

1 **Highland City Planning Commission**  
2 **June 12, 2012**  
3

4 The regular meeting of the Highland City Planning Commission was called to order by Planning  
5 Commission Chair, Chris Kemp, at 7:02 p.m. on June 12, 2012. An invocation was offered by  
6 Commissioner Temby. Commissioner Carruth led those assembled in the Pledge of Allegiance.  
7

8 **PRESENT:** Commissioner: Chris Kemp  
9 Commissioner: Sherry Carruth  
10 Commissioner: Abe Day  
11 Commissioner: Tim Heyrend  
12 Commissioner: Scott Temby  
13 Alternate Commissioner: Lance Garrett  
14

15 **EXCUSED:** City Administrator: John Park  
16 City Engineer: Matt Shipp  
17 Commissioner: Jay Roundy  
18 Commissioner: Steve Rock  
19

20 **STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director: Nathan Crane  
21 Secretary: Jill Stewart  
22

23 **OTHERS:** Chris Dalley, Ryan Ollerton, Sharon Brocious, Jay M. Worthington, Greg Nield, Mark  
24 Hampton, Jeff Byers, Michael Nilson, Lon Nield, Pat Nield, Brooke Nield, Kristine Mansfield, David  
25 Kaylor, Brett Burns, Susanne Brough, Tracy Young, Melinda Wright, Scott Barclay, McKaiden Carruth,  
26 Gary Wright, Rebekah Kaylor, Ruth LeBaron, David Dean.  
27

28 **A. APPEARANCES**  
29

30 Commissioner Kemp turned some time over to Commissioner Abe Day.

31 Commissioner Day expressed that during the last Planning Commission meeting on April 24, 2012, there  
32 was some exchanges that we had about Patterson Construction and Commissioner Day said that in  
33 speaking with the Mayor that he would like to make a public apology for some of the things that he said.  
34 Commissioner Day indicated he met with Wayne and James Patterson to clear the air and gave them a  
35 copy of his apology letter. Commissioner Day read his apology letter at this time which is addressed to  
36 Wayne Patterson and Patterson Construction.

37 Dear Wayne, I wish to offer you my sincerest apologies for my statements directed at you and your  
38 company during the Planning Commission meeting on April 24, 2012. I am truly sorry. I feel as a  
39 Planning Commissioner it is my duty to make sure I am objective and civil with all entities that appear  
40 before the Planning Commission. I was wrong and am embarrassed that I used inappropriate words  
41 describing my impressions of you and your business. The last thing I want to do is disparage Highland  
42 businesses, existing residents, or land owners from utilizing their property to their most effective and  
43 profitable uses. I have approved and recommended some of your company's developments here in  
44 Highland and truly believe they have added beauty and value to Highland City as a whole. I want to be as  
45 helpful and approachable as possible to all Highland residents and businesses. Please feel assured as you

1 come to the Planning Commission that I will be as fair and encouraging as I can towards your future  
2 developments. Again, I apologize for any of my negative remarks toward you and your company and  
3 appreciate you calling me on it. Sincerely, Commissioner Abe Day, Highland City.

4 Commissioner Kemp thanked him for his comments and moved forward to the public appearance portion  
5 of the meeting and outlined the process for public comment.

6 Commissioner Kemp read an opening statement for the Planning Commission.  
7

8 “This Planning Commission is composed of Highland City citizens who have been appointed by  
9 the City Council to serve on the Commission as a civic responsibility. In the interest of  
10 maintaining a fair and efficient hearing, the Commission adheres to the following steps:

- 11 The Chair calls the agenda item;  
12 Staff gives a brief report and recommendation;  
13 Applicant then may give a presentation;  
14 Opposition and support give testimony, no more than three minutes per speaker;  
15 Applicant may give a response, and  
16 The Commission has a discussion and makes decision.  
17

18  
19 Anyone wishing to speak before the commission must fill out a speaker information form and  
20 hand it to Nathan Crane, Community Development Director. We expect all that participate will be  
21 civil in their public discourse and that they will be respectful of others whether they agree or  
22 disagree with any action taken. The Commission will stand against any incivility when we see it.  
23

24 We thank you in advance for your participation.”  
25

26 Commissioner Kemp invited comments from the public regarding items not on the agenda. Hearing no  
27 comments Commissioner Kemp continued with the scheduled agenda items.  
28

