

Minutes of the Syracuse Planning Commission Work Session, July 5, 2016

Minutes of the Syracuse City Planning Commission Work Session held on July 5, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., in the Conference Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present:

Commission Members: Ralph Vaughan, Chairman
Dale Rackham, Vice Chairman
TJ Jensen
Curt McCuiston
Greg Day
Troy Moultrie
Grant Thorson

City Employees: Noah Steele, Planner
Royce Davies, Planner
Paul Roberts, City Attorney
Stacy Adams, Commission Secretary

City Council: Councilman Gailey

Excused:

Visitors: Ray Zaugg

[8:13:58 PM](#)

1. **Department Business:**

[8:14:07 PM](#)

a. City Council Liaison Report

Councilman Gailey stated Director Mellor kind of stole all his thunder when they were talking about this new zone, might mention a couple of things might want to look at in the verbiage that has seen so far in the description of this new one. The smallest lot size is 3000 sq. ft. feet and already negotiated is nothing less than 3500 sq. ft. Would suggest would take Director Mellor up on going down and visit Foxboro, was surprised the homes that were built on 3000 sq. ft. lots they were roomier than thought would be for him personally can't do stairs, he and his wife can't do stairs, so couldn't built anything that doesn't have a lot of stairway in it but go down and take the tour and look at it. One of the reasons why the Council is looking at this is because that corridor is going to present an issue all the way along the corridor of marketability of what can be built along the corridor that will sell. The reason why they are proposing a new zone is that if something should happen in the City down the road as that corridor continues to develop they may find that there are others that may want to do something similar. The feeling in the Council right now is nothing less than 100 acres that would not look at this zone for anything less than 100 acres. The only other thing that they discussed that was relative to the Commission is what have been talking about with this parking issue and the Council is as confused as the Commission, but they didn't get cake. Apologize for not being present at last meeting was at a family reunion and Councilman Lisonbee was going to cover that but had something come up and wasn't able to attend. City Attorney Roberts stated the with the potential zone change they are really hoping to have the Commission dig in and get our hands dirty here so didn't want to give too much direction at first except for the few things have talked about. Councilman Gailey stated would like the Commission to look at it and the smallest parcel being 3500 sq. ft. as a starting point and don't want to go any lower than that.

[8:17:44 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen asked Councilman Gailey to briefly talk about the water audit they had a presentation on. Councilman Gailey stated they met with a company out of Houston Texas that has the software and capability of looking at flow rates in the City and looking for illegal connections and places where meters might be misreading and helping the City understand what possible revenues might be lost to the City in culinary water usage because of metering and flow rates and are going to do a study. It was a presentation given to the Council 2 weeks ago but they still have to act on that and there is both positive and negative of both of those things, what the City would be bound to would be a sharing of 60% of the increase revenues with the current business that is being proposed over a 3 year period of time or perhaps a 50% over a longer period of time. Many times when they come into cities there is no outlay for the cities at all, there is no cost to the City at all the thing that would be giving up would be future revenues that would be found as they do the flow studies to see if do have some issues with the delivery of water. Commissioner Jensen stated one of the other things they mentioned was if someone bypasses a meter so the meter is not reading this might be a way to help protect those meters. Councilman Gailey stated that is a possibility. The individual that came and represented this Company said there are cities where they find absolutely nothing and we might be one of those but there is no out of pocket cost for the City. The benefit to the City would be understanding and realizing maybe a financial gain later on, this Company would be tied to the City for revenue sharing for a period of either 3, 4 or 5 years depending on what percentage would be negotiate but that is still under negotiation. Commissioner Vaughan asked if this was an issue that would come before the Planning Commission. Councilman Gailey stated no, this is not a Planning Commission issue, it is Public Works.

[8:20:35 PM](#)

b. City Attorney Updates

City Attorney Roberts stated no updates for them.

[8:20:42 PM](#)

c. Upcoming Agenda Items

Planner Davies stated they have received an application today for the Jackson Court subdivision, the PRD over off 2000 W so are anticipating that to be on the agenda for next meeting. Commissioner Jensen asked staff if had heard anything else from the Criddle property. Planner Davies stated no, no updates.

