

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, February 27, 2018 7:00 p.m.
Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: David Driggs, Presiding
Commissioners: Jared Anderson, John Dredge, Jeff Dodge, LoriAnne Spear,
Steven Thomas
Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
Joel Wright, City Attorney
Jenny Peay, Planning Associate
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder
Others: Mr. Wardell, Mr. Greenwood

1. Call to Order

This meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by David Driggs.

2. Public Comment: Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns and comments (limited to three minutes per person with a total of 30 minutes for this item)

Steve Profit recognized the members of a local Scout Troop.

C. Driggs recognized C. Anderson as alternate member of the Planning Commission. He said there were openings on the Planning Commission and he encouraged people to serve.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Review/Recommendation on Preliminary Approval for the Wardell Subdivision, located at approximately 9730 N Canyon Road
There were no comments.
- Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 6A: Planned Commercial Development Projects Related to Conditional Uses in the SC-1 Commercial Zone

Ted Davis, resident close to the development, said he and his neighbors had opposed any development in this area because it was not appropriate for commercial. He said they thought it would increase traffic in that area and was difficult for vehicles to go south from the development. He asked that they block off the ability for vehicles to go south to help residents in the area. He noted that the land was owned by Cedar Hills but it was in American Fork City and they might use any means to stop the City from putting in an entrance that affected their neighborhood.

Mr. Davis, another resident who lived close to the development, said that he did not want the traffic pushed on to their road. They were concerned with traffic and asked they block off the entrance and exit. He said the Commission could influence the American Fork City Council on this decision.

Steve Profit, resident whose home bordered the development, said he also did not want an exit onto their road.

- Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 4B & 4F Related to Accessory Structures in the R-1-15,000 and the RR-1-20,000 Rural Residential Zones

Hance Hunter, resident, asked how the change would affect the property. C. Driggs said they would address the topic in the agenda. He said the main change was to give residents the option based on their lot size to have a taller structure. Mr. Hunter said this was their primary concern, and C. Driggs said the proposed amendments would add flexibility to the developments.

- Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 5-32 Related to Accessory Apartments

There were no comments.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

3. Approval of Minutes from the January 23, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION: C. Spear—To approve the minutes from the January 23, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting. Seconded by C. Thomas.

Aye -	C. Dodge
	C. Dredge
	C. Driggs
	C. Spear
	C. Thomas
	Motion passes

4. Review/Recommendation on Preliminary Approval for the Wardell Subdivision

Chandler Goodwin, City Manager passed out a packet with information regarding the Open Public Meetings Act. He asked the Commission to look over the packet and said he would answer any questions.

Mr. Goodwin said the Wardell subdivision would be going from one lot to two. He said construction would start in two or three weeks on Canyon Road. With the construction they would widen the road and install a sewer line. Homes in this area were on septic systems and this would allow the residents to connect their homes. He said Mr. Wardell had access off Canyon Road and approved a second access. They planned on installing sidewalk, curb, and gutter. He reiterated that this would be an easy subdivision.

C. Thomas asked if the out building was eight feet, to which Mr. Goodwin answered in the affirmative. Mr. Wardell noted the setback would be 15 feet from the property.

C. Dodge said that both lots would be single family homes. Mr. Goodwin said that Lot 1 would be 34,000 square feet and Lot 2 would be 15,900 square feet.

C. Driggs asked about the parking. Mr. Wardell said their plan was to modernize the property and put in a garage. Mr. Goodwin added that the parking plans would be addressed when building plans came forward. C. Driggs clarified that this motion was to approve the preliminary plan.

MOTION: C. Thomas—To recommend approval of the preliminary plan for the Wardell Subdivision, located at approximately 9730 N Canyon Road. Seconded by C. Dredge.

Aye	-	C. Dodge
		C. Dredge
		C. Driggs
		C. Spear
		C. Thomas

Motion passes

5. Review/Action on a Conceptual Plan for the Property located at approximately 9826 North County Boulevard in the SC-1 Commercial Zone

Mr. Goodwin said they were discussing the conceptual plan not the preliminary plan on this item. He said he understood the entrance on south end was a sensitive subject. He explained the concept plan and said they were willing to make changes. He noted a key feature was the ability to walk from one side of the property to another. They were analyzing logistical features for safety, public works, and convenience.

