



**REGULAR MEETING
OF THE VINEYARD PLANNING COMMISSION,
Vineyard City Hall, 240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah
Wednesday, February 7, 2018 at 6:00 p.m.**

Present	Absent
Madam Chair: Cristy Welsh	Vice Chair: Anthony Jenkins
Commissioner: Bryce Brady	Commissioner: Jeff Knighton
Commissioner: Tim Blackburn	
Commissioner: Nate Carter	

Staff Present: Community Development Director Morgan Brim, Planner Elizabeth Hart

Others Present: Resident David Lauret, Resident and Councilmember Tyce Flake, Resident Stan Jenne, Boy Scouts, Resident Chris Judd, Greg Bird, Mark Bateman, Ethan Miner, London Haring, Caden Miner, Dawson Clabrook, Collin North, Chris Jensen, Sterling Ricks, Eric Malmberg

1. CALL TO ORDER

Madam Chair Welsh called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM

2. INVOCATION OR PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Blackburn offered the invocation

3. OPEN SESSION

Madam Chair Welsh opened the public open session.

Sterling Ricks, resident, states that the American Flag in front city offices needs to be lighted at night if it is not taken down. He mentioned that he would be willing to taking it down at night and raising it in the morning during the time that the city deliberates about what needs to be done about this issue.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that multiple council members are present at the meeting at that they would be able to do something about it.

Caden Minor, resident, Le Cheminant, friends like to go to play on houses being built, saw a burning cigarette inside the home.

Madam Chair Welsh asked for additional public comment. Hearing none she closed the open session.

4. MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Madam Chair Welsh asked for any comments or corrections on the minutes from the January 17, 2018, Planning Commission Meeting. Hearing none he asked for a motion.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BRADY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 17, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES. COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS:

5.1 Edgewater Site Plan Amendment – Continued from the January 17, 2018

This is for a site plan amendment application for the Edgewater Development, located at 255 Mill Road. The proposed amendments include adding and removing site amenities.

Commissioner Blackburn asked Mr. Brim to give a brief description of what he does for the city for the boy scouts and Mr. Brim did so.

Mr. Brim, went over reviewed the changes to the site plan and noted that the majority of the changes have been consolidated around the middle of the site. He stated that the biggest change made to the site was the Dog Park and this change was the main focus of the previous planning commission meeting. At the last planning commission meeting the commission did a site visit and then discussed the site at the meeting. The two changes they recommended were adding additional landscaping to the north of the Dog Park and providing lighting to illuminate the path to the dog park itself.

The applicant has suggested that in lieu of landscaping that the same mesh that is surrounding the pool surround the Dog Park thus providing cohesion between the two. With regards to lighting the applicant is concerned about light pollution bleeding into the windows of nearby residents.

Mr. Brim then added that the code requires alleyways be lit and because the Dog Park creates an alleyway the code applies. He then stated that staff recommends the pool covering but requires two lights on the pathway.

Commissioner Blackburn stated he liked the changes they made even though there wasn't initial approval. He stated he felt it improved the quality of life for the residents. He was disappointed with just the mesh around Dog Park he would like to see some landscaping around, as a resident he wouldn't like to see just the mesh. Does need light, felt uncomfortable being there in the dark.

Commissioner Carter, reiterated what Commissioner Blackburn stated, would be disappointed with not having any landscaping based off original plan if he were a resident in that area.

Madam Chair Welsh invited Greg Bird representing the HOA of Edgewater and R2R.

Greg Bird, applicant and representative of the HOA and R2R developer, gave a backstory of the property and the phases. He stated that he is confused as to why he has to go through a site plan amendment as he is improving the development. He stated that the reason for the Dog Park is because of the push he has received from the HOA and tenants. He added that the reason he is going through this amendment process is because a potential tenant complained and this caught the attention of the city. He added that this is not reason enough to go back through the process.

Mr. Bird went on to explain that he didn't know that he needed permission to add an amenity to a site that has already been approved. He added that there was a disagreement between what he believes he can do and what he needs permission for. He then spoke about the changes made to the site and reiterated to the council that the things he was adding to the property were of higher quality and more expensive than what was on the original plan.

Mr. Bird went on to explain that when the commission went to the site they weren't able to see the screen that is now up. He added he would be willing to put the same screen that is currently around the pool around the dog park to create cohesion between the two.