[8:21:16 PM](#)

2. Discussion Items:

a. Open Space PRD 10.75.040 Ordinance Revision (Percentages & Direct Road Connections)

Planner Steele stated have been working on this for a little while now and feel like are making progress and the intent is to tighten up what they consider to be common space in the PRD zone. Last meeting Commission gave staff the direction to address and clarify who can access the installed amenities, timing for amenities installation and method of calculating the total require open space. Also there was some confusion, so created a graphic to clarify the percentages required. What it says right now is open space, common space shall be a minimum 50% of the total land area excluding roadways, buildings, acreage and excluding any above ground City infrastructure of that 50%, 30% shall be in open space and 20% in common space. So for example if have a 10 acre development would take 50% and 30% of the total, that was where the confusion was, is whether or not were taking the 30% of the total acreage or 30% of the 50% so and that is why are obviously addressing this so it is not so confusion. So of the total it would be 3 acres would be open and 2 would be common space. Are proposing to change it, the acres of common space would be the same, minimum of 20% of the gross acreage of the project shall be developed in common space so it cuts out a step and makes it a little more straight forward. Also included photos of what is considered common space and what is open space which is the entryway and nice landscaping around that would be maintained by the HOA and can also include some wetland type things but are just counting the acreage for the common space which are the amenities.

[8:23:58 PM](#)

10.75.040 Minimum lot standards.

(A) Density: overall density of six dwelling units per gross acre.

(2) A minimum of 20% of the gross acreage of the project shall be developed as common space. Common space areas shall:

- i. be landscaped by the developer with turf, trees, shrubs, ground cover, amenities, and an automatic sprinkling system.
- ii. be equally accessible and distributed for all residents of the HOA community. Access by the general public may be included as agreed upon in a development agreement.
- iii. be generally contiguous, not a collection of remnants.
- iv. create an open atmosphere where development does not feel overly intense.
- v. not include required front, side, and rear, yard areas towards common space acreage.
- vi. be administered by an active homeowners association.
- vii. be permanently restricted from future development and shown on the subdivision plat as perpetually common.
- viii. include multiple amenities from the following list: club house, tennis court, pickleball court, basketball court, playground, community garden, picnic shelter, swimming pool, park benches, walking trails, outdoor exercise equipment, dog park, or splash pad. City council shall approve all proposed amenities and may approve an amenity not included in this list.
- ix. include approved amenities in each segment of common area, landscaping alone does not qualify a segment as common space.
- x. Common spaces shall be installed proportional to the progress of the development. Common space amenities not completed before the recording of the phase that it resides in, shall be guaranteed with an escrow agreement amount equivalent to the cost to install said amenity.

[8:26:56 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated still on the record that need to designate open space on top of the common space but what would propose since Planner Steele has moved the common space down into subsection 2 and maybe make that a subsection 3 and change the current 2 to say 'open space shall be a minimum of 30% of the total land area' and then take out all reference to common space so that there is one subsection that talks about open space and one section that talks about common space and don't have to worry about the total of 50% even though it adds up to 50%, just say 30% goes open space and 20% goes common space. One of the things they suggested was bumping that to 40% instead of 30% but the rest of the Commission may not agree with that but if just separate those 2 entirely then don't have the issue of if whether take the 50% of the 50% or if it is in 2 separate sections and one says 20% and one says 30% then it is clear. Planner Steele stated they could add another number and go into what think open space is and the percentage.

[8:28:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan asked Commissioner Jensen if had a specific percentage in mind. Commissioner Jensen stated think the 50% they say with the Criddle property wasn't working that is why thinks they need to bump the open space requirement because essentially that was so compartmentalized with all the little things they were calling open space and all the houses were so close together think it just defeated the purpose of the ordinance or at least the intent of when that was defined so if are going to designate open space thin it needs to be at least 40% of the development and another 20% to common, that that would be better than 30/20. Commissioner Vaughan asked if had a specific place where wanted to change that. Commissioner Jensen stated taking section 2 and breaking that into a 2 and 3 and 2 would