## 29 **A. PUBLIC HEARING AND LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

- 30  
31 1. TA-12-06 A request by Eternal Spring, LLC to amend Section 3-4606.1 of the Highland City  
32 Development Code increasing the maximum building coverage on a lot from 30% to 35% for the  
33 Senior Care Assisted Living Overlay Zone. *Legislative.*  
34

35 Nathan Crane explained the requested amendment is for a specific section in development code relating to  
36 the maximum building coverage to increase that from 30% to 35% in the Senior Care Assisted Living  
37 Overlay District (SCALO). Mr. Crane said that overlay districts allow additional uses in a particular zoning  
38 district of certain criteria. An analogy of would be to think of an overlay as a layer on a cake; the base layer  
39 is the base zoning district and this comes on top and allows additional uses under certain circumstances.  
40 In this district, in order to apply for a conditional use permit and utilize this district there has to be a  
41 minimum of 1 acre, 180 feet of frontage, located along a major arterial, <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> mile separation between similar  
42 uses, and separate license is required in addition to the state license. Mr. Crane explained that this overlay  
43 district allows assisted living and nursing care facilities through a conditional use permit. The SCALO was  
44 approved in 2009. Building coverage is determined by multiplying the square footage of the lot by the  
45 percent of building coverage allowed. It is important to note that only the footprint is addressed, not the  
46 total square footage. If it is a multi-level building, it is only the footprint of the building that is the  
47 building coverage.  
48

1 Mr. Crane indicated that included with the staff report, that there was a discussion on what happened  
2 between a first draft of the proposed ordinance and the adopted ordinance. The ordinance changed; it is  
3 common for ordinances to change. The current requirements were a part of the Planning Commission's  
4 recommendation; that is what Council saw and that is what was adopted.

5  
6 Mr. Crane further explained that this overlay district would be applied to a site; Ashford Assisted Living is  
7 looking to expand. He stated that there are a number of things that they need to address before they can  
8 expand and before they apply for a conditional use permit. The proposal from Ashford is just over a  
9 37,000 square foot building, two stories, building footprint of just over 18,000 square feet, and would  
10 result in 47 new units. As this has gone forward, there may be additional amendments that are needed to  
11 the overlay district to accommodate this use. Mr. Crane advised that if the applicant has additional  
12 amendments, the Commission may want to hear those all at once as opposed to a piece meal manner.

13  
14 Mr. Crane stated that the requested increase from 30% to 35% would allow for just over an additional  
15 2,000 square feet of building footprint for every acre of ground. On the proposed site, that translates to  
16 just over 4,500 square feet. Mr. Crane said that research was done on lot coverage on our non-residential  
17 zoning districts. The C-1 zone, Kohler's site, has 25% lot coverage; the CR zone, Taco Time area, has  
18 30%; RP zone, office buildings on the corner of SR74 and SR92 and The Pointe, has 25% lot coverage;  
19 the PO zone, Highland Boulevard, allows up to 40% at the discretion of the Planning Commission; the  
20 Town Center has no maximum lot coverage and that is on purpose because an urban feel is trying to be  
21 created and building mass is one of the most important things to create that feel. Research in other cities  
22 showed no consistency for building coverage requirements. Some cities do require that assisted living  
23 facilities be located and have a similar size and scale to the surrounding residential uses.

24  
25 Mr. Crane went over some things to consider. The first consideration is applicability; this change is being  
26 proposed to accommodate a specific plan. This change would apply to any development utilizing this  
27 overlay district. The second consideration is compatibility; one of the key things that the Planning  
28 Commission is charged with is balancing private property rights with resident needs and concerns.  
29 Compatibility is a big issue for the Commission, staff, and City Council to address. Mr. Crane indicated  
30 that some of the important things as it relates to this request is the building size and location. Those have  
31 direct correlation to the intensity of the use on the site and can affect compatibility. The final  
32 consideration is residential character; what type of character is trying to be created. The purpose of the  
33 overlay district is to allow these facilities as a residential character integrated with surrounding residential  
34 uses.

35  
36 Mr. Crane indicated that the Planning Commission needs to hold a public hearing and determine if the  
37 amendment is consistent with the purpose and intent of the development code in this district, if it would  
38 result in compatible land use relationships, not adversely affect the community, and if it is needed at this  
39 time. Mr. Crane said that if there is an additional amendment needed, he thought there may be one and  
40 the applicant could clarify this, the Commission may want to make a recommendation on both of those  
41 amendments at the same meeting.