Mr. Bird then addressed the question of the lighting. He stated that the lighting on the north side is much better than the lighting on the south side. He then concluded that he didn't want to add more landscaping because landscaping was already such a big expense for the development. Madam Chair Welsh then thanked Mr. Bird and asked the commissioners for comments.

Commissioner Blackburn, stated that he appreciates all the applicant has done to improve Edgewater but that he would still like to see lighting on the sidewalk and landscaping on the northern end of the fence. He added that he felt it would add a lot to the area without much more expense. He then asked Mr. Bird if he had electricity running over by the pool and Mr. Bird answered that they have concrete everywhere. Commissioner Blackburn stated that he understood, but that the area around the pool also contained grass and ground.

Mr. Bird started to comment but Commissioner Blackburn stopped him. Commissioner Blackburn, stated the commission had listed to the applicants' presentation and at this time the commission would like to comment. He stated that there needed to be lighting on the sidewalk on the interior between the dog park and the pool. He agreed with the applicant in that the sidewalk closest to the parking lot was well lit and he had no issues there. He then stated that if he were a resident he wouldn't living on the northern end he wouldn't want to look into a black screen and felt additional landscaping would be a better solution. He concluded that he appreciates the improvements made but still feels there needs to be more landscaping and lighting.

Commissioner Brady asked Mr. Brim about lighting standards.

Mr. Brim, stated that the code requirement says that pedestrian pathways must be illuminated. He added that because of this it was in the commissions' purview to request lighting on this pedestrian pathway. Mr. Brim added that when he and the Commissioner's went out to the site it many of the commissioners commented on how dark the area was. In addition residents walking from the parking area to their homes wouldn't be able to see if someone was hiding. He reiterated that it falls under the Commissioners purview to request lighting.

Mr. Brady commented that he thinks it's great that the applicant is adding so many amenities.

Mr. Bird, commented that the light requirement shouldn't apply because it's a private sidewalk and not a city sidewalk. He stated that this is just a disagreement and that he is willing to add small solar lights but if he was required to do more he would rather just take the Dog Park out.

Madam Chair Welsh stated for clarification that what the applicant was saying was that if the commission required lighting that Mr. Bird would just take the park out all.

Mr. Bird, Yes. It would be easier for us to do that than to add lighting.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that doing so would make the tenants who lived closest to the park happy.

Mr. Bird, stated that lots of tenants want the park. He added that the council should talk to the head of HOA in Edgewater who could attest that the park is in high demand.

Commissioner Blackburn commented that whether or not the park exists is not the issue that the planning commission has. The issue is what is and isn't code.

Madam Chair Welsh, stated the Commissions main concern is the residents of the city. The commission went to the site at night and felt it was dangerous. She added that there were three women in the group and all of them said they would not walk in that area at night because it felt dangerous. She added that if the park were wrapped it would turn into an enclosure and if someone was under duress you wouldn't know it. She stated that the wrapping would create a tunnel where you can't see onto the other side even if the pathway is lit. She concluded that the whole development was dark and that the applicant had been able to cut costs with lighting in other areas of the development and should be able to add more lighting.

Madam Chair, asked Mr. Bird if he had used cheaper lights that were less well-lit in other phases and Mr. Bird responded that he had and that those lights were approved on the North Side of the development. Madam Chair Welsh responded that she felt that if this path is wrapped it needs to be well lit.

Commissioner Brady asked Mr. Bird if he was okay with putting in LED lights. Mr. Bird responded that he would be willing to get small landscaped solar ones. Commissioner Brady responded that he would feel more comfortable with getting lights that went on top of the fence and Mr. Bird agreed that would be doable. Mr. Brady concluded that if Mr. Bird put the LED lights on top of the fence that would be a solution he would be okay with.

Mr. Bird added that he doesn't want to get fixed lights because he feels it wouldn't be worth it to dig up the area and get to the electrical but he's willing to take the wrap off.

Madam Chair Welsh started to comment and Mr. Bird interjected that the safety issue he felt she was going to bring up was the same argument he could make about the pool.

Madam Chair Welsh stated that she felt that those two things weren't comparable as the pool is a much larger area that is visible from a distance and will have more people. She added that the dog park will be open year round whereas the pool won't be. She then asked Mr. Bird if this was correct to which he responded that the pool was open year round the residents just needed to use their keys.

Mr. Brim, recommended that the chair allow the public to make some comment.

