  
23 item should be handled in future meetings. These questions and concerns can be emailed  
24 to Lonnie Crowell for answers and if he needs to, he can contact David Church, city  
25 attorney, for clarification.

26  
27 Meeting adjourned 10:05pm.