

**Adopted Minutes
Spanish Fork City Planning Commission
September 3, 2003**

Agenda review at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Pierson discussed the possibility of a multi purpose trail constructed through and behind the proposed Spanish Vista subdivision. The issue of animal rights per the zoning ordinance was also discussed. Current horse owners may keep their animal rights. Future owners will not be allowed to have animal rights. The Commission must keep this in mind when discussing Spanish Vista. The sizes of the lots in the proposed Spanish Vista project was also discussed.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Lewis.

Commission members present: Chairman David E. Lewis, Commissioners Roy L. Johns, Thora L. Shaw, Paul Bradford, Thad S. Jensen, Ted Scott.

Staff Members Present: Emil Pierson, City Planner; Richard J. Heap, City Engineer/Public Works Director; Chris Cope, Secretary.

Citizens Present: Kirk Humphreys, 1940 East Canyon Road; David and Alyn Olsen, 1942 East Canyon Road; David Adams, 274 South 600 East Alpine; Steve Day, 151 West Vine St., Murray; Scott Parson, 151 West Vine St., Murray; Jason Harding, 151 West Vine St., Murray; Leslie Nielsen, 1813 East 1310 South; Alan Vincent, 1249 South 1880 East; Mike Dalley, 151 West Vine St., Murray; Don Harreld, 1102 South 1700 East; Del and Marianna Robins, 1777 East 1310 South; Jeannine Harding, 1046 South 1700 East; Thomas Lowe, 1805 East Canyon Road; Pat Parkinson, 1778 East 1310 South; Jennifer Salsbury, 1778 East 1310 South; Patty Esch, 1438 South 1400 East; Mary Holm, 922 South 1700 East; Mike and Beth Pearson, 1692 East 1000 South; Richard and Brenda Evans, 1705 East 1310 South; Pat Rex, 1910 East Canyon Road; Vince and Sylvia Monk, 1835 East Canyon Road; Norma Monk, 1787 East Canyon Road.

Preliminary Activities

Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Lewis.

Minutes

Commissioner Bradford made a **motion** to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2003 meeting of the Spanish Fork Planning Commission. Commissioner Scott **seconded**, and the motion was **denied**. Commissioner Shaw will give the secretary a copy of the required changes.

Commissioner Shaw made a **motion** to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2003 meeting of the Spanish Fork Planning Commission as printed. The motion was **seconded** by Commissioner

Jensen and **passed** with a unanimous vote, with the exception of Chair Lewis who was not present at the August meeting.

Commissioner Shaw made a **motion** to hear Staff Report item 2, the Geslison Subdivision Waiver, first. Commissioner Scott **seconded** and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Mr. Pierson asked for clarification on the order of items to be heard on the agenda.

Commissioner Shaw amended her motion to reflect that Public Hearing items 2 and 3 will now be 3 and 4.

Staff Report: Geslison Subdivision Waiver Location: 535 East 400 South Zoned R-1-6
Applicant(s): Jerry Pidcock

Mr. Pierson stated that the applicant, Jerry Pidcock is requesting Subdivision Waiver approval for 4 lots. Currently, the property has the three homes that will remain.

The property is .90 acres in size. The applicant is requesting to rearrange the property lines for the three existing lots and create a new lot. Lot 1 will be 6,030 square feet, lot 2 will be 10,922 square feet, lot 3 will be 6,017 square feet, and lot will be 16,164 square feet. Lot 4 is not considered a flag lot since it has 50 feet of frontage. All of the lots will meet the requirements of the R-1-6 zone in size and width.

The setbacks for the subdivision will be 20-feet in the front with a garage being 25-feet. The side setbacks are 5-feet and rear setbacks are 25-feet.

The item was discussed at the September 3 DRC meeting. The property currently consists of three lots and has one owner. The waiver is requested to allow the property to be divided into four lots, all with frontages. There will not be a flag lot. Mr. Pierson has checked to make sure the setbacks meet the requirements.

Mr. Pierson stated that he tried to guess as to what the Planning Commission recommendations would be and then addressed the issues at that mornings Development Review Committee.

The DRC recommends approval the Geslison Subdivision Waiver located at 535 East 400 South on the following condition(s):

1. Relocate the existing power pole and install a new power pole, at the developers expense, as approved by Jeff Foster of the Electric Department, and
2. Install a fire hydrant at the corner of 500 East and 400 South at the owner's expense.

Commissioner Bradford asked how many new homes would be built, what the height will be, and if the property lines will be realigned.

Mr. Pierson stated that only one home will be built and that it will be 30-feet to mid point. The applicant will need to go through the subwaiver process to change the property lines and create a new lot.

Commissioner Shaw asked whether the home will be built at the front or back of the property.

Jerry Pidcock, the applicant, stated that the legal frontage will not accommodate the size of the home. It will be built at the back of the property. A road will be put in following the design of a flag lot.

Chair Lewis asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

Commissioner Jensen made a **motion** to approve the Geslison Subdivision Waiver at 535 East 400 South subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Meet all of the construction and development standards;
2. Receive approval of the electrical from Jeff Foster of the Electric Department,
3. Replace any curb, gutters, and sidewalks as directed by the Engineering Department,

Commissioner Shaw **seconded** and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Staff Report: Jack B. Parson Conditional Use Permit Location: 1172 Del Monte. Zoned I-2
Applicant(s) Jack B. Parsons (Steve Day)

Mr. Pierson stated that Scott Parsons is present and will address the Commission. This is a pre-hearing discussion as to why the applicants have not fulfilled their responsibilities.

Jack B. Parson was approved for a Conditional Use Permit on June 6, 2001 to operate a concrete batch plant at this location. A letter was sent out on July 10, 2003 to revoke the conditional use permit since they have not completed the site improvements (sprinkler system, ground cover, 2-inch caliper tree, and a masonry wall).

Since that time most of the 6-foot wall has been put in place. According to code, if the CUP is revoked a Public Hearing must take place. The residents will be notified per ordinance. The applicants are planning to make some improvements to the area. Staff has decided to have a discussion on this prior to the hearing.

Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission require the applicant to put in a curb and gutter. There were not other subdivisions going in originally. The utility restriction has been lifted and the growth boundary is to follow Del Monte Road. The Quail Hollow on the River project has been approved. Additional traffic will go into the area. There will be no sidewalk on the East side of the road for safety reasons.