say 40% open space is required and 3 would say 20% common space is required and they are 2 separate things. Planner Steele stated there is more than one way to figure density so if the intent is to reduce the density because essentially having the open space like that would reduce the units and so can control density through minimum lot sizes or max densities per acre or can require to increase the open space or can also increase the setback requirements so if the intent is to decrease the density would say let's just be more direct about it and just say don't want as many units. Commissioner Jensen stated the thing he is looking for is that and what bothered him and some of the other Commissioners was with the last PRD they saw was that essentially it was just so uniform and there really wasn't, yes there was open space there but all the houses were evenly spaced throughout the entire development and it just really wasn't, it just didn't look the idea behind and a lot of the land use conferences they have been to lately is want to try to cluster the homes together to create open space and felt that that development didn't do that. Certainly when talking multi-family units it is a lot easier to get open space because have 4 units all on one foundation but when trying to have four units and four separate foundations that is where the uniformity starts creeping in try to get away from that uniformity because then it just looks like a row of houses and at that point might as well just call it an R-3. Planner Steele stated in that particular development and know in general when see a lot of homes in a row that does create a monotonous type of environment and agree urban design does not recommend and is not urban design to have the same setback down 1,000 ft. Commissioner Jensen stated that is his concern with increasing the setbacks is basically forcing that uniformity so don't think increasing the setbacks is the way to go necessarily because then everything is getting spaced out evenly to try to make up for the setbacks. Planner Steele stated they could explore some language to encourage some variation in setbacks as well. Commissioner Vaughan stated that would be setbacks but on this particular item are looking at the percentages.

[8:31:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated they have seen this a lot of times and have talked about open space and common space and they have kind of gone through a lot of refinement and his objection to the Criddle property wasn't a previously agreed upon density higher than what the PRD currently allows and the Criddle property showed they could meet open space in 100 different ways to the point that the open space requirement became not even needed and think that is why they moved to where they are and know Commissioner Jensen would like to still include it but is of the opinion and have seen it a lot of times, like the way it is written and think they have addressed his concerns and would make a motion now that they, not doing that now, but would make and approve a motion right now that it be recommended to the City Council as written, they have seen it a lot of time and have addressed and talked about a bunch of these different things and would like to see if could get out of their hands as quickly as possible tonight. Commissioner Jensen stated just wanted to be clear that all of the requirements that were added under section 2 for the common space items i-x think all of those are good and should keep those and at the very least think need to get those moved forward.

[8:33:34 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated just wanted to echo what Commissioner Thorson stated think they make a mistake by referencing Criddle Farms because the process that one went through was a little bit unique and really unfortunately this body didn't have a lot of part in, there is an agreement upon annexation agreement that was driven and so think by maybe that being the centerpiece of what are doing is a mistake on this body but think there has been a lot of refinement and think this could actually promote some good things and think more of it is the design than anything, don't think can really codify a vision appropriately but really like what have changed and would vote to approve this.

[8:35:02 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen stated it doesn't really relate to the changes they are talking about right now but something the Commission might think about. Right now the Commission really doesn't get a chance to weigh in on development t agreements think it might help the Commission when are making these decisions that they could at least look at those agreements to understand what the underlying agreement is when trying to make these decisions so don't know if need to put something in there that the Commission would get a chance to review them or something but don't think that would necessarily be a bad idea but that doesn't really relate to today, but it does relate to PRD.

[8:35:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated so it is just the definition and percentages. Commissioner Vaughan asked staff to bring it forward to the next meeting as action item.

[8:35:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Jensen removed himself from diose for the next item.

[8:36:05 PM](#)

b. Master Planned Community Zone Creations Discussion

City Attorney Roberts stated before staff gets started just wanted to preface this, it is going to be tempting to think of this only in relation to the Woodside development and aren't here to talk about Woodside. This is a proposed zone and this has been done in a lot of cities to some success where look have a potential for a Master Planned Community zone where essentially the developer comes in through the door asking for zoning approval with a master plan, a transportation plan and even with plats so would have all the information up front before decide whether to approve the zone or not and of course zoning is a discretionary action by the City Council ultimately so it is not as if people are going to walking in off the street and saying, 'Hey ,I want to do a MPC'. A developer is not going to waste that kind of money putting together a plan like that unless they feel like it is something that the community wants. So would encourage the Commission not to think of this strictly as like the Woodside zone but think of it as Master Planned Community zone and this is something

that could be applicable in other parts of the City or an annexed areas and just think what are the basic requirements that want developers to bring through the door on that initial meeting.

[8:37:28 PM](#)

Councilman Gailey wanted City Attorney Roberts to respond to whether or not Commissioner Jensen needs to be recused for this discussion since it is a zoning discussion in general and if he really needs to recuse himself. City Attorney Roberts stated it is up to Commissioner Jensen's discretion if he feels it is going to be a conflict of interest. Commissioner Jensen stated the reason he is recusing himself from this discussion is for right now the zone is specifically being created for his property so certainly other developers can develop it later but feel where he is going to benefit from this zone he can't be involved in the discussion.