C. Anderson asked about the minimum number of ingresses and egresses on the subject property. Mr. Goodwin said the code did not require a certain number. However, the number of ingresses/egressess on 4800 was determined by UDOT. He said there were no requirements for a cut-out but one was warranted by the traffic flow throughout the area. C. Anderson asked why there was a roundabout and if it had a functional purpose. Mr. Goodwin explained the landscaping requirements and said the code required a certain amount of open space.

C. Dodge asked if part of the subject property became City property. Mr. Goodwin said the green space may be dedicated to the City.

C. Thomas said he was concerned about the setbacks for the larger buildings. Mr. Goodwin explained where the property line would be located and said a minimum of 30 foot setbacks were required. C. Thomas asked how they determined the setback. Mr. Goodwin said it depended on the use and size. He said that none of the buildings were higher than two stories. C. Thomas said the parking for the storage facility was small and he asked if there was a provision to provide more parking if that area developed. Mr. Goodwin said storage facilities have minimal parking needs but the property might not always be a storage facility; it could be repurposed at some point. C. Thomas said he was concerned if the property did not stay the proposed use it would not have adequate parking. Mr. Goodwin said they did not need to plan for the max use because any of the buildings could require additional parking. He said there could be shared parking agreements with some of the office buildings' parking lots. C. Thomas said they would not have to approve the additional plat as part of this development. He said the two uses for the larger buildings were not allowed in the zone. He asked what the process would be for changing the land use. Mr. Goodwin said they would discuss that issue next but they were trying to do these issues in tandem for the purposes of the public hearing.

C. Spear asked if they would arrange the buildings so the greater potential for traffic would be away from the homes. Mark Greenwood with Openshaw Properties said the matter had been discussed; presently, they were still in the conceptual stages and they were open to suggestions.

C. Spear said they could help lower the level of concern of the residents by arranging the buildings away from their homes. Mr. Greenwood said when they do the traffic study they would be more competent to make a decision on how to arrange the development. C. Spear said she thought they were over parked because she had never seen the two office buildings in the plan. Mr. Greenwood said they had several options but he did not know what would be critical for the owners. C. Spear asked what type of office building they would build, and Mr. Greenwood said it would be a professional building. C. Spear said she was also concerned how the street cutouts were being planned. Mr. Greenwood said they were trying to address technical issues to make street access efficient and explained what their potential options were for the access.

C. Anderson asked about the driveway to north. Mr. Greenwood explained that it could be transformed into parking with minor modifications.

C. Spear asked if the size of the training center was necessary, and she was informed by Mr. Greenwood that the size shown was what was specifically requested. Mr. Goodwin added there was no minimum threshold in the code.

C. Dodge said he was concerned about access on the south side. He said there was a roadway on the east side of mortuary and suggested an option for access. Mr. Goodwin explained there was an access on the north end and they wanted people to access the whole development. He said this was made difficult by the existing roads and developments. They needed more information, options, and the traffic study to make their decision on access. C. Dodge said he was concerned these facilities looked big near the neighborhoods. Mr. Goodwin said they could provide examples to address these issues. C. Dodge said he liked the circle because it slowed traffic down but made it easy to move through the development. He said he thought they could change the arrangement and architecture to solve some of the issues.

C. Dredge said there should be more discussion on the exit. He asked if there was a better location for the dumpsters if they were accessed during the day. Mr. Goodwin agreed they needed to adjust the dumpsters and indicated that this would be taken into consideration.

C. Dodge asked if they designed the office buildings to be situated a part from one another, could the access be changed. Mr. Greenwood said that was a valid thought and clarified the area was not big enough for a roundabout to function. Mr. Greenwood said there was several traffic calming devices that were similar to a roundabout. C. Dodge made another suggestion for the access to ease traffic. Mr. Greenwood said this was a difficult situation trying to balance traffic with trying to market the development and accommodating the residents to the south.

C. Spear was concerned with having the dumpster in back near the residents. Mr. Greenwood said they could look at other options.