42  
43 Commissioner Temby asked for clarification on the  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile separation. Mr. Crane explained that facilities  
44 that utilize this district or other nursing or care facilities cannot be located within  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile of another  
45 facility in Highland City. Mr. Crane said that he listened to the meeting recordings of when this overlay  
46 district was approved and they were aware of the Cedar Hills facility and did not raise concern.

47  
48 Greg Nield, applicant, explained that they have several sketches they have looked at over the course of the  
49 last few months. He said there was a plan that he had shown Mr. Crane and the Mayor; at that time they  
50 understood that there were some discrepancies in the code that were brought to their attention. At that

1 point, they stopped working on the floor plans. The property to the north of the existing facility was  
2 purchased by them and they are looking to expand and offer assisted living without the dementia care.  
3

4 Commissioner Kemp clarified that Mr. Nield is requesting the increase from 30-35% for the lot coverage.  
5 Mr. Nield indicated that is correct. Commissioner Kemp asked if there would need to be a change to the  
6 existing setback regulations. Mr. Nield said that he received an email last week from Mr. Crane asking  
7 what the future expansion rear setback was; Mr. Nield indicated it was approximately between 30-40 feet.  
8 At that point, Mr. Crane informed him that the development code requirement was 80 feet; Mr. Nield was  
9 under the impression it was 30 feet. Mr. Nield explained that they then looked in the development code  
10 under the building section setback and it discusses 30 feet from the rear property line; then a couple of  
11 pages after that, an 80 foot setback is discussed. Mr. Nield at that time identified this was another  
12 discrepancy that would need to be brought up, but because of public noticing requirements, it could not  
13 be on tonight's meeting agenda.  
14

15 Commissioner Kemp clarified to the Commission that tonight only the lot coverage is being addressed,  
16 but at some point, it sounds like another part of the code would need to be addressed at a future date.  
17

18 Commissioner Temby asked if there was a plan to expand when the original facility was built. Mr. Nield  
19 said there was to the east; at that time that was the plan. In the meantime, there has been a lot of interest  
20 in regular assisted living without the dementia care. Commissioner Temby asked if at the original  
21 application time if there was any consideration for any height restrictions. Mr. Nield said at that time they  
22 knew it was 35 feet, so they kept that in mind. Commissioner Temby asked if the residents to the east are  
23 the same ones as when Mr. Nield originally approached the City Council. Mr. Nield, with help from the  
24 audience, indicated they are the same residents.  
25

26 Commissioner Temby asked if the plans now are preliminary based upon what the City Council approves;  
27 Mr. Nield explained that he was under the impression that he had 35% for lot coverage and when they  
28 found out otherwise, they put those plans on hold. Mr. Nield said he looked into it and found the code  
29 had changed; it was not ever discussed in a Planning Commission or City Council meeting. He said that  
30 with the help of Mr. Crane, they reviewed notes and meeting minutes and could not find documentation  
31 of why it changed to 30%. So in order to get that percentage increased a code amendment was required  
32 and the reason the request is before the Commission tonight. The current building covers 28% of the lot.  
33

34 Mr. Nield expressed that if the lot coverage is left at 30%, that it would not work for the business and they  
35 would not be able to move forward and offer regular assisted living. At 35%, it makes sense for them.  
36 Their banks and investors asked for specific numbers in order to get loans. Mr. Nield explained that for  
37 dementia care the rooms are typically very small compared to regular assisted living facilities. For  
38 dementia patients it is confusing to have a large area, so small rooms work best. The goal is to provide  
39 regular assisted living which requires more space. Mr. Nield expressed that in his opinion the business  
40 model of a Beehive Home does not sell well to this population and area.  
41

42 Commissioner Temby asked if the intent is to have a second story only on the site to the north. Mr. Nield  
43 clarified that the existing structure would not be expanded upward.  
44

45 The Commission chose to hear the comments from the public at this time on the lot coverage and then  
46 make a recommendation at the next meeting for both the lot coverage and setbacks.  
47