[8:38:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated think this creates a conundrum if Commissioner Jensen recuses himself it is obvious that this is for a specific property and would either say Commissioner Jensen needs to participate and make it not a property, this map should not have been submitted from staff and going to Foxboro as a Woodside Home development is pretty blatant and doesn't know how this cannot be a single property unless they start with a different beginning point.

[8:38:51 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated at this particular point what is up on the screen then should not appear in any record because how can they say that they have to turn a blind eye to the proposed development when they are showing them the proposed development and even have a potential ordinance and have examples included in the packet. It is very difficult would think to be able to defend an action saying no are not talking about this project but here is the project don't know how they get around that particular challenge but it is kind of tough, because they know too much. City Attorney Roberts stated ultimately it is too late to un-ring the bell but a developer will bring in an idea and it is an idea from another city or something that has worked before so what is saying if this zone is created it will be generally applicable available zone for developers with appropriate projects. With the project that has been discussed is potentially one of those projects but what the Commission ultimately approve or disapprove in this zoning document might change the project because that is what they are talking about is what do they want to see as a Commission in this type of a Master Planned Community zone where people bring in more units which means they can do a lot more with an HOA and aren't talking about a 20 unit subdivision but more like several hundred units. Could do a lot better amenities so they were sort of the reason that are considering the zone but let's consider it and what is saying lets be broad and think to yourselves how do we want this type of zone to develop further. Whether Commissioner Jensen recuses himself don't think there is any way that can require him to come back, he can recuse himself for whether he is required to or whether he just feels like there is an appearance of impropriety.

[8:40:56 PM](#)

Planner Steele stated he will just add that staff has been asked to create a tool and since are on analogies tonight of the whole cake and broccoli thing and everything, there is a tool to address a need that a growing community has. The City has various large acreage parcels in the City that have not been annexed and are annexed and just to be clear as staff as an example let's say a hammer, staff are not hammer salesmen and not necessarily pushing 3500 sq. ft. lots, staff is just trying to help the community get what they ultimately want and create the tool that if they want to have the necessary tools to have the types of communities that they want this is something that needs to be created. Now whether or not they pick up this tool just this one time to create something or if they want to keep it in their tool belt and deploy it in other areas is ultimately up to City Council or if they throw the tool in the garbage eventually it is not in staff's hands or even Planning Commission's hands and know there is a lot of fear around creating a zone and what would happen in 10 years down the down if another Council gets it and they do something ultimately they could create a different zone that didn't like equally undesirable. Hopefully when it comes down to it staff has been directed to look at this potential tool and don't think it is really a conversation of whether or not should create the tool but more of what really what are trying to accomplish with it.

[8:43:03 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson asked staff and Director Mellor mentioned why it couldn't be done under the current tools and they weren't really told a reason and does staff know of the reason why it can't be done under the current tools. Planner Steele stated yes, it comes down to density and flexibility in lot size and a community like Syracuse is growing and density can be a pill to swallow. Commissioner Thorson stated the minimum lot size and density of a PRD aren't high enough for this. Planner Steele stated yes, a lot of Master Planned Communities they call it cradle to grave and so they want to create and the fact is a lot of people can't afford the larger lot and so the idea of creating a community where starting families and older families can live in the same neighborhood which the idea is it creates good social interaction and more of a complete neighborhood and ultimately if the City doesn't want it they don't have to, they could stick to 5 acre parcels if they wanted to if felt like that was the, so it is kind of opening a broader philosophical question of who we are as a City and what want but think the City Council has given them the direction that are okay with lots down to 3500 sq. ft. and what that does is provide a flexibility, also toured the project and not even a quarter of the lots are that small but it just adds another level of flexibility for the developer to provide a gradient of densities throughout the development so ultimately that is up to City Council whether or not they want to create lots that small.

[8:45:11 PM](#)

Councilman Gailey stated generally does not like to speak, there is a difference in speaking on behalf of and in behalf of and has been sent tonight to speak on behalf of the City Council which means is going to give the Commission their opinion and are asking the Planning Commission to create a new tool for the City, there is universal acceptance of this on

the Council and feel like the City needs the tool to help do this. Now hopes it doesn't look as contrived as perhaps a visit on a tarmac in an airplane but seldom has he seen the unity within the City Council that there is with this project, the Council generally looks favorably on this project and would ask the Commission to try to stay with the timeline and ask them to come up with a tool that they can manage this and the Council didn't know they were going to get an order for a grilled cheese sandwich until they had it but now they want to add it to the menu. Universally among the Councilmembers this has been accepted.