Commissioner Johns asked why the applicant is being penalized and made to put in sidewalks when there is development on the east side of the road.

Mr. Pierson stated that the City Council approved the subdivision and they are the ones who said they did not want the sidewalk on the east side.

Commissioner Johns does not agree with that decision.

Mr. Pierson stated that staff does not make the decisions, but reports to the Commission.

Scott Parsons, representing Jack B. Parsons, has provided a packet of information to the Commissioners containing plans for their ready mix plant on Del Monte Road.

Mr. Pierson stated that prior to holding a public hearing the applicants have stated that they would like to come in and explain the delay in finishing the improvements to the site. Staff requests that if the Planning Commission would like to proceed in holding a public hearing to revoke the Conditional Use Permit, they make a recommendation to do so.

Scott Parsons presented a Power Point presentation to the Commission with a packet of information. The plant was purchased in 2001 from Valley Ready Mix. This is a time of rapid growth for their company. When they came to the city for the Conditional Use Permit the applicant's plan was to enclose the plant and make a few modifications, but essentially leave the plant as it was. Since that time they have evaluated the market and the investment. Parsons now wants to completely rebuild the plant with new automation. The company knew last summer that they would have to make significant changes. Parsons had also discussed with Mr. Pierson the construction of the masonry wall along Del Monte and the completion a sloping berm. They are asking for leniency due to the changes and renovations they are planning to make.

With new technology Parsons envisions a new, cleaner operation for Spanish Fork City and for the company. They have auto loading systems to fill silos and to use when making concrete that is fed from the silos. Currently the only mechanism is to use a loader, causing complications.

Commissioner Bradford asked if the raw material is trucked in or if Parsons obtains it from local sources.

Mr. Parsons said that no raw materials are on site and that some sources are local. Materials come from the plant at the Point of Mountain which has two pits, and a quarry on the west side Utah County.

The current Spanish Fork plant has 20 employees and produces just under 100,00 cubic yards of concrete per year. The company intends to move and put a new plant in when they apply for a building permit in the next month. Included will be a sales office and maintenance facility. Parsons is designing for efficient traffic flow. Their vehicles will be making right hand turns onto Del Monte Road. They are planning on having the least impact on the community as possible.

Commissioner Johns asked how much materials the silos will hold.

Steve Day, the Operations Manager, stated that the silos are 18 feet in diameter.

Commissioner Johns asked if the silos will be filled during the day or night.

Mr. Parsons stated that it would depend on the work load. At night the operation would be very quiet. This will also depend upon the conditions of the CUP.

Commissioner Bradford asked if the plant would create dust.

Mr. Parsons stated that it will be a very clean operation and they will sprinkle the conveyors so that there is no dust. That is purpose of the renovations.

Mr. Parsons discussed the violations of the current CUP. The first violation is the landscaping and masonry wall, which is 80% done. The landscape is not completed due to the hot summer. Parsons had concerns as to whether or not the trees would be successful. There had been some discussion on the curb and gutter. The city preferred that the proposed sloped berm be only a level area. Another condition is the hours of operation. Management changes at Parsons caused a lack of communication regarding the condition governing the hours. They had the Home Depot project with some early morning pours and carried out the work without proper notification to the city. They have since developed proper procedure for communicating with Mr. Pierson and understand the condition prohibiting operation before 6 a.m. Mr. Parsons apologized for this.

Parsons would like time to finalize their renovation plans and are asking for leeway from the Planning Commission. Part of the CUP is a \$50,000 water line thru Del Monte. Rather than simply patching the road, Parsons elected to completely redo half of it along with the city. Parsons is trying to be the best company possible and wants to be a long-term partner with Spanish Fork City.

Chair Lewis gave the Commission an opportunity to ask questions.

Commissioner Jensen stated that Parsons said that they would comply when they were granted the original CUP and have not. Parsons needs to explain what is different now and what will take place if something unforeseen happens.

Mr. Parsons stated that they are in compliance now as far as wall and work is progressing.

Chair Lewis stated that it has been two years. No contractor would allow them to take this long to complete a project.

Mr. Parsons stated that he did communicate with Mr. Pierson and the Mayor regarding the delays.

Chair Lewis stated that Parsons was granted two years to complete the work. Now the applicant needs more time. The applicant needs to justify this request.

Commissioner Shaw stated it was one year after granting the CUP that Parsons contacted the Mayor. Why was this information not conveyed to the Commission until now? She does see the advantages to doing the work now are that the dust will be lessened and the site more pleasing. Commissioner Shaw also stated that Parsons has been a much more pleasant neighbor than last company that occupied the facility.

Commissioner Johns asked the applicant if they had been using the excess concrete for the masonry wall forms rather than dumping it.

Mr. Parsons stated that they had been and that is why it has taken this long to construct. They did the work themselves rather than hiring a contractor.

Commissioner Bradford asked if the wall obstructs the view for traffic and for Parsons vehicles.

Mr. Parsons stated that the wall sits back 20-25 feet and there are no obstructions.

Commissioner Shaw asked how much frontage there is for the curb.

Mr. Parsons stated there is 1,500 feet and that this will be done at a substantial cost.

Commissioner Shaw asked if Parsons is using their excess concrete for the curb as well.

Mr. Parsons explained that quality can't be maintained that way and they will hire a contractor and supply the material.

Chair Lewis asked if there are any other questions. There were none.

Chair Lewis stated that the intent at this time was to listen to the applicant's side and gather preliminary information for consideration by the Commission. He asked if this is the consensus of the Commission. It was.

Commissioner Bradford stated that it would be well not to make a decision at this time but to research it further.

Chair Lewis stated that the CUP won't be revoked at this time. Parsons can continue to operate and the Commission will make a decision next month.

Commissioner Johns made a **motion** to move into Public Hearing on Spanish Vista. The motion was **seconded** by Commissioner Bradford and **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Chair Lewis instructed the residents to keep emotions to a minimum, to approach the podium and speak into the microphone. He also instructed them to be considerate in their use of time and to avoid repetition. He then turned the time over to Mr. Pierson.

Mr. Pierson addressed the Commission and asked for clarification. He recommended hearing both the Rezone and the Preliminary Plat together. There were no objections.

Commissioner Jensen asked if they would be voting on the two separate issues.

Chair Lewis stated that each issue will be voted on separately.