C. Driggs said they should pick a name for the athletic training facility. He made some suggestions on Building E and the access. He thought the access to south should be a right turn only. He suggested a second cutout by Building F with a right turn only. Mr. Goodwin said there needed to be access by building F and explained there could be unintended consequences

of having right in right out. C. Driggs said if they decided on one entrance he recommended they push that entrance west. He asked if it would be possible to coordinate with UDOT, and Mr. Goodwin said this could potentially delay the project.

Mr. Greenwood said the road classification on 4800 had changed. They now had a minimum of 600 feet separation on an access.

C. Driggs said they wanted the indoor storage facility to be climate controlled, and tenants will need to understand the hours of operation. Mr. Goodwin said he did not believe these items were in the agreement; however, they had discussed limiting access during certain hours. There was further deliberation on the matter.

C. Spear said they should have an area where parents could wait for students leaving the training facility. Mr. Goodwin said there was discussion about using the park as a retention basin. Mr. Greenwood noted there was insufficient storage for this particular use.

C. Driggs listed several items he wanted for the park, including tables for parents and situating the playground to the east away from traffic. He noted that the concept plans showed four drive-thru restaurants, whereas the residents had expressed a desire for sit down restaurants. He requested that the applicant consider fitting sit down restaurants into the design. Mr. Greenwood said they were open to options on the north side and noted they would have room for modestly sized sit down restaurants. C. Driggs asked what type of restaurants these areas would attract, and Mr. Goodwin asked the Commission to keep in mind this was a conditional use discussion.

Joel Wright, City Attorney, said choosing restaurants was not in their limits of power.

C. Driggs asked if they planned on building the entire development at once and Mr. Greenwood said there would be phases. He explained there were tenants that were eager to move forward and they would build first; however, the other tenants were not available at that time. C. Driggs asked if they had a projected timeline. Mr. Greenwood said he guessed it would be a two to three year project. C. Driggs said his concern was granting a permissible use for the storage and training facilities because they did not generate tax revenue. He said they would like some show of commitment. Mr. Greenwood said he had known Mr. Openshaw for 15 years; Mr. Openshaw had been in business for 20 years and generated 6,000 projects. Mr. Greenwood was confident in Mr. Openshaw's ability to deliver the product being discussed.

C. Thomas said they had no guarantee and if they rezoned there was no recourse. Mr. Goodwin agreed with C. Thomas. C. Thomas said he was concerned about the athletic facility being close to the high school. He said they needed to ensure the traffic was slow. Mr. Goodwin said they needed to address the walkability. C. Thomas said he liked the roundabout because it forced traffic to slow. Mr. Goodwin said if they had speed tables every 100 feet, traffic would be calmed. C. Thomas agreed they needed to control the traffic for safety concerns. Mr. Goodwin said that was the purpose of doing a traffic study and noted that the data would provide better direction.

C. Driggs asked why the office buildings were not uniform in shape. Mr. Greenwood said when they created the layouts they tried to meet parking requirements. They started with the primary source of revenue for the developer and moved from that point. He expressed his gratitude and said they did not want to force anything and were open to feedback. C. Driggs asked what would be the outcome if they approved the conceptual plan but later the Council denied the uses. Mr. Wright subsequently described what would happen if this matter went to the Council.

C. Driggs said they should be approving the permitted uses during the public hearing process. Mr. Goodwin said the public hearing had already taken place. Prior to making a motion, the Commission briefly reviewed the discussion points that had taken place during this item.

MOTION: C. Dredge—To approve the conceptual plan for the Cedar Hills Gateway Commercial Subdivision. Seconded by C. Driggs.

C. Dodge said he wanted to make sure they understood what they were approving. Mr. Goodwin read code Title 11 Chapter 4, 11-4-2. He said they were not giving the developer any vesting rights by approving a concept plan.

C. Spear asked when to expect the preliminary plan, and Mr. Greenwood said it would be prepared in a few weeks.

C. Driggs called for roll call vote on the motion.

Aye	-	C. Dodge
		C. Dredge
		C. Driggs
		C. Spear
No	-	C. Thomas
		Motion passes

6. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 6A: Planned Commercial Development Projects Related to Conditional Uses in the SC-1 Commercial Zone

Mr. Goodwin said they were asking to consider uses not currently allowed in this zone and noted there were two motions to review as part of this item. They would give a recommendation to allow indoor climate control as a conditional use in a mixed retail zone. The other motion would be to give a recommendation to adjust the boundary for an overlay zone.