[8:46:53 PM](#)

City Attorney Roberts stated so with that in mind think it would be good for staff to sort of run through what some of staffs ideas have been of what are looking for in a Master Planned Community and what do they want it to look like.

[8:47:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Day stated one thing would like to add as they commence this discussion is that think there is an opportunity here not saying for or against this particular project but think there is an opportunity for the Commission to contribute in a positive manner to this zoning verses talking a negative of not participating in the writing in the zoning. If they take a negative approach in a sense we as the Planning Commission have lost their voice and are not going to have that voice in the crafting of the zone, know that is going to be hard because for many of the reasons stated but perhaps there is some good in it and they start looking at some of the positives and look how they can positively affect it.

[8:47:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan stated in a hierarchy between the City Council and the Planning Commission this is an issue that the City Council has given specific direction for them to look at and review. They have already indicated a more than passing vote of their approval of the consideration of this even down to lot size of 3500 sq. ft. Is correct in that they are giving the Commission an opportunity to craft it with as many restrictions and possibilities and opportunities as possibly can. Being as how they are the City Council they have the luxury of being able to review anything the Commission does and anything they propose are well within their rights to be able to modify it once they give them something to work on as have seen them do in the past. So it is an opportunity for the Commission to do that and one of the things they do have, they have the ability to say as this and in other times because if they follow the projected timeframe for this they would have a discussion tonight, one in 2 weeks and then it would be hoped possibly that the might be able to be ready to make some type of a proposal at their 3rd meeting from tonight with that in mind they are going to have plenty of microphone time to be able to say they embrace the concept of being able to have a smaller Master Planned Community with a variation in density. In some ways, will use one example, in the past the City has indicated very clearly that they are against very, very dense housing, most people think of that as being apartments or condos or groups of duplexes if they were to go forward with a project like this they would indicate that no the City is not against condo or apartments or high density things but embrace them but would like to see them put in such a way that the City has as much control over them as can under the fair housing act and all of the other things have here in the State. So this is an opportunity and they can say personally that no they are not in favor of this type of development in Syracuse but if have the opportunity to work on it yes they can saw what they would want to see in this type of a community. There is a market for homes like this the project down in North Salt lake is proof of that. Has not been to that location and has not seen their product but has been able to read the newspapers and noticed that the opening price for basically their bottom unit is \$310,000 that is not cheapy apartment or cheapy housing, that is a very, very tight number for square footage on a smaller lot when compare that to some of the homes that are being currently offered in Syracuse. It is not as though they are looking at just throwing up the most flimsy thing. In regards to Commissioner Thorson's comments it is not about zoning it is about the number of units, it is not lot size it is how many buildings can they put up and how many can they sell. That is what the building industry does; everybody who is in the industry knows that their average profit is 2-6% depending upon how many amenities they put in so the more units they can get 6% on the more money they make, 6% of 600 units is a whole lot bigger than 6% on 100 units which is what they would have. They have already seen some indications and one suggestion that has been mentioned that instead of 3000 sq. ft. that was banded about that has been changed to 3500 sq. ft. that is a 1/7th reduction in size that means it a reduction by basically by 7.5% in the number of units. Looking at this handout they were given it was initially envisioned that there would be 305 units of that size and if take 1/7th of that away that is 80 units and is now down to closer to 200 units so right of the bat are already taking density away. Now this particular developer in this case appears to be that the property owners in the process of buying it is very familiar of the philosophy of this Planning Commission because it wasn't that long ago the project that is in between the 2 areas on the map called the Cottages the Planning Commission reduced that in size something like 40-50%, remember how dense that was when they started with it so they know without any direction from the City Council that the Commission is already predisposed to trying to have a better product a larger if they are the same thing moving forward. So in consideration of that this can be done and can craft an ordinance and think should give it their best shot and then do whatever the Commission thinks and try to keep it within the spirit of what they initially were looking for, think this kind of a target but are not saying this is what they want because they can't do that to the Commission, by law they can't do that to the Commission. So the Commission has a lot of say in this and can do as much as they possibly can, aren't pushing back are just telling the Council what their opinion is as a Planning Commission what think would be the best thing for use of this type of property in this part of town and think they have a golden opportunity here.

