HEBER CITY CORPORATION
75 North Main Street
Heber City, UT 84032
Heber City Council Meeting
August 12, 2025

Approved August 26, 2025

6:00 p.m. – Regular Meeting

1. **Regular Meeting:**

   I. Call to Order

Chairman Phil Jordan called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and welcomed everyone present.

   II. Roll Call

Planning Commission Present:	Chairman Phil Jordan Vice-Chair Tori Broughton Commissioner Dennis Gunn Commissioner Greg Royall Commissioner Robert Mckinley
Planning Commission Absent:	Commissioner Dave Richard Commissioner Darek Slagowski Commissioner Josh Knight Commissioner Robert Wilson
Staff Present:	Planning Manager Jamie Baron Planner Jacob Roberts Planning Office Admin Meshelle Kijanen City Engineer Ross Hansen
Staff Participating Remotely:	Sara Nagel
Also Present:	Gary Bush, Kate Becker, Michael Bradshaw, Cody Whitenton, Mike Johnston, John McDonald, Jaea Woreanz, Cassie and Shawn Harrison
Also Attending Remotely:	Grace Doerfler KPCW, Matt Watson

   III. Pledge of Allegiance: By Invitation

Commissioner Dennis Gunn led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

   IV. Prayer/Thought by Invitation: N/A ()

   V. Recuse for Conflict of Interest

Chairman Phil Jordan recused himself from Action Item, "Jordanelle Ridge Village 3 Marcella Preliminary Plat".

2. Consent Agenda: N/A

3. Action Items:

I. Bush Annexation, consisting of 1.863 acres, located at approximately 3450 N US 40. (Planner Jamie Baron)

This item was discussed third.

Planning Manager Baron explained this item and introduced Gary Bush and Mike Johnston as the applicant and the engineer, respectively. He said Mr. Bush had proposed that his property be annexed into Heber City and he directed the Commission to the location of his lot. He detailed the annexation process and provided a history of this item thus far. Planning Manager Baron reported that Mr. Bush's application had been approved by the City Council to move forward, so it was now up for review and consideration by the Planning Commission to move on to the next step in the process. Planning Manager Baron stated that the property was within Heber City's annexation policy plan. He said the County currently had the lot zoned as Town Core, which allowed for up to six ERUs per acre. He then explained that Mr. Bush's proposal for development was to have ten live-work units, two of which would be affordable or deed-restricted. He said this plan fell within the parameters of the zone's density requirements.

Planning Manager Baron shared the site plan and noted that in addition to Mr. Bush's property, a portion of land owned by Finch Creek would be annexed as well with this plan. He indicated where the ten units and an accessory barn would be located and also indicated the elevation of the site.

Planning Manager Baron summarized that Staff recommended approval and was looking to the Commission for direction about the zoning.

Mr. Bush stated he had owned the property for 20 years and hoped to develop it in a way that provided function to the community.

Mr. Johnston made clear that he was participating as a friend of Mr. Bush's, and not serving in his capacity as a Heber City Councilmember. He stated that he had recused himself from this item on the Council and would not vote on the item.

Mr. Johnston provided a history of this parcel and the North Village. He said the zoning had the highest possible density for commercial zones. He said the area was serviced by the North Village Special Services District and the property owners in the area paid fees to fund the sewer treatment and water treatment plant. Mr. Johnston said Heber City and the County had an MOU for Heber City to annex the area, so annexation of Mr. Bush's land was part of the City's General Plan. He explained Mr. Bush's intent was to build a barn on his property, and noted that nothing could be developed on the property until UDOT fixed the road access issues. He said the property could not be developed without a frontage road, so annexation was necessary.

Mr. Johnston commented that when the frontage road was put in, the homes that were currently in the area would need to be torn down. Mr. Johnston opined that this area was not suited for single-family homes and thought it was better suited for a commercial