48 Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing.  
49

1 Susanne Brough lives directly behind the Ashford Assisted Care Center and has lived here for 20 years.  
2 She stated that their last home backed the golf course and they were not able to use their backyard because  
3 it was bombarded with golf balls. They moved to the Wildrose Subdivision. She said they have a very  
4 small yard and are most directly affected by the current building. Ms. Brough said that her father was in a  
5 dementia care unit for 2 ½ years and she wishes this facility would have been here six years ago. It is a  
6 beautiful unit as it stands now and is well run; they have done a great job following the code. When she  
7 heard the adjoining lot was purchased and they wanted to increase the size of the building, she became a  
8 little alarmed because she was concerned about the setbacks. She said they are following the landscape  
9 setback almost; she believes it is close to 80 feet. Ms. Brough then went and read the development code  
10 and found that the structure needs to be 30 feet from the property, but it needs to be 80 feet from  
11 residential property. She said they want to hold them to the 80 feet. After thinking about the setbacks,  
12 another concern became the amount of people that would be in the structure behind their home. Ms.  
13 Brough said she called the Charleston facility, in Cedar Hills, and they built on commercial property and  
14 they have about 61 residents currently with 91% capacity, but generally run at 95% capacity. She stated  
15 that based on the expansion plan she saw for Ashford, they want 63 units and that is when she became a  
16 little alarm. She feels like such a large facility should have been planned for and built on commercial  
17 ground initially. She requested that they follow the development code standards.

18  
19 Commissioner Garrett asked for clarification on the setbacks being adjacent to commercial/residential  
20 areas. Mr. Crane explained that adjacent to existing residential it requires an 80 landscape setback. The  
21 main structure rear setback is 30 feet. The setbacks apply to any development in this district.

22  
23 Gary Wright owns two properties; horse property directly south of the assisted living and then another  
24 property in Wildrose which is one of the four right by the assisted living facility. Mr. Wright said the folks  
25 at Ashford have been great neighbors. He indicated that the concerns that were raised when the facility  
26 was first proposed have not been an issue and the facility has been a great use there. He said he would  
27 probably prefer this as a neighbor rather than a regular neighbor. Mr. Wright stated that this issue boils  
28 down to three things, two story and too large of a facility, the view will be diminished, and the third issue  
29 may be increased traffic. Mr. Wright distributed copies to the Commission of properties in the area for  
30 consideration to keep consistency with the surrounding properties. He indicated that the view is to the  
31 east and that no one's complaint is going to be losing the view of 4800 West and the high school. He said  
32 this type of use is going to generate less traffic than any other type of commercial use. He stated he is in  
33 favor of this use.

34  
35 Ryan Ollerton occupies one of the homes directly across the fence from the Ashford center. Initially,  
36 when the area was rezoned their main concerns were buffering the existing homes. He said he is very  
37 pleased with Ashford, but the current proposal seems to encroach on that buffer. He is against increasing  
38 the size; it is too much of a building for such a small lot. Mr. Ollerton said he understands wanting to buy  
39 only a little bit of land for a facility; he is a doctor doing the same thing in American Fork. In this scenario  
40 with overlay and mixed used, he strongly urges the Commission to maintain the setbacks at 80 feet and try  
41 to prevent this two story going right behind their homes. Mr. Ollerton expressed that a two story home  
42 on a one acre lot is different than a two story motel 30 feet from the fence. He suggested they build a  
43 similar sized structure to what is existing. He said if they wish to have such a large facility that they should  
44 look to procure more land. He said most of the home's views look to the west in this neighborhood. Mr.  
45 Ollerton closed by saying he likes Ashford and wants them to be there and expand, but just done in the  
46 right way to not have such an impact on the homes.

47  
48 Rebekah Kaylor reiterated what many of the neighbors have said. She recognize that the City is trying to  
49 different ways to restructure some land use. Ms. Kaylor said she does support them in trying to find the  
50 right fit. She stated they are only requesting to maintain the current code. She referenced the setbacks in

1 the code. She said that the existing residential setbacks requirements were addressed later in the code in  
2 the landscaping; she said this is not an error, it is just that the existing residential dwelling situation was  
3 addressed in the rear setback with landscaping. Ms. Kaylor stated that when 47 additional units are  
4 looking to be added, that is no longer a family feasible size and that will significantly impact the land and  
5 surrounding structures. She expressed that not only the equity of the properties will be affected, but safety  
6 and protection will be impacted because of the increase of patients, families, employees. She closed by  
7 asking that the protections that have already been set in place be maintained.  
8

9 Tracy Young stated that she has been a Highland resident for about 9 years and also has worked at  
10 Ashford as a CNA since about November. She expressed that the standard of care at Ashford is great;  
11 Greg has set very high standards. Ms. Young expressed that this facility has provided employment to  
12 several Highland residents. She views this facility as an asset.  
13

14 Sharon Brocious has lived in Highland for 47 years. She is also employed at the Ashford facility. She  
15 remarked that her friend's spouse is at the facility; it is the third home she has been at and it has been  
16 great. Ms. Brocious said that having lived here for 47 years, a lot of things have changed; we have to  
17 welcome change. We all have aging parents. We need to have a facility that we know and trust and know  
18 patients are being taken care of.  
19