Staff Report

Spanish Vista rezone: Located at 1700 East to 2300 East and Canyon Road to 1200 South Zoned R-R to R-1-8, R-1-9.

Applicant(s): ESAD, L.C. and Nebo School District.

Mr. Pierson stated that the applicant(s) ESAD, L.S., represented by Dave Adams, and Nebo School District, are requesting to rezone approximately 80.5 acres from Rural Residential (R-R) to Standard Urban Residential (R-1-9) and Medium Urban Residential (R-1-8). If approved, the developer would like to construct single family homes, patio homes, town homes, and condos (see Spanish Vista Preliminary Platt).

The property is 80 acres in size., The General Plan for the southern end of this property is Low Urban Residential 2.5 to 3.5 u/a and most of this property which on the northern end is Residential 3.5 to 5 units per acre. This designation would provide for the R-1-8 and the R-1-9 zoning designations. An R-1-8 zone requires 8,000 square foot lots. The developer is choosing to a Master Planned Development (MPD), meaning that the density is flexible and the homes can be clustered and the lots made smaller. This is allowed as long as the developer meets the requirements of a MPD ordinance and is approved by the Planning Commission and City Council. DRC recommended that the lower area be zoned R-1-9, meaning that the house sizes are larger, has a finished are at a min of 1,300 square feet, not including basement or garage.

Mr. Pierson reminded the Commission that utility restrictions are still in place on the bench and that this condition is tied only to the storm drain, being run from 1100 East to the river. The storm drain is being designed with the city and the developers engineers. The storm drain must be bonded for 120 days. The road is dedeed to the city, including the easements. To take the storm drain from 1100 East to the river, the easement will be in place and the developer said they would do that. The city engineers and the developer are working very closely and have met numerous times. The storm drain must be in place before any building permits are issued.

The Development Review Committee reviewed this request at their August 27 meeting. The DRC discussed the subdivision in great detail as well as the zoning for this property. They recommended approval of changing the zoning from R-R to R-1-9 and R-1-8 with the following findings and conditions:

1. The recommendation of R-1-8 and R-1-9 zoning follows the general plan for the property, and
2. The capital facilities plan was considered when making the following recommendation.

Condition(s):

3. The utility restriction is to be lifted when the storm drain line is;
 - a. Bonded with a completion time frame of 120 days,
 - d. The right-of-ways are acquired and deeded to the city,
 - e. Designed and approved by the city, and
 - f. Installed and functional prior to the issuance of any building permits and the paving of roads.
2. The R-1-8 zoning follows the General Plan Residential 3.5 to 5 u/a on the northern section of the property and is zoned R-1-9 2.5 to 3.5 u/a on the southern.

Commissioner Bradford asked if each resident will pay into the storm drain fees or impact fees.

Mr. Pierson stated that citizens will pay the money in the form of impact fees to Spanish Fork first and then the city pays the money back to developer to recoup the cost. This can take upwards of 20 years to complete and the applicant knows this.

Chair Lewis asked if the upper portion of the development has a density of 3.5-5 u/a and the lower portion is 2.5 to 3.5 u/a.

Mr. Pierson stated that yes, in the packet are density calculations that show the breakdown on the zoning and allowed density.

Chair Lewis asked if the chart is from the applicant.

Mr. Pierson stated that it was done in conjunction with staff. The Planning Commission can adjust that information just like in other projects. Mr. Pierson will give a summary and let the developer make his presentation.

Staff Report: Spanish Vista Preliminary Plat. Location: 1700 East Canyon Road, Zoned R-1-8, R-1-9.

Applicant(s): ESAD, L.C. (Dave Adams)

Mr. Pierson stated that the applicant(s), ESAD, L.C. (Dave Adams), is requesting preliminary plat approval in order to develop: 173 single family homes, 41 patio homes, 64 town homes, 84 stacked condos, 1 school site, 1 church site, and 2 existing homes.

To the north is Canyon Road and large undeveloped parcels with animal rights and an LDS Church. On the east is some large lots in the Towne and Country Living subdivision zoned R-1-30. To the south is the Spanish Fork Country Estates subdivision zoned R-1-30 and the Abbie Court subdivision. West is the Canyon South subdivision that is zoned R-1-9.

Analysis

Lot sizes:

The applicant is proposing 173 single family lots that range in size from 6,000 to 12,000 square feet these homes will be 1,100 square feet or larger. Each home will have a two car garage and have a masonry front with brick and stone accents.

The patio homes lots size range from 4,900 to 6,000 square feet with the home being 1,000 square feet or larger. Each home will have a two car garage with a masonry front.

The town-homes have an individual garage and constructed with the “big house” look (see packet for more details). They will be fenced and landscaped.

The condos will be 12-plexes located on the northwest corner of the project with easy access onto 1700 East. They will have access from a private roadway onto 1700 East. The area will be fully landscaped and have a tot lot and sports court.

There is a two acre area that will be deeded to the city to be used for a future substation and storage of city equipment and possible tree farm.

Access:

There are five access points into the project. One from Canyon Road, three on 1700 East and one from Abbie Court.

Density:

The General Plan has two designations for this project. The first is Residential 2.5 to 3.5 units to the acre approximately 25.88 acres is in this category with the remaining 54.6 acres in the Residential 3.5 to 5 u/a area. The developer is proposing this subdivision at 4.4 u/a, well below the 5 u/a shown in the General plan. If the developer did not want to do the Master Planned Development (MPD) concept he would be required to have all of the lots over 9,000 square feet and 12,000 square feet. The developer, on the other hand, is doing a MPD and is planning a variety of types of home as well as different lot sizes. The developer is requesting to adjust the side yard setbacks from the required 10 feet to 6 feet on one side and 10 feet on the easement side of the patio and single family homes.

Amenities:

In order to have the increase in density as well as the change in the side yard setback for the project the applicant is proposing (see packet for more detail):

1. Water wise landscaping - single family & patio homes full front, town-homes & condos all of the area
2. Off-setting lot design
3. Staggered front setback
4. Mix of housing types
5. Playground (tot lot)
6. Sport court
7. Dedication of land (and building) to the city
8. Fencing of town-homes and condos

Required of a MPD:

1. R-1-8 zoned: 1,100 sq. ft. rambler, 750 sq. ft. 2-story, 1,100 sq. ft. town-home.
2. R-1-9 zoned: 1,300 sq. ft. rambler, 1,000 sq. ft. 2-story, 1,000 sq. ft. town-home.
3. Duplicate house - there shall be no identical houses, i.e. same footprint (floor-plan, elevation) within 120 feet of another.
4. Parking - single family housing developments shall provide at least a 2-car garage. Developments are encouraged to have side-entry garages on corner lots.
5. Roofing - homes in the development shall have at least a 5:12 pitched roof.
6. Design appeal - homes in the development will be required to blend in with adjacent homes sharing similar design characteristics and using high quality materials.