C. Driggs asked why the climate control was only a part of the motion. Mr. Goodwin said the athletic training facility was already a permitted use.

C. Thomas asked if there was an overlay with the site plan. Mr. Goodwin explained where the overlay would be situated in the development.

C. Driggs asked if the City Park was permitted in this zone, to which Mr. Goodwin replied that the park was considered open space. C. Driggs said he wanted to see a closer presentation of what they were approving before they considered approving non-tax generating facilities. Mr. Goodwin said they were changing uses in the zone, not approving a rezone.

C. Anderson explained that this was a function of the code and wondered if this would be an issue if the City had a more established code. C. Driggs said they needed to make a vote regardless of the code function.

C. Dodge said in the past they had discussed options for mitigating commercial and single family developments; he asked if the overlay would address those concerns. Mr. Goodwin said an overlay zone accomplished two things: (1) it created a buffer by allowing for a softer retail that the residents would use; and (2) it would provide more options for filling open spaces. C. Thomas asked if they had to do both, and he was informed that one or the other were possibilities. C. Thomas said he did not have a problem with changing the boundaries; however, he was not sure he wanted to approve the proposed conditional uses.

C. Dredge said he works near a storage facility and they did not receive much traffic. He said these facilities made for a good quiet zone to buffer against residential.

Mr. Goodwin said the architecture of the indoor storage facility would matter. He agreed with C. Dredge that the facility would not impact the area negatively. The facility would not provide sales tax but it would provide services and some property tax. There was also a demand for an indoor storage facility with climate control. He said that nothing in this zone would dramatically change the sales tax for the City.

C. Spear asked if the final sale and closing depended upon tonight's decision. Mr. Goodwin said yes; however, other uses could also be explored. C. Driggs said the tenants would continue to be lined up and the timeline could be extended.

MOTION: C. Spear—To recommend a change in the boundaries of the Retail and Mixed Use Districts by allowing the Mixed Use District to overlay the Retail District within three hundred feet of a Cedar Hills residential zone. Seconded by C. Dodge.

Aye	-	C. Dodge C. Dredge C. Spear C. Thomas
No	-	C. Driggs

Motion passes

MOTION: C. Dredge—To recommend indoor, climate controlled storage and general office space as a conditional use in the Mixed Use District of the SC-1 Commercial Zone. Seconded by C. Dodge.

C. Spear said she wanted to see concept images of the proposed facility. C. Thomas said they were not the land use authority; rather, this was the Council's authority. The Commission further discussed the motion. C. Driggs stated that this would be an agenda item for the upcoming City Council meeting.

C. Driggs called for roll call vote on the motion.

Aye	-	C. Dodge
-----	---	----------

		C. Dredge
		C. Spear
		C. Thomas
No	-	C. Driggs
		Motion passes

Mr. Goodwin said the applicant still needed to provide building elevations. Mr. Greenwood said he was not sure if they currently had elevations available at this particular site; however, he could bring examples of similar locations. Mr. Goodwin said the challenge would be to make the buildings look colonial.

7. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 4B & 4F Related to Accessory Structures in the R-1-15,000 and the RR-1-20,000 Rural Residential Zones

Mr. Goodwin said the current codes allowed for accessory structures to be built up to 20 feet high. The proposed amendments would allow structures to be higher in certain cases.

MOTION: C. Dodge—To recommend the proposed amendments to Cedar Hills Municipal Code Title 10, Chapter 4B relating to accessory buildings. Seconded by C. Dredge.

C. Driggs suggested subjecting the motion to include the language that is in the proposed amendments.

MOTION: C. Dodge—To modify the motion to reference the suggested code changes indicated in red included as part of the Planning Commission packet. Seconded by C. Dredge.