Madam Chair Welsh asked for public comment

Mark Batemen, resident, stated he has LED lights on his fence and he felt the commissioners weren't listening to Mr. Bird when he presented this option.

David Lauret, resident, stated he feels the area is a great addition to the community and he appreciates it and then asked about the fencing around the pool. Suggestion to enclose the walkway with the fence but he didn't understand where the fencing is.

Mr. Brim commented that when amending a site plan by adding infrastructure it automatically triggers a need for the site to go through the amendment process. He stated that he wanted to make it clear was that the city wasn't trying to determine whether or not the Dog Park was good or bad in the meeting they were trying to mitigate the impact caused by the amenity by having it go through the site plan amendment as required by code. He added that the lighting is something that is required by code and needs to be taken care of. He added that the code states that pedestrian pathways need to be lit which typically is interpreted as fixed lighting. He added he was aware that for the developer LED was easier

but the city needs something more permanent and enforceable. Mr. Brim recommends to the commission that they require fixed lighting.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if there was a minimum lumens per foot.

Mr. Brim stated that there needs to be more clarity in the standard because as it stands the pedestrian pathways need to be lit.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if a pathway had to be something constructed and established to be considered a pathway.

Mr. Brim answered that he interpreted it to be an established pathway.

Mr. Bird commented that the major issue he has as a developer is that he feels the city is selectively enforcing zoning codes. He brings up that he was promised lights on Mill Rd and that hasn't happened and he feels like the city isn't following their own code.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that she understood that is frustrating and that they have changed the code so that incoming developments install their public improvements, like lighting, prior to the building permit.

Mr. Bird, commented that his site has met and exceeded standards and he doesn't understand why one portion of the site is being held to a completely different standard. He then adds that putting in too much light can possibly have the opposite effect of the intention and put too much light in the windows of nearby residents.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that the commission doesn't disagree with Mr. Bird. She added that lighting has become an increasing priority in the city as it continues to grow.

Mr. Bird commented that lighting was his number one priority when we got to Vineyard and the city gave him a commitment that there would be lights and Mill Rd and it still hasn't happened.

Commissioner Blackburn commented that after hearing everything that's been said it's important for the commission to remember that they can't go back in time and guess why staff did what they did or they would be second guessing all their decisions. Madam Chair Welsh replied that the issue is that Vineyard hardly had any staff.

Commissioner Blackburn stated that in spite of what was said and because of what was said we have to deal with what we have right before us.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that she feels it's the theme of the commission to do the best with what they are given and if they could go back they would do it better.

Mr. Brim, stated that he would like to move on from the topic of lighting to landscaping. He addressed the commission and suggested that what they could do to ensure landscaping is to make sure that the applicant is following the plans that were given to the city. Going out and ensuring the applicant is following the plans is a way to compromise.

Commissioner Carter commented that as long as they are following the approved plan he doesn't have any issues.

Commissioner Blackburn asked if there was a minimum number of lights and Mr. Brim responded as the conditions are written two lights are required.

Mr. Brim stated that the applicant will add two full cutoff lights adjacent to the pathway east of the dog park area. Mr. Brim adds that the city interprets that to be fixed lights and so whether that's LED the lights need to be infrastructure. It needs to be substantial whether it's solar or not doesn't matter what matters is that it will withstand the test of time.

Madam Chair Welsh asked if the wording needed to be changed in the code

Mr. Brim stated that he would recommend in the condition to say as conditioned in the staff report with the amendment. He then recommend that they read condition four and add way to make the lighting permanent.

Commissioner Blackburn asked Mr. Brim to define a cutoff light

Mr. Brim, a cutoff light is a lightbulb that is contained with a canister.

Commissioner Brady commented that for safety reasons one side of the Dog Park should not be covered in the mesh. Madam Chair Welsh asked Commissioner Brady if there would be lights within the dog park or just on the path. Commissioner Brady responded that he was talking about the enclosure and not the lights. Mr. Bird commented that you can see shadows through the mesh.

Commissioner Brady commented that mesh was fine if it's easy to see people. If not than the mesh wouldn't be something he would agree with.

Mr. Bird stated that he would prefer wrapping the whole park or just leaving it open rather than just wrapping a part of it.

Madam Chair, asked if it became an issue if the city would need to be called.