Development Review Committee

The Development Review Committee reviewed this request at their August 27 meeting. The DRC discussed the project proposal in great detail including: lot sizes, setbacks, housing types, materials, storm drainage, property donation, and the utility restriction.

The DRC recommended approval of the preliminary plat with the following recommendations:

1. The utility restriction is to be lifted when the storm drain line is;
 - a. Bonded with a completion time frame of 120 days,
 - b. The right-of-ways are acquired and deeded to the city,
 - c. Designed and approved by the city, and
 - d. Installed and functional prior to the issuance of any building permits and the paving of roads.
2. Install a masonry wall along Canyon Road matching the wall on 2300 East with 2" caliper trees every 30 feet with additional landscaping approved by the city planner,
3. Submit the development's covenants, codes and restrictions to the city,
4. The developer is to sign off on all house/town-home plans in the subdivision,
5. Provide to the city with a title report for all properties included in the development,
6. The 12-plexes in the development are to be condos and the exteriors are to be constructed with three materials, excluding siding,

7. Construct all homes with 100 percent masonry fronts with stone and brick accents,
8. Construct all homes located on corners with 100 percent masonry on street facing sides and fronts with stone and brick accents,
9. Install and front and side yard landscaping with two 2" caliper trees on each single family home,
10. Install all landscaping and fencing for condos and town-homes,
11. Construct a 66-foot roadway through the development,
12. Allow for the needed transition from the private road to the public road,
13. Receive approval of the density as shown on the attached spreadsheet,
14. Setbacks for each detached building side yards are to be 10 feet on one side and 6 feet on the other side allowing for one 10 foot utility easement at each property line,
15. Receive approval of the electrical design for the development from Jeff Foster of the Electric Department, and
16. The lot with the existing building is to be donated to the city with a road and utilities to the site.

The property is shown in the General Plan as two different land use densities. The northern section is Residential 3.5 to 5 units per acre and the southern section is Residential 2.5 to 3.5 u/a. That is in effect for entire project. The applicant will address the Commission to further explain the density. A private right of way and access point are shown on the diagram. An interesting point about the traffic to the school is that this will be a non-bussing school according to Nebo School District.

There was a motion by the City Council pertaining to a trail. This needs to be addressed because of the R-1-30 areas of horse properties. Normal process would mean that an outline of the trail to be approved by DRC would go to that committee in two weeks. It will then come before Planning Commission in October and the City Council in November dealing with an amendment to the trail ordinance. In the meantime, this project can be approved tonight, go before the City Council in October, and the trail plan be passed over. Ted Livingston brought the prospect of a trail before City Council last night. Mr. Pierson did some preliminary research and saw no horses or corrals in that area, however, some of the neighbors may have other information. To the south west there are properties that will have or do have horses.

The property north of Spanish Vista and Spanish Vista have the same zoning and density and same size homes. Also, once the homes in Spanish Vista are built, the property to the east will not be able to meet the requirements for future animal rights and will lose those rights. To have animal rights the structure must be 100 feet from the nearest dwelling.

Chair Lewis asked for clarification on animal rights. Properties with animals now present can continue to have animal rights even after Spanish Vista is built, whereas other properties cannot use their rights later after the new homes are in.

Mr. Pierson said that this is true. Horse trails, per his research, as multi- use paths must be 10 feet wide. If horses are going to be allowed then Mr. Pierson recommends that the trail be 18-feet wide to give enough space. Another option is to use a combination of crushed rock to construct the trail. This will allow the trail to be 10 feet wide and be used by horses, pedestrians and bicycles.

Commissioner Bradford asked if it is possible to separate the paths to have one for horses and one for pedestrians.

Mr. Pierson stated that it would have to be 18-20 feet wide.

Commissioner Jensen, in looking at the aerial photo on the screen, asked how old it is.

Mr. Pierson stated that it is from 2000.

Commissioner Johns asked if the trail system is approved would the developer then be required to donate the land for the trail.

Mr. Pierson stated that it does not have to be that way.

Commissioner Shaw asked where the trail is proposed.

Mr. Pierson stated that the Master General Plan shows sidewalks for pedestrian access down to the river bottoms. Sidewalks there are also considered trails. Poplar lane or along Riverbottoms they literally are planned trails and are sidewalks. From Spanish Oaks Golf Course to I-15 is a proposed trail system under the current General Plan.

Commissioner Johns asked if Mr. Pierson is saying that the developer is going to have to donate the land under this plan.

Mr. Pierson stated that this is something to be worked out and discussed with the developer.

Chair Lewis asked if there were any other questions of Mr. Pierson. There were none.

Chair Lewis reminded the public that they may approach the podium to comment and to speak into the microphone. The Commissioners are also residents of Spanish Fork and they understand that this is an emotional issue, however, emotions are to be kept to a minimum. Speakers need be considerate of the amount of time used and avoid repetition.

Chair Lewis stated that Mr. Pierson may open the Public Hearing and address the Commission. Items 2.1 and 3.1 will be combined.

Commissioner Jensen asked if there will be a separate vote on these items.

Chair Lewis responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pierson read an email from Ted Livingston, who is not present. Mr. Livingston is concerned with the density and the stress on the utilities and school classroom size. He is concerned with traffic, safety services. Wants a horse trail to cross through the development and extend across future developments from 1400 S between 1700 East and 2000 East. Mr. Pierson gave the copy of the email to Chair Lewis for review.

David Adams, Applicant-274 South 600 East Alpine-Represents Providence Realty Group and Hubble Homes. Would like to address the features of the development. He has taken a lot of time to lay out the subdivision. The condominium area shows diversity in the types of housing and residents. The area with the highest density will be fenced to buffer single family detached lots and the traffic to Canyon Road. Housing types will be grouped into enclaves of the same types and the structures will face each other to give it a neighborhood feeling.