[8:54:12 PM](#)

Commissioner Vaughan said Commissioner Rackham spoke a little earlier because he was the Chairman of the committee that went through the revision of the General Plan and is intimately familiar with lot size and density and what the pulse of the City was at the time so can understand his initial comments as clearly spoke them earlier this evening. Commissioner Rackham stated specific to this plan that has been presented here asked the question earlier and didn't

feel like got a good response the City requires that houses have frontage to the road and yet these have little access roads and have turned down developers before because they didn't allow them and there was no understanding of who was going to maintain them so forced them to have a regular road and here are proposing it and so that issue didn't see it get addressed in here as far as making sure have frontage on the road and don't have a private driveway with houses behind because know there are other people in the City that would love to take their 3 acre lot and put a second home behind it with a long driveway to get to it and the City doesn't allow it, like flag lots, so would that be allowed on these, didn't see it really addressed in there and think that needs to be addressed. Like said earlier there really was quite a push to either are going to condense the homes or lot size to have an amenity to share and this one does but are they condensing them to the point where are just packing them in and then are going to come back and say the setbacks are too much and need to extend beyond to have overhangs or patio covers so they really need to take a look at that and say is the lot size adequate to build a home that belongs in Syracuse because one of the things they wanted was wanted nice family homes, that is what came out of the committee and is his opinion also. This document that they were presented with where did the draft of that come from. City Attorney Roberts asked which document is her refereeing to.

Commissioner Rackham stated the new ordinance. Planner Steele stated staff created it. Commissioner Rackham stated because one of the things is in clusters they made very certain that contiguous meant contiguous not contiguous as long as it is 200 feet away and noticed in this kind of just thrown that out the window and think they need to be consistent in their documents and can't remove it from one and put it in another.

[8:58:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Thorson stated would like to note that the time is approaching 9 o'clock and are they going to go beyond 9 o'clock or is he incorrect in thinking that is a time milestone they need to approve an overage. Commissioner Vaughan stated he is ready to go if they are, if they can hammer out some basic philosophies on this, has gone through this and it is very well written, Planner Steele wrote it and knows their philosophy and knows the philosophy of the City Council and thinks he put together a tentative thing for them to, it is a starting point. Commissioner Thorson stated he understands and his objection isn't to the starting point is wondering if they are going to approve an overage of time or if that is necessary. Commissioner Vaughan stated there are 2 more meetings if they follow the suggestion of the City Council, they can't force them if they are not ready as much as they would like to they can't force them if are not ready and cannot come to agreement on this but is possible if could just run through some of this if there is anything else staff would like them to know, perhaps Planner Steele could take them through some of the headings to let them know everything that is being covered in here and then if at the next meeting they really come prepared to the max knowing all of the paragraphs all of the thoughts all of the hot buttons for each one of them to come forward ready to discuss they could pound this out as much as they have where they have their own little weaknesses and frailties and strengths and desires on it. Commissioner Rackham stated regarding a question that was asked earlier if this were left as a cluster or PRD or an R-3 they don't have enough information on here to decide what the density would be, could they get that. Commissioner Vaughan stated part of the luxury that they have is they would have this as a site plan, this just happens to be an illustration that accompanies what the possibility is of an ordinance than is drawn up and as far as if this was presented to the Commission and they did have this ordinance in effect would they still say yes this marches it and whether or not they like it. Commissioner Rackham stated not based on approving or not approving this want to know how what they are seeing here would compare to what they have today. Commissioner Day stated on the diagram this would show the density of 3.5 units per acre if that is what he is looking for. Commissioner Rackham for the total. Commissioner Day stated on the map if go to the totals column on the bottom and is assuming wrong but it shows 3.5 dwelling units per acre. Planner Steele stated that is correct.

[9:01:11 PM](#)

Commissioner McCuiston stated point of order according to their bylaws they are not supposed to extend past 9 o'clock without a vote to do so and they have not done that. Commissioner Vaughan stated he would like to extend 15 minutes thinks they can take care of it in 15 minutes. Commissioner Vaughan stated Chair cannot make a motion but thinks they can do an awful lot in 15 minutes. Commissioner Day stated he is not opposed to the timeline that sis outlined in this document but is not in favor of extending tonight's meeting and thinks they should wait until next meeting.

[9:01:50 PM](#)

COMMISSIONER RACKHAM MADE A MOTION TO EXTEND FOR 15 MINUTES. NO SECOND WAS MADE MOTION DIES FOR LACK OF SECOND.

[9:01:58 PM](#)

3. **Commissioner Reports**

None.

[9:02:06 PM](#)

4. **Adjourn**

COMMISSIONER RACKHAM MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COMMISSIONER DAY SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.