Mr. Brim, said that if the commission wanted they could put an "if" condition in their recommendation. They could say that if the developer installs perimeter fencing surrounding the dog park it can be wrapped with material.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that it doesn't matter to her whether it's wrapped or not. She prefers it not to be wrapped because she believes it safer. She adds that she understands people not wanting to see in there. She addresses the applicant and says that the "if" condition would be positive because the applicant wouldn't need to go through planning commission again.

Commissioner Blackburn recommended to adopt the staff report as is outlined in the Edgewater site plan subject to the four conditions with the adjustments being made to number three. It allows the developer the latitude to wrap or not the wording can be adjusted that it's not a requirement but it's an option. But if it is wrapped it will be consistent with the pool wrapping and then in number four to add in fixed lights or the applicant will add two full cut off fixed lights to the pathway.

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE STAFF REPORT AS OUTLINED IN THE EDGEWATER SITE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE FOUR CONDITIONS WITH THE ADJUSTMENTS BEING MADE TO NUMBER THREE. COMMISSIONER BRADY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. WORK SESSION:

6.1 Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments Discussion

Madam Chair Welsh gave a review on what they have been working on with drive-thrus. They have been getting codes amended.

Commissioner Carter asked about the landscaping in the front. He asked if a 3 foot berm enough shielding or is it too much or if it cause a problem and companies are going to want signage.

Mr. Brim, gave an overview of what drive thrus are and why they are regulated for the boy scouts. He spoke about the changes that would be made to the code in order to meet the codes intent. He stated that the changes are to allow the one exception for a drive aisle to be in front of the building and the front set back. This would allow for an extra lane and meet the intent of the code. This change and referenced in subsection 4G and section H references the limited drive aisle. In subsection 11 there is a provision for a conditional use permit meaning that they have to go through the normal application process as well as go through planning commission. The conditional use permit will allow the commission to look for more impacts. He then goes into more detail on the specifics of the code which can be found in subsection 11. He adds that the main purpose of these regulations is for people to meet the intent of the code and to keep that in mind when reviewing applicants.

Mr. Malmberg, representative of Anderson Warren and associates, he stated that his company is interested in subdividing the property owned by America First Credit Union so that Starbucks can fit on the same lot. He addressed Commissioner Carters about berm height stating that the main purpose of a berm is to screen headlights from shinning into the road. He added that he has seen anywhere from 24 to 36 inches higher than the back of the sidewalk or the top back of curb on the street.

Commissioner Carter asked if that ever created a concern for Starbucks Mr. Malmberg answered that Starbucks and a lot of the developers want their store to be seen from the road and the pushback comes from berming around the monument sign. If a monument sign is out on the street if we have any berming around we try and keep the berming down. He added that some jurisdictions have max height requirements for the monument signs. Commissioner Carter asked where berming starts.

Mr. Brim it's from the top of the berm to the finished grade

Mr. Malmberg commented that some jurisdictions would like to include an earth berm and they sometimes accept shrubs that are dense enough to prevent headlights from passing through.

Discussion of signage amongst commissioners

Mr. Malmberg, stated one of the Starbucks and the developers concerns was the modification to 11d. 11d states that no menu boards or related drive thru infrastructure are permitted between the front façade and front property line. Their concern is that the vehicles need to circulate counter clockwise and that they need some sort of cover over the menu speaker so that water doesn't get in. He added that they'd want to find a way to mitigate the menu board appearance so that it wouldn't detract from the visual aesthetics of the building.

Commissioner Blackburn asked how many feet from the front of the building would the drive thru represent.

Discussion of the front façade and length of drive thrus among Commissioners.

Commissioner Carter what does front façade means in reference to buildings and tables

Mr. Brim, stated that the front façade is taking a perpendicular line of the side to the front coming out. He added that the commissioners can write to include the area right in front. He also added that they don't a giant menu board facing the street.

Madam Chair asked if the line could be parallel with the building.

Mr. Brim asked Mr. Malmberg if he could extend the building to have a larger interior dinning space rather than an outdoor dining space.

Madam Chair Welsh if a covered patio could work in that space

Mr. Brim, commented that the commissioners needed to keep zoning language concise and objective but that to keep in mind the intent of the code.

Madam Chair Welsh stated having the board be aligned with the building would prevent it from being on a curve.