Mr. Adams has tried to be sensitive to the neighbors as the development was laid out. The higher density areas are put near commercial corners. The larger lots are near the perimeters on the west 8-10,000 square feet, consistent with the area. The future church site buffers the larger lots, 10-12,000 square foot on the south. The north end is buffered by open space. The church area will have an 80-foot retention basin to act as buffer to the existing homes.

There is now a ditch irrigation to the north. Mr. Adams has talked with homeowners. The ditches will be piped and he will work with the homeowners on the design. The work will be done at a time when the irrigation is not being used. Any area near the proposed detached homes and the church site will have privacy fencing, as will the higher density areas.

Mr. Adams stated that he was also contacted by Ted Livingston, who he believes is the only resident who contacted him. Mr. Livingston asked him to look at access for horses. Mr. Adams stated that he is not under any obligation to provide a trail but wants to work with the neighbors. 1700 East and 2300 are collector streets around the project and he wants to keep pedestrians away from the heavy traffic. Although it is not in the plan, the developer will provide an easement for access to Canyon Road through the development and an opening in the masonry wall. He will also provide an easement for bicycles and pedestrians. Easements going through the development will done in accordance with the city. He suggests providing an equestrian trail also by easement. There will be a Homeowners Association to maintain the access.

Mr. Adams explained that he is trying to create an enclave and a "lifespan neighborhood". There will be many single residents to occupy the condos and patios homes. Professionals who want their own spot will have the option of choosing patio homes.

Chair Lewis asked Mr. Adams to define "patio home".

Mr. Adams stated that the patio homes offer options to a diverse group of homeowners. Patio home is a marketing name. They offer a smaller, narrower lot to care for with a private yard. Young couples, small families, mature couples will all be marketed to. 80% of homeowners choose the option of having a full basement. A church and school will all be nearby. Mr. Adams

compared the homes to some in Esther Ridge built by Hubble Homes. Uses masonry fronts with accents. Corner lots have an option for side entry garage.

Mr. Adams stated that a significant issue raised by cities is pressurized irrigation and water usage. All single family detached homes will be landscaped in the front and on the sides by the developer. All attached homes, condos, etc. will be fully landscaped by the developer. They are implementing a water wise program with auto irrigation that adjusts when it rains. Sprinkler systems will have pop up heads and there will be drip lines, which use 30-40 percent less water. The development will have turf that uses 25% less water than standard bluegrass. An option the homeowner has is to use ground cover in the parking strip. He will also utilize bark and shrubs for low water consumption. The developer will have a low water usage list of standard trees and the resident can select from. These trees use ½ to ¾" water per week. It is also standard to do walk through on each house, showing the resident how to use the appliances and amenities and to also instruct them on taking care of the landscaping.

This landscaping can consume 15"-20" annually.

Chair Lewis asked Mr. Adams how he has come to the statistics.

Mr. Adams responded that he has worked closely with a landscaper, the state conservation program and the Salt Lake Water Conservancy District.

Chair Lewis asked if the water use statistic comes from the data gathered by those organizations and relate specifically to this proposal.

Mr. Adams stated that yes, it is specifically for this development. Smaller lots will also use less water.

He has two to four builders to create variety and diversity. The homes will be staggered and have varying elevations.

Chair Lewis asked Mr. Adams to clarify how many builders will be utilized.

Mr. Adams has two builders who can do different styles to avoid monotony. He has 12-15 plans with three elevations for variety. There will be 60 varieties by two to four builders. City standards dictate that homes of the same elevation cannot be within 120 feet of each other. He reiterated what a patio home is. A smaller, narrower lot and smaller home with a private yard. They are 1,000-1,200 square feet ranging in price from \$120-160,000. There are three and four bedroom models with room for home offices.

Commissioner Shaw asked if the patio homes are the ones with a proposed 50-foot frontage.

Mr. Adams stated that yes, they are on a 5,000 square foot lot. Originally he proposed 8-foot side yards. Jeff Foster of the Electric Department asked for a 10-foot for easement, which will be on one side.

Chair Lewis asked if there will be 10 feet on one side and 6 feet on the other, for a total of 16 feet.

Mr. Pierson explained that when the setbacks were approved with the 6 foot/10 foot setbacks, the city dictates exactly which side will have 10. The side of each home that will have 10 feet will be facing each other so that there will actually be 20 feet in between the homes and 6 feet on the opposite side. This provides for the easements to be together and allow more room for utilities.

Chair Lewis asked if this setback design is applicable only to the patio homes or if it will apply to all the homes.

Mr. Adams stated that these setbacks will apply to all the homes to accommodate the Electric Department.

Mr. Adams next showed pictures of the town homes being built on Riverbottoms Road to illustrate the facades.

Chair Lewis asked if these are examples of homes Mr. Adams has already built.

Mr. Adams stated that they are not, but the purpose of showing these are to show that the garages are built so that not all of them face the street. Mr. Adams also discussed other amenities. The tot lot is geared to children 2-6 years of age. There are lots of benches and bike rack nearby. The developer is also providing a recreation area for adults and teens in the form of a fenced ball court.

There is a future Church site as well as a school site. Nebo School District purchased a large tract of land, anticipating a Jr. High. They have since decided to build an elementary and asked the developers to master plan the excess land for them. It was proposed to the Development Review Committee that there be open space dedicated to Spanish Fork City, possibly north near Canyon Road.

A major item is the construction of the storm drain line, which will be from the north end of the subdivision to the Spanish Fork River. The anticipated cost is \$350,000. The developer is working with the city to engineer to bore under Riverbottoms Road and with the landowners to obtain the easements. The storm drain must be fully bonded for up front and completed within 120 days. As future developers come in they will pay impact fees on the storm drain. The fee will be about \$150.00. In approximately 20 years it will be repaid, foregoing \$250,000 in interest at a 10% investment.

Commissioner Johns, addressing Mr. Adams, stated that Mr. Adams mentioned he is doing the storm drain to benefit the city, but in reality the developer is doing it for himself so that he can develop the land.

Mr. Adams stated that if he were doing the storm drain improvements for himself the developer would own it and charge usage fees. He is doing it for Spanish Fork City.

Commissioner Johns stated that Mr. Adams is really doing it because he is required to.