Aye	-	C. Dodge
		C. Dredge
		C. Driggs
		C. Spear
		C. Thomas
		Motion passes

8. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 5-32 Related to Accessory Apartments

Mr. Goodwin and Jenny Peay, Planning Associate, presented the staff report. Staff reviewed the current accessory apartment code as listed above, and was recommending a number of changes as it related to occupancy, sale, permitting, and parking for accessory apartments. Cedar Hills wished to ease the process for residents who currently had an accessory apartment as well as those who wished to have them. Additionally, as the City sought to develop a moderate income housing plan, accessory apartments would be key in determining the housing stock available to those whose adjusted gross income met the requirements of needing moderate income housing. The proposed code was taken from a number of cities in the State that regulated the zoning requirements of an accessory apartment.

In response to a question from C. Dredge, Ms. Peay noted City Administration would be the land use authority.

C. Driggs and Mr. Goodwin discussed the language in the code regarding approvals. Mr. Goodwin said there was not necessarily one person on staff that made approvals; rather, this was more of an administrative position. When a developer complies with the building code they would need to also comply with the zoning code or they would not get approval. C. Driggs suggested they title the positions the “zoning administrator” and “building official” for the approval process. Mr. Goodwin agreed with the suggestion and said the powers should also be delegated.

Ms. Peay said most of the language they used in the code came from other cities in Utah. She then explained the time limit clause in the code. C. Driggs asked if there would only be one fee, and Ms. Peay said there would only be fees for the conditional use permit. Mr. Goodwin added there could also be inspection fees.

C. Thomas asked if this was only for new construction, to which Mr. Goodwin replied this would be for both old and new construction. He also noted that old construction would still need to be inspected. C. Thomas asked about the owner occupied fee, and Mr. Goodwin said homes could not be subdivided.

Ms. Peay said the annual registration fee could be subject to discussion. She read more from the code concerning the building permit. C. Driggs asked about the bathrooms and kitchens in these buildings, and Ms. Peay said this was not that part of the code. C. Dodge expressed concerns with safety issues. The intent of the code was for the City to make approvals for an accessory apartment.

C. Dredge asked if they should be residents prior to approval. Mr. Goodwin commented if occupants were children it would not be considered an accessory apartment. He said they probably have several accessory apartments in the City but none are registered and they needed to work with the residents to have these inspections. Ms. Peay said they needed some type of incentive in order to obtain this data for the State. There was subsequent discussion regarding why the amendments pertained to two families living in a home.

C. Thomas said to sell a home he did not need a new certificate of occupancy. Mr. Goodwin explained that a certificate of occupancy was not covering an accessory apartment. C. Dredge said if someone called it a four bedroom instead of two they would be breaking the law. Mr. Goodwin said there were two types of apartments in the code: an accessory apartment and a supplementary apartment. An accessory apartment was a shared area with shared facilities, whereas a supplementary apartment was two separated living areas connected by a door inside. The code for a supplementary apartment was more stringent. They did not want to make the requirements for an accessory apartment to be as stringent because no one would report or build them.

Ms. Peay read more from the code concerning entrances and addresses. C. Spear asked if they had to have both addresses on a home even if the entrance was in the back. Ms. Peay answered in the affirmative, and noted this was for emergency responders.

There was some discussion about putting identifiers on different parts of the structure to differentiate living spaces. Mr. Wright said people put beautiful numbers on their home or painted numbers on the curb as one such example; however, they could not force everyone to do the same. C. Driggs said they needed additional language to specify the need for visible locations on accessory apartments. Ms. Peay suggested putting something on the curb; there was no City code to designate the style of the house number. Mr. Goodwin said sometimes the CC&Rs enforced a standard as well.

Ms. Peay read more from the code concerning main access and size limitations. C. Spear asked if the limitations would include shared area, and Mr. Goodwin said no. C. Thomas asked if this specification could be made in the language of the code. Mr. Goodwin explained there had to be an entrance from the other dwelling; otherwise, it would be a duplex.

Ms. Peay read more from the code concerning owner occupancy. C. Thomas asked why this was a part of the code. Ms. Peay said they wanted to maintain single family homes. Mr. Goodwin added that this was a common code, because if they allowed homeowners to rent out both areas they would create duplexes. He said this would also eliminate nuisance issues with renters. He explained that only one family could rent the home and that would not change the primary use of the home.

C. Driggs said they should consider expanding the definition of “owner” to include dependence of the owner, legal partner, etc. C. Anderson said that was a slippery slope and went against the policy concern. C. Spear said if a family moved out and their children occupied the home, this would be against the code if the accessory apartment was also occupied.