Commissioner Brady commented that he didn't have concerns about this as long as the monument sign wasn't too big. He was however concerned that they needed to make sure the code language wasn't too open to interpretation.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that they could leave the language as is and require screening

Mr. Malmberg commented that he could make that work

Mr. Brim commented that they need to define the area between the façade and the street.

Mr. Malmberg commented he is concerned about the plan he presented because it was done just to give the commission an idea of what they are considering doing.

Mr. Brim commented that the intent of the code is so that the sign won't be facing the street.

Discussion of where the sign should be placed.

Mr. Malmberg, commented that the intent of the code is to avoid signage going out to the street

Madam Chair Welsh stated that the intent of the menu board not being out in the street was so that it wasn't used as advertising.

Mr. Brim, commented that Vineyard wants the drive thru infrastructure to be less visible to the public right of way. He stated the purpose of this is so that Mill Rd looks cleaner and puts focus on architecture rather than parking.

Mr. Malmberg if the intercom system the covering over the top that protects the person placing their order. What if that infrastructure is on an angle would that need to be moved?

Mr. Malmberg, asked if the covering on the intercom system would need to be angled

Commissioner Carter stated that it's likely always going to have to be somewhat angled. He added that the wording in the code needs to state that the menuboard shouldn't be used for street adverting. That it needs to be on site, contained, and mitigated.

Mr. Brim commented that the plan shows a lot of infrastructure and it's not too much

Mr. Malmberg stated that he believes Starbucks is going to keep things within the code

Commissioner Brady added that they we're more worried about the language we're setting in the code and Mr. Brim added that the commission needed to remember that the permit Mr.Malmberg is looking for is a conditional use permit.

Mr. Malmberg commented he appreciate the conditional use permit because they could work with the city on meeting the guidelines but be accommodated as necessary.

Mr. Brim what I'm going to do is write it so the area in front is a definite no. It can't be directly parallel to the street. At some point there's going to be infrastructure. The idea is to show the building and the entrance not the menu board.

Mr. Brim commented that the code will be written so that the front area of the building wouldn't allow signage and that it can't be directly parallel to the street. The idea being to show the building entrance and not the menu board.

Commissioner Brady asked if they should require higher landscaping so that the area is angled more.

Commissioner Carter commented that part of the code talks about the landscaping between the road and the front of the building and he asked if a developer were to have a sign if there was a method for mitigation in place.

Mr. Brim answered that the conditional use permit doesn't get around the code it allows the commission the city to control impacts and add additional requirements.

Mr. Malmberg we're willing to work with the code and modify things to make them work

Chris Judd, resident and councilmember, asked if the site being a small site could potentially create a future demand for conditional use permits because of the size of the area.

Mr. Brim stated that regardless of size of the site conditional use permits provide the ability exercise exceptions and mitigate them.

Mr. Judd asked if a site has two side facing streets which side should be the front.

Mr. Brim answered that would be wherever the address was delineated. This would be used to establish a setback.

Mr. Judd, stated that one of the things he wished he had done while on planning commission was done more to mitigate the façade of Dairy Queen with regards to the Drive Thru. He added he knows the code is changes and when we add exceptions there should be updates to both sides of the façade.

Mr.Brim, clarified for the commission that instead of the code saying front facing it should say street facing.

Commissioner Brady asked what exactly would need to be changed.

Madam Chair Welsh, stated that Mr. Judd is referring to the properties that are on a corner lot.

Commissioner Brady stated when looking at the Dairy Queen he noticed there is a three foot wall around the perimeter.

Mr. Judd stated he would've changed how much stone was required behind the building. He feels the code was changed so that drive thrus would not be allowed on the front at all and now that the commission is considering then they should add that the front façade should be more aesthetically appealing.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that Dairy Queen looks like the back of the building. So if the drive thrus are allowed in front people need to be able to tell where the front is.

Mr. Brim added that if a building is on a corner an architectural element would be necessary so that the front of the building would look more established.

Mr. Judd commented that there is a big difference between stone and stucco and the commission needs to keep in mind that stucco isn't an upgrade.

Madam Chair Welsh addressed Mr. Brim and asked if an applicant met code requirements would the planning commission still be able to reject the applicant.

Mr. Brim answered that the commission is allowed to still have conditions but you still have to approve the applicant. He added that anything that will add a lot of money should be stated in the condition and be directly related to the site impact.

Commissioner Blackburn so would be add a section F that would talk about facades that would face the front.