Mr. Adams stated that yes, he is required to do so. He showed several pictures of the surrounding property and open spaces. There will be CC&R's to assure standards are met. There will be amenities that by the city's calculations equal 420 units, 4.5 u/a. They are using 366 units and not pushing the density. The density is 4.5 and can go up to 5 u/a.

Commissioner Johns pointed out that if the church and school sites were excluded the developer would be pushing the density.

Mr. Adams stated that if these properties were excluded they would be right at the density requirements.

Commissioner Johns stated that the developer is building to their maximum and not getting anything from city as far as a density bonus. Mr. Adams is asking for a 10% density bonus for the church and school, which should have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Adams stated that he is just following city ordinance.

Commissioner Johns stated that there are some concerns about stucco. He asked if the developer is aware of any concerns or problems and how can the developer guarantee it is done properly.

Mr. Adams has seen reports in the news that water can cause rotting. He has a 20 year guarantee on any major component including foundation, stucco and structure. He believes it is transferrable.

Mr. Adams concluded his presentation. Chair Lewis asked if the Commission had any other questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Bradford asked that if this is zoned R-1-9 and R-1-8 and the patio homes are approximately 40 foot frontage, is this consistent.

Chair Lewis stated that if this were a regular subdivision and not a MPD, then the required lot size would be 8-9,000 square feet. Because this is a MPD, there is flexibility.

Chair Lewis called for a 5 min recess at 8:40 p.m., to be followed by the public comment.

Chair Lewis called the meeting to order at 8:47 p.m.

Chair Lewis stated that he wants an explanation from the developer. The Commission has been given paperwork on density requirements. Mr. Adams needs to clarify the 2.5 density.

Mr. Adams stated that the engineer had pointed out that they originally had amenity items that added up to 420 units. At DRC they were not given credit for certain items and Mr. Adams failed to adjust the number. The numbers should add up to 371 and they are asking for 366.

Chair Lewis asked Mr. Adams to review the pages outlining the density so that the Commission can better understand the information.

In active rec area, 10% allowed, asked for a 3% bonus for the tot lot, sport court and amenities associated with the condominium area. The common building has to do with the metal storage building. Staff had made a comment made that this is would be a good area for a city tree farm.

Chair Lewis asked if Mr. Pierson was present at this discussion.

Mr. Pierson stated that there is a two-acre parcel with an existing structure at the center. The city needs certain utilities in that area. There is a possibility that the city can use the existing building for equipment. Staff had talked with the developer about possibly donating this property to the city. There has been discussion of a tree farm and a future electric substation. There are needs for power and the city looks for areas that have major power lines that can come off from Canyon Road to certain areas.

There are evaluation sheets in the packets given by the developer to the Commission dealing with density. The DRC reviewed this and there were more units added. This is the version that the DRC is recommending.

Chair Lewis asked if because of the metal storage building, the developer is asking for the 5% density bonus.

Mr. Pierson stated that Yes. The open space and The tot lot, recreational areas, etc is other 3%. They would be looking at deeding two acres.

Commissioner Johns asked if there would have to be a wall along the open space.

Mr. Pierson stated that if that is what the developer is proposing, then yes.

Mr. Adams stated that the open area on the north end is owned by Dr. Reed Call. He also wants to make it clear that they have not come to any terms regarding this property. Even if Mr. Call does not deed over the property the developer will do something similar in the way of land or a money donation that is the equivalent of the property value, probably close to \$125,000.

Chair Lewis asked that if the Call property does not go through, will something of equal value be made up somewhere else.

Mr. Adams stated that yes, it would.

Chair Lewis asked if a common building in the open space is actually related to common buildings in the subdivision for the neighborhood to use.

Mr. Pierson stated that this can be interpreted in different ways. The developer may not need pavilions due to the school district improvements. However, the city may want a pavilion at another location, , giving the developer the opportunity to still donate open space or amenities. This would be an agreement between the city and the developer. Where amenities for common areas will be built, if there are recreational facilities already provided within a half mile they will not be needed.. Currently there is the grade school and the Abbie Court park which have amenities already.

Commissioner Johns asked when this property or building would be incorporated.

Mr. Pierson stated that the Commission can make this a condition as to when the property would be deeded and they can make that condition now. A condition can be made that the property will be donated at a particular stage of the development.

Mr. Adams stated that it interprets into \$400 per lot in impact fees to the City. It is up to the Planning Commission as to how it will be donated.

Commissioner Johns stated that they could ask Dr. Call to donate the property directly to the city.

Commissioner Bradford asked for a completion date on the project.

Mr. Adams stated that it could take three to five years.

Chair Lewis asked Mr. Adams to clarify the fencing issues.

Mr. Adams stated that there will be fencing around every attached unit and around the open space. There will be a 6 foot privacy fence and a full masonry wall consistent with what exists on Canyon Road. Regarding landscaping, the developer is asking for full landscaping credit and feels that they have gone above and beyond the landscaping requirements.

Chair Lewis asked if the developer is asking for 5% on the metal storage building and another 5% on the two acres of open space.

Mr. Adams stated yes, that is correct. As far as lot sizes, they have gone to extremes in providing diversity in the facades to comply with the ordinances. There is a mix of styles, and the lots are offset to stagger the views. On the 3.5 density the developer is using the same design.

The same calculations done on a different base of 3.5 density. The developer had some bonuses they feel they deserve due to the off site storm drain. DRC removed some bonuses No one else had offered to install it and they do not feel they are really getting a bonus on the \$350,000 line.

Chair Lewis asked if there were any other questions from the Planning Commission. There were none.

Chair Lewis opened the meeting up for public comment. The citizens were reminded that although this is an emotional issue dealing with their homes and neighborhood, to keep emotions to a minimum. The members of the Planning Commission have also lived here a long time and have seen changes affecting their own homes. They understand the concerns of the residents. The Commission wants to do the best they can for the residents.

Dave Olsen-1942 E Canyon Road-concerned about a fence protecting his yard and adjoining properties. He has no objections to the masonry fence. Thought the developer had planned a vinyl fence, which he would object to. He does want a 6.5 foot masonry fence along 2300 East as opposed to a 6 foot fence. The pipe for the ditch will have to be run now. The ditch flows west to east. If it going to be run east to west the whole ditch will have to be dug up. Mr. Olsen is opposed to a substation. He spoke with Jeff Foster and if the current substation can be expanded to meet the utility needs the city does not need a new one.