20 Melinda Wright has lived in Highland for a year; she moved here a year after her husband passed away.  
21 She has found an amazing job and loves being at the Ashford. She indicated that she does not know if she  
22 will be able to support herself if the facility is not able to expand. Ms. Wright said she hopes that the  
23 Commission will think of all the angles that affect the expansion of the facility.  
24

25 Ruth LeBaron has lived in Highland for 22 years. She works at Ashford and has enjoyed working there.  
26 She said that the residents that are concerned about the facility and the expansion, they have said they are  
27 good neighbors and she agrees with that 100%. Ms. LeBaron indicated that those individuals who come  
28 visit patients at the facility do not appear to create any threat to the surrounding homes. She posed the  
29 possibility if setbacks could be delineated and the option of expanding more on a single level. Ms.  
30 LeBaron said in her opinion the view of the residents is not going to be changed by a two story building.  
31 Her opinion is that they cannot see beyond the Ashford currently. If there is mixed use, she cannot think  
32 of a better use there.  
33

34 David Dean has lived here for about 15 years; he grew up in American Fork. For the last 10 years, he has  
35 been involved in taking care of his parents. He expressed that in the event anyone has to experience that,  
36 you will try many different options. In his search, they have experimented with many different options for  
37 his family. When Ashford opened up a couple of years ago, they found the option that worked. His  
38 mother was the first patient at Ashford. Mr. Dean expressed that the facility became his mother's home.  
39 He said it was a real answer to prayer. He is thankful for a facility in Highland like this; we need these  
40 types of facilities here. He encouraged the Commission to do whatever they have to keep this type of  
41 facility in Highland.  
42

43 David Kaylor, owns the property just east of the piece where the facility is looking to expand. He  
44 addressed the question raised earlier as to what knowledge they had of the facility's expansion; they were  
45 never under the impression they would be expanding as they would want to. Mr. Kaylor said that when  
46 they say they have no problem with the current Ashford, that is true, but the expanded Ashford does have  
47 some concerns. He indicated that this is not about the view or the ethics of the Ashford or the  
48 employment opportunity. He stated that what affects them is their property and what they moved in to.  
49 Mr. Kaylor said that Ashford may have a nice facility, but that does not mean he needs to subsidize their  
50 new property just because they are good folks. The reason those setbacks are in there is so that they can

1 maintain their property values that they paid for. He is asking for their personal space and property value  
2 to be maintained. He is also speaking for other residential properties who may be faced with similar  
3 situations at a future time with this overlay zone.  
4 Scott Barclay has lived here about 30 years. He said the city has changed a lot, but that they expect to have  
5 some change. He indicated that he was quite please when they learned an assisted living facility was  
6 coming here. They had an experience when he aging father-in-law fell and broke his help; they had him  
7 live with them for a year. Their needs are different and it is challenging. Mr. Barclay expressed that they  
8 may have to put him to an assisted living facility as his health is deteriorating and it would be a benefit to  
9 have a facility close by. He feels a facility like this in our community would be a great benefit.

10  
11 Bret Burns lives in the Wildrose subdivision, but he does not abut Ashford. He used to be a partner with  
12 Greg in managing assisted living facility. His facility was 120 units. He said that what he is really  
13 supporting is thinking of those neighbors abutting the facility. Mr. Burns said he has property behind him  
14 and now that it has been changed to mixed use, so anything that happens here could happen to his  
15 property. He is here to advocate that we do not change existing codes and we keep some buffers for all  
16 the neighbors.

17  
18 Greg Nield, and his architect Michael Nilson, addressed the Commission again at this time. Mr. Nield said  
19 that he wants to be clear on the setback; on the approved site plan they received from the City shows their  
20 expansion and it is within the 30 feet setback, it is not an 80 foot setback. Mr. Nield stated that Mike  
21 Walch was on the Planning Commission when the item came through; Greg spoke with him yesterday and  
22 Mr. Walch expressed in regards to the setback discrepancy that he had never heard of an 80 foot setback.  
23 Mr. Nield said that they have looked into all of the different codes in Highland and there is not one area  
24 that is required to have an 80 foot setback with a structure on it. The most landscape they found with  
25 existing commercial buildings is about 16 feet. Mr. Nield stated the he believes this was a clerical error  
26 with the discrepancy on the setbacks.