C. Thomas asked about enforcement in this particular situation. He said there were rental homes that had more than two related people. Ms. Peay said they had to comply with City Code with letters they sent out. She said that typically people comply; however, there were others who did not.

C. Anderson said under this code they could revoke the conditional use permit. Mr. Goodwin said it could be a class B misdemeanor. C. Driggs said the property owner would receive the misdemeanor. C. Thomas said it would be a good idea to expand the language. Ms. Peay said they could have included something that indicated temporary occupancy.

C. Driggs said there were some people that occupied homes whose names were not on the title. He suggested they broaden the language to cover these types of circumstances. C. Thomas said this could be an issue because it could prevent people from renting the home. Mr. Goodwin said they would shut people down if they were renting out multiple homes to two different families, because this did not comply with the current code. C. Dodge agreed with the language stating that the homes should be owner occupied; property owners should not be able to turn a single family home into a sublet.

Mr. Wright said there was a public policy concept idea that if someone owned a home they should be able to rent the home. He said these people should be treated differently than someone

who owns solely for renting. Ms. Peay said that an example of this issue was a home turned into a frat house. She said they wanted to detract from this type of circumstance.

C. Dredge said the phrase “main dwelling” was not well defined. Mr. Goodwin suggested striking the word “main”. Ms. Peay continued reading from the code concerning occupancy.

C. Anderson said the amount appeared too high to have four unrelated adults. The standard in the City required two off-street parking and the potential of four was excessive. Ms. Peay said the current code was four; the Commission should consider that a family with children could exceed four. C. Anderson said they could fix the language by saying one family or three unrelated adults.

C. Dodge said what was being suggested was more lenient as long as it was a single family home. C. Anderson said he did not think this was inconsistent with the rest of the code. He said this was speaking to the whole home not just the accessory apartment.

C. Anderson said parking would be the biggest concern for the neighbors, and Ms. Peay concurred. She said there would be no separate utilities and it would be the property owner’s responsibility. She read more from the code concerning parking. C. Anderson said they needed to add something about off-street where the language said “accommodate onsite”. Ms. Peay said they could add “no on-street parking for tenants”. Mr. Goodwin said the current code allowed for 48 hours of parking unless it was winter. Ms. Peay said the code stated the frontage of the property for parking. She said they typically did not ticket a vehicle unless it became a problem.

There was subsequent discussion regarding the units not being intended for sale, exceptions and grace periods for compliance.

C. Spear left the meeting at 9:36 p.m. C. Anderson was recognized as voting member.

MOTION: C. Thomas—To table item #8, the recommendation on the proposed amendments to Cedar Hills municipal code Title 10, Chapter 5-32 relating to accessory apartments, and will review the subject changes made by staff. Seconded by C. Anderson.

Aye -	C. Anderson
	C. Dodge
	C. Dredge
	C. Driggs
	C. Thomas
	Motion passes

9. Discussion on Smoke Shops, Vape Shops and Retail Tobacco Specialty Businesses in the SC-1 Commercial Zone

Mr. Goodwin said State code allowed cities a stricter stance on retail tobacco businesses. He said they would like to prohibit these shops, like what had been done in Washington City, Utah. This would not affect gas stations or Walmart because it was only for businesses that earned more than 30% of their income from tobacco. C. Dredge said that also included related paraphernalia. Mr. Goodwin said if they adopted this plan they could limit these businesses’ proximity to public spaces.

C. Thomas asked if there was a proximity to schools, and Mr. Goodwin answered in the affirmative. C. Driggs said these businesses currently were not permitted, and C. Dredge said noted they were permitted with conditions.

Mr. Goodwin made a comment about not allowing specialty tobacco businesses in the City. He said the City cannot outright ban certain uses, but they could make it difficult to allow them to come to the City. Mr. Goodwin read the State Code noting there was nothing that required the City to issue licenses to these types of businesses. He explained that they could adopt portions of Washington City's code into their own City's code.

ADJOURNMENT

This meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m. on a motion by C. Dodge, seconded by C. Dredge and unanimously approved.

Approved:
May 22, 2018

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC
City Recorder