Chair Lewis asked Mr. Adams if the direction of the ditch water will be reversed.

Mr. Adams stated that he will do what it takes and work with the residents.

Rick Evans-1705 East 1310 South-Some homeowners intend to expand their backyards and utilize their animal rights. They have not yet done so. He personally is not adversely affected. Resale values on properties will be affected. The proposed density is a concern. The need for another elementary in close proximity to an existing one illustrates the density issue. Higher density also creates higher culinary water usage, which is the biggest problem. The city has had the foresight to put in the pressurized irrigation, and these smaller lots will use less water. On 5,000 square foot lots there is 12 feet in between homes and they will be too close together. Patio homes don't have a good resale value. The PUD west of the High School, Sunset Park, has homes people like to buy, but cannot resell. People who move here want space. People who want condos and patio homes want to live near commercial areas. Mr. Evans is not opposed to development, but the density too high. He wants to see larger homes on larger lots.

Chair Lewis instructed the audience that applause is not appropriate.

Leslie Nielsen-1813 East 1310 South-She is a realtor and is concerned about future animal rights, which is a huge selling point. When they bought their lot they were promised water, animal rights, a horse trail and a vinyl fence by their developer. None of these things have materialized. They are not concerned so much about landscaping, but about pressure. She has a big problem with water pressure and the city does what it can. The system can't keep up with 300 more households. The traffic is a nightmare when school gets out and will get much worse. That the future school will have no bussing means more moms to pick up kids. She wants to know if the state needs to address traffic flowing into Canyon Road.

Chair Lewis stated that Canyon Road can be addressed by UDOT.

Ms. Nielsen stated that traffic is a huge issue. The kids race the cars through the streets and it is dangerous.

Chair Lewis asked her to clarify the location of the school and the roads she is talking about.

Ms. Nielsen stated the road is 2300 East. A left turn onto Canyon Road is dangerous. She can also stand on her back porch and see three elementary schools and five churches. Ms. Nielsen paid for open space and country and is now getting condos. Finally, the way the proposed subdivision is configured, the fencing runs behind the structures along the street. The street side of the fence is never maintained. She suggests that the developer provide a gate for access to the other side for maintenance.

Mr. Pierson asked if Chair Lewis wants him to address the issue of the walls. Chair Lewis stated that he does.

Mr. Pierson stated that 2300 East is a major collector to Highway 6 and there will be traffic problems. Although 1100 East now has a light, it will take time for UDOT to see a problem at 2300 East. 1700 East also does not have a light. Mr. Pierson is trying to not require fences and does not approve of them. In the new Aspen Meadows development the homes face road. That is also required here. Corner homes can face the street but must have side entry garages. This eliminates the need for fencing. Regarding the area along Highway 6, the city maintains it. Developers must post a cash bond of \$100 per tree. If a tree dies, the developer replaces it. All the trees must last one year or the city does not take over the care and maintenance.

Alan Vincent-1249 South 1880 East, Spanish Fork Country Estates-He agrees with the other residents. He is also present in behalf of Ted Livingston, who is not present for medical reasons. Mr. Livingston has invested in a barn and has horses. Mr. Vincent has open space and will utilize animal rights in the future. He will now lose his animal rights forever. He disagrees with the transition between low and high density areas. Variations in lot size do not equal diversity. The only variation is small lots versus very large lots. There is no mix of low, middle and high income homes. Because it is a PUD, custom homes will not be built to fit in with the existing custom homes. The project does not have to be approved simply because it meets zoning requirements.

The bigger picture of the trail is not that it is an equestrian trail. There are currently only sidewalks to offer. This is an opportunity to have a multi-use soft, wide trail to accommodate everyone and enhance what Spanish Fork now has.

Mr. Vincent stated that any developer who want to utilize the area will be required to install the storm drain. He hopes the Commission can see through Mr. Adams' comments that he is doing it for Spanish Fork City. Mr. Adams is only adding congestion to the community, not value. The Commission needs to turn down the project and look for a developer who will reflect the values of Spanish Fork, bring broad diversity, and a true trail system.

Mary Holm-922 South 1700 East- She is a mortgage broker.. The proposed condos look more like the Diamond Fork Apartments to her. There is no resale value and they will likely become rentals. It is hard to get loans on condos. She does not know if there are any other condos in

Spanish Fork and wants to know where their value will come from if they are the only condos in Spanish Fork. Mrs. Holm wants to know if there are any other condos in Spanish Fork.

Chair Lewis stated that there are condos on 16th and 17th holes of Spanish Oaks Golf Course.

Mrs. Holm stated that those condos are very expensive. As a mortgage broker she has done loans on condos. They start out nice and then lose their value. Her second issue is the traffic. Traffic on 1700 East is already a problem. Her understanding when she moved there was that no homes were going to be built on 1700 East. The proposed condos will have eight units housing 96 families.

Don Harreld-1102 South 1700 East-He has lived here for two years with open spaces. His concerns echo the other resident's concerning the traffic. There are three proposed streets coming out onto 1700 East and one onto Canyon Road. There is easily room for three streets coming onto Canyon Road. This is a beautiful development, but don't build it in Spanish Fork.

Beth Pearson-1692 East 1000 South-She had talked to Mr. Pierson several months ago and understood that the homes would be starter homes. The future school site is not only a school district problem, but a city problem because of the taxpayers. The school was to be a Jr. High and now it will be an elementary school, attracting young families into starter homes, as in Esther Ridge. Mr. Adams referred to a lifespan neighborhood. It will not be an area for stable families with older children in larger homes who plan on staying there. She agrees with comments made regarding resale values. She has one of the largest homes in the area and her property value will plummet. Some homes in her neighborhood are vacant because the owner cannot sell and had to move. Many residents did not bother coming because they heard that once a development reaches planning and zoning, it will be approved. The Commission needs to zone it for larger homes and show loyalty to the citizens and not the developers.

Brenda Evans-1705 East 1310 South-She is a realtor and supports the comments made about home values. Horse properties and lots from 1/4 to 1/3 acre are very desirable. She has never had someone ask for a patio home. She can provide data on vacancies and turnarounds for the Commission if they so desire.

Kirk Humphreys-1940 East Canyon Road-In looking at the proposed development, he can count 22 homes around his. He does not have the nicest home, but he has put a lot of work into it. He has spoken with Mr. Adams. Mr. Humphreys is concerned with emergency services having access to the proposed development.