27  
28 Michael Nilson, architect, gave some information on assisted living centers. The state of Utah has codes  
29 to ensure the appropriate amenities. A facility has to be a certain size to provide all the amenities require.  
30 Zoning ordinances are built so that certain types of businesses can be in certain areas. The way the  
31 economic climate is now and the way lenders are requiring a certain amount of money to be returned and  
32 the state requirements, assisted living facilities need to be of a certain size to work, otherwise they are not  
33 viable. Mr. Nilson indicated that an assisted living facility would not work on this designated site unless  
34 the percentage is increased. He asked to look at how the code was rewritten and see where the  
35 discrepancy came from and take that into account. Commissioner Kemp stated that they also have the  
36 obligation to look out for property rights of other people and compatibility.

37  
38 Commissioner Garrett asked why a new proposed structure could not support assisted living and dementia  
39 care. Mr. Nilson said that dementia care has to be separated from a regular assisted living facility. There  
40 are certain space requirements from the state code. Commissioner Temby asked if there is a minimum  
41 square footage required for a mix of dementia and assisted living care facility. Mr. Nield said they could  
42 look at doing a Beehive Home and the cost is less because of the level of care is less. He indicated they  
43 would rather not be in the business of providing less services and have the revenue be less per month.  
44 Commissioner Temby indicated he is really curious if they have a design in mind with the current  
45 ordinances. Mr. Nield said with the setback discrepancy they do not, but at the next meeting they can look  
46 at having something like that. Mr. Nilson said the current building does not meet the current setback; it is  
47 only at 73 feet. This is one of the reasons they were surprised by this.

48  
49 Commissioner Day indicated he was on the Commission when this came through; he thinks that this was  
50 the first mixed use area that they approved. If he remembers correctly, they may have included the

1 language about the 80 foot setback in the code after seeing the original plan. He did not remember  
2 looking at any other set back areas. He said it is within their realm to make it more consistent with other  
3 areas. Commissioner Day discussed the aging population and needs for facilities in the future.  
4

5 **MOTION: Commissioner Heyrend moved that the Planning Commission table this item until we**  
6 **can discuss the setbacks and the additional amenities.**

7 The question was asked if we are waiting because no notice was given regarding the setback issue. Mr.  
8 Crane said that is correct; whenever an amendment is done to the development code, it is posted in the  
9 Daily Herald. That allows people interested to know what is being amended. In this particular instance,  
10 we only advertise the amendment for building coverage. We did not know that a request for setbacks was  
11 needed until late last week.

12 Commissioner Carruth asked if at the next meeting if we can know if other commercial properties that  
13 back other residential areas have an 80 foot setback. Mr. Crane said there is one in the CR zone that has a  
14 100 foot setback, but the others are less than that.

15 **Commissioner Garrett asked if it can be added to the motion to discuss maximum building**  
16 **height. Commissioner Heyrend indicated that is fine.**

17 **Motion seconded by Commissioner Garrett.**

18 **Those voting aye: Commissioner Garrett, Commissioner Temby, Commissioner Heyrend,**  
19 **Commissioner Carruth, Commissioner Kemp. Those voting nay: Commissioner Day. The**  
20 **amended motion carried with a majority vote; 5:1.**

21 **B. OTHER BUSINESS**

22  
23 No other business items for discussion.

24 **C. COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**

25  
26 **D. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR APRIL 24, 2012 – REGULAR MEETING**  
27

28 **MOTION: Commissioner Temby moved to approve the Meeting Minutes for April 24, 2012 as**  
29 **amended. Motion seconded by Commissioner Carruth. Unanimous vote, motion carried.**  
30

31 **E. PLANNING STAFF REPORT**  
32

- 33 • Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Budget

34  
35 Mr. Crane explained that the City Council has reduced the Planning Commission budget which will  
36 result in having one meeting a month. We are trying to target the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month for the  
37 meeting.

- 38 • Planning Commission Email Address

39  
40 An email has been set up on the website so that if anyone wishes to email the Commission, they  
41 can click on it and it will get sent to all of the Commissioners.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

- Recent City Council Actions

There was a work session on the trails master plan and then on July 28<sup>th</sup> there will be a tour of the trails at 8 AM with the Council. Residents and the Commission are welcome to attend.

The Council has talked about doing a discussion on density. That will come to the Commission in July or August.

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Commissioner Garrett moved to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Heyrend. Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

**Meeting adjourned at [8:36:36 PM](#).**