Mr. Brim, stated the front façade area can be for the menu board making it so even if you're on a corner the street side of the building would have the same architectural embellishments as the front. This would allow architectural cohesion and would still be visible on the street side.

Mr. Judd, commented that the goal for applicants is to be able to read the code and meet everything they can. He added that the commission should remember that this is the first one their doing and they are setting the standard for incoming companies.

Madam Chair Welsh commented that she agrees with Mr. Judd and that allowing applicants to have exceptions means the commission should require more in exchange.

Mr. Brim reiterated that there needs to be continuity in the design but the street signs should be the things that are really enhance. Don't let the building be designed for the architect but provide standards for example using a variety of materials. He also reminded the commission that they don't have to approve an applicant that same night that they are allowed to continue it and require them to address the commissions concerns.

Commissioner Blackburn commented that the idea is good but he would rather that the sides that are facing needs to be enhanced and not just have a variety of materials.

Mr. Brim commented that he could add the language in the code that would enable them to get what they have been talking about.

Commissioner Brady asked Mr. Malmberg if this gave him cause for concern

Mr. Malmberg stated that there is a Starbucks in Logan with a drive thru in the back and a false front. The back appears to be the front and makes the building more aesthetically appealing.

Mr. Judd, commented that the commission needed to take into consideration that they needed to clearly state the kinds of upgrades they were looking for when allowing a drive thru that would not in the front.

Mr. Malmberg, stated that the Starbuck they are planning in Vineyard is going to have three sides that look like the front due to the aesthetics and architecture.

Mr. Brim commented that Starbucks is providing a good first example by coming in with a great design and setting a precedent.

Mr. Malmberg commented that he is confident that they aren't going to skimp out because they know that people on Mill Rd will see it as another frontage.

Mr. Brim, commented that for the public hearing he will have language that addresses the concerns that were brought up. He added that the commission is making recommendations and they are allowed to make modifications in the text before it goes to council. Mr. Brim then added that he will have language prepared and if the commission doesn't like it, it can be amended.

7. COMMISSION MEMBERS' REPORTS AND EX PARTE DISCUSSION DISCLOSURE

Commissioner Blackburn talked about the completion of the heritage section of the general plan and the movement of vintage farm equipment to a holding place on the Anderson property.

Commissioner Carter, asked where the city was at with short term rentals. Mr. Brim answered that the code has been amended to no longer allow people to do those but if people were already doing that then they will be grandfathered in.

Mr. Overson commented that the people that were having problems with that feel like they've been approved and they only way to solve the problem is to have a citizen meeting.

Commissioner Brady asked if a ruling had been made at a state level.

Mr. Brim said no ruling had been made and that cities had tried to mitigate it by finding citizens through website but they determined that intent was not commitment of the crime.

Madam Chair Welsh, still waiting to hear from the mayor on who will be full time planning commissioner. It'll be at least the end of the month because council has canceled planning commission on the 14th so plan on the alternates filling in on the 21st. We always need three to function so try to make it.

Madam Chair Welsh stated that they are still waiting to hear back from the mayor who will be a full time commissioner. She asked that people really try to be there because of the turnover and they need three commissioners to function.

8. STAFF REPORTS

- Morgan Brim, Planning Director- Two grants are up for review for trails around Utah Lake. All the mayors in Utah will get together and vote on their approval. Madam Chair Welsh asked if it was possible to write to these mayors. Mr. Brim answered that because they are public officials you can call or write to them.

Mr. Brim then moved on to talk about the team of UVU students who were creating a design for the promenade and a portion of the trail. The design they are using was created by a BYU planning class. Madam Chair Welsh requested that they incorporate the cauldron.

Mr. Brim then talked about the forge applying for funding for a parking structure and the development of the area around the Megaplex.

Madam Chair Welsh asked about upcoming meetings and Mr. Brim mentioned the general plan open house and let the commission know they were welcome to come volunteer. Commissioner Blackburn then added that there will be a City Council meeting on the 28th approving the naming of public land facilities.

- Don Overson, Town Engineer – not in attendance

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: COMMISSIONER BLACKBURN MADE A MOTION TO ADJURN THE MEETING. COMMISSIONER CARTER SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MEETING WAS ADJURNED AT 7:58PM

MINUTES APPROVED ON: March 21, 2018

CORRECTED BY: /s/ Claire Hague

Claire Hague, Permit Technician