Mike Pearson-1692 East 1000 South-He agrees with statements made regarding traffic. He is not against growth, but condos don't fit with the area.

Pat Parkinson-1778 East 1310 South-She is presenting a question for her neighbor, Mr. Robbins, who cannot attend. He wants to know where the storm drain will go.

Mr. Adams stated that the storm drain will go through the subdivision down 1700 East in front of the school to 1400 East and into the city's system.

Mrs. Parkinson agrees with what has been said about the town homes, resale values and animal rights. The city makes exceptions on other issues when they choose to and can make an exception on the matter of animal rights. Many residents have left the meeting due to the lateness of the hour and have not been heard. She is not opposed to development, but it needs to be done in controlled doses.

Chair Lewis asked if there are any other comments.

From the audience the question was asked if the issue regarding animal rights only pertains to large animals. Will residents retain rights to smaller animals or are those rights lost as well?

Mr. Pierson stated that the minimum distance from a neighboring dwelling is 100 feet. If the 100-foot requirement is not met, there are no rights to begin with. Mr. Pierson read Title 17 Zoning Ordinance, 17.28.040.D. The minimum distance for game birds is 50 feet.

Dave Olsen stated that if he has animals less than 100 feet from the neighboring dwelling can he not have them.

Chair Lewis stated that any resident with existing animals can continue to have them and will be grand fathered in regardless of the distance to the future neighbor dwelling. If a non-conforming homeowner with animal rights goes for a period of a year or more, the rights could be forfeited.

Mr. Pierson stated that there is a difference between when the home was built and if the owner has animals now. If the animals are present now and meet the ordinance and the neighboring dwelling is built later, the owner may keep the animals.

Rick Evans-1705 East 1310 South-He thanked the residents who gave their input and also thanked the Planning Commission for their patience in hearing all the public comments, even though the hour is late. He also thanked Mr. Adams for a well done presentation.

Patty Esch-1348 South-She will be living across from a 41 unit building that has already been approved (Community Housing). At that time that was approved a precedence was set. The same thing is happening here. She is asking the Commission for bigger lots and not a low income area.

Chair Lewis asked if there are any other questions from the audience. There were none.

Commissioner Johns stated that the citizens have valid points and they must be weighed out heavily.

Chair Lewis asked Commissioner Johns if he has concerns with the development as it is now.

Commissioner Johns stated that yes, he has a concern with the traffic.

Commissioner Jensen stated that he has concerns with density. There is a problem with water, power and safety. He has nothing against growth, but it must be managed. The present state of Spanish Fork has problems that need to be taken care of before there is more building.

Commissioner Shaw stated that the developer remarked that this would be a walkable community. She asked if there will be a walkway to the new school.

Mr. Adams stated that the plans are tentative.

Chair Lewis stated that this is the biggest development he has seen since he has been on the Commission. This is his fifth year. The developments started with five acres here and there. Now developments are an issue of money available to developers. This development is overwhelming in size. The fact is that there is too much to consider in such a short amount of time.

Commissioner Shaw stated that she is not opposed to going out to look at the area and is not ready for the question this evening.

Chair Lewis stated that he agrees. He appreciates the effort gone into the presentation by Mr. Adams. This is one of the best presentations the Commission has received and a lot of thought was put into the design. Chair Lewis does have an understanding of the citizens perspective. The issues need to be investigated more deeply, especially concerning Canyon Road and UDOT. Chair Lewis stated that his other concerns are the future school and the road on the north side and the west side of the school as a drop off zone, affecting the horseshoe subdivision to the west. He has learned from sitting on the Commission that no one person has the best answer. The Commission discusses the issues with the city staff and other councils. The best decision is made from everyone's input. Chair Lewis would like to use more time before deciding the rezone issue.

Mr. Adams stated that the road that comes from the church will be complete and have an access onto Canyon Road.

Chair Lewis stated that it would not do the project nor the citizens justice to make decision after only 3 hours. He asked for any other input.

Mr. Pierson stated that Chair Lewis had voiced concerns over density, water, safety, and diversity in housing types. Mr. Pierson asked if he is requesting that a traffic study to be done and if Chair Lewis is asking for more information on these issues so that everyone know the direction the Planning Commission is going to take.

Chair Lewis stated that the traffic issue probably needs to be considered more in depth.

Alan Vincent stated that if there will be 366 homes with two-car garages, that will double the number of vehicles.

Chair Lewis stated that the Commission needs more information on the following items:

Input is needed from the Engineering Department regarding the traffic coming onto 1700 East from the four streets feeding from the subdivision. There is a possibility of a traffic study with UDOT regarding Canyon Road.

More details are needed regarding the possible uses of this property and the possibilities of donating the property to the city. This issue is still up in the air.

Demographics are needed regarding the quantity and diversity of the housing types and lot sizes and how this development would change or add to the demographics. The Commission wants to know about other areas where these types of housing have been approved. Information is also needed concerning the growth over the lifespan of similar projects and what the development will be like in 10, 20 and 30 years. Concerns over the resale value of homes needs to be addressed.

The issue of animal rights needs clarification concerning present rights vs. future rights.

The Commission is in agreement with residents that if the city has said they want the trail, which is in the General Plan, then they need to look more seriously at it now, in the planning stages, because it will be harder later to incorporate the trail once development begins.

Chair Lewis asked if the Commissioners understand these items and if any other issues need to be addressed.

Commissioner Shaw stated that Commissioner Jensen had voiced concerns about power and water.

Mr. Richard Heap had left the meeting early and was not present to address pressurized irrigation.

Commissioner Jensen stated that residents said they had no pressure on their irrigation and this is a big problem.

Commissioner Johns stated that this is not a problem.

Commissioner Jensen stated that he had received his utility bill as had his neighbor. The utility bills are a huge problem.

Chair Lewis stated that utility bills are not an issue here.

Commissioner Bradford stated that density is an issue.

Chair Lewis made a motion to table the Spanish Vista Rezone located at 1700 East Canyon Road for one month subject to the previously stated items and to allow time to review input from

other sources. Commissioner Bradford seconded the motion and the motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Chair Lewis made a motion to table the Spanish Vista Preliminary Plat located at 1700 East Canyon Road for one month subject to the previously stated issues. Commissioner Bradford seconded and the motion passed with a unanimous vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.