zone. He said that Mr. Bush's plan to build a storage barn- not a living space- was an appropriate use of the land. He summarized that Mr. Bush was waiting for UDOT to develop the roads, and said the final plan for the development was not set in stone, although he did know the development would be commercial and not residential.
Planning Manager Baron elaborated on the history of the area and said that Mr. Bush's parcel and his neighbors parcels had been part of the original petition for North Village, but the neighbors had requested to be left out and so their parcels had not been included on the final plat.
Mr. Johnston reiterated that the barn Mr. Bush wanted to build was for personal use, and that he knew he had to wait for the roads to be built by UDOT before any kind of development could move forward.
City Engineer Hansen said he had no issues with this application from an engineering perspective.
Chairman Jordan said there would be a public hearing at the City Council about this item after the Planning Commission's recommendation. Chairman Jordan acknowledged there were members of the audience who wanted to speak on this issue, but said that this evening's meeting did not include a public comment period. He invited members of the public to speak if they had relevant information to share about this application, but specified that opinion-based comments would need to wait until the Council's public hearing.
Kate Becker, representative of the owner situated to the north of Mr. Bush, spoke. She said the road was private, and had not been annexed into the City since the majority of landowners in the area had requested to not be annexed. She expressed that annexation would create problems with traffic on the private road. She said that in order for the road to be the mandatory 26 feet required by the City, it would require the drainage ditch to be removed, which would dissolve the property. She opined it was wrong to tell long-time property owners that their houses would be condemned and torn down if this annexation were to go through.
Commissioner Gunn noted a positive recommendation this evening would only continue the discussion, and he anticipated there would be more discussion at the upcoming public hearing.
Motion: Commissioner Gunn moved to forward a positive recommendation of the Bush Annexation, consisting of 1.863 acres, located at approximately 3450 N US 40, subject to the findings and conditions outlined by Staff. Commissioner McKinley made the second.
Discussion: Vice-Chair Broughton agreed with Commissioner Gunn that it was appropriate to continue this conversation at the City Council level.
Voting Yes: Chairman Jordan, Vice-Chair Broughton, Commissioner Royall, McKinley, Commissioner Gunn
Voting No: None. The Motion Passed 5-0.

II. <u>Jordanelle Ridge Village 3 Marcella Preliminary Plat (Planner Jamie Baron)</u>

This item was discussed first. Planning Manager Baron explained the agenda item, although the audio does not capture the beginning of his summary. The audio also does not reflect that Commissioner Jordan recused himself from this item due to a conflict of interest.

[Audio begins at 00:10:18]

Planner Baron discussed the steep slope and identified two lots, 422 and 521, that needed to be corrected and moved to a location more suitable for development. He overviewed the design requirements. Planner Baron summarized that City Staff recommended approval, subject to findings and conditions from Staff and the City Engineer.

Mike Bradshaw identified himself as the applicant and offered an overview of the development. Mr. Bradshaw said the development had been divided into neighborhoods that each had a distinct feel. He noted there was a lot of open space, with more than double the open space than what was required by the MDA. He also stated that they would add to the trail system as well. Mr. Bradshaw listed some of the amenities, including a golf park, complete walking path system, family clubhouse, and tennis and pickleball court. He shared a rendering of what the central park would look like.

Commissioner McKinley asked about the timeline for the golf park and Mr. Bradshaw replied that they were currently sodding the golf park and planned to officially open in September. Mr. Bradshaw added that the club house would take a little bit longer to complete.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked how many of the amenities would be open to the public. Mr. Bradshaw replied that the trail system was public, though the development itself and the clubhouse were private. Mr. Bradshaw clarified that existing trail use would not be impacted by the development. Vice-Chair Broughton thanked Mr. Bradshaw for making sure that the trails remained open.

Motion: Commissioner Royall moved to approve the Jordanelle Ridge Village 3 Marcella Preliminary Plat, with findings and conditions as identified in the Staff Report. Commissioner McKinley made the second.

Discussion: N/A

Voting Yes: Commissioner Gunn, Commissioner Jordan, Commissioner Royall, Commissioner McKinley, Vice-Chair Broughton.

Voting No: None. The Motion passed 5-0.

III. <u>Requesting an MDA approval for Downtown Food Truck Court DA, located at 89 W 100 S. (Planner Jacob Roberts)</u>

This item was discussed second.

Planning Manager Baron overviewed this proposal for a 16-vendor food court lot. He reported it was in the C-3 zone and was a part of the downtown area. Planning Manager Baron stated that Staff recommended approval, as long as the impact to the surrounding area was mitigated to the greatest extent possible. He added that the Planning Commission had previously moved to continue this item, contingent on a revised MDA that addressed all components of the Municipal Code. He listed the requirements that needed to be addressed, namely lighting and landscaping. He noted that ‘food truck’ also needed to be defined in the development agreement. Planning

Manager Baron highlighted that the new plan included ADA access, which had previously been missing.

City Engineer Hansen stated that Engineering had reservations about the use of the word 'temporary' and said that it needed to be clearly defined in the MDA. He explained that the applicant was requesting several waivers on the grounds that the development was temporary, and so the definition needed to be clear. He added that the waivers should be granted by the Commission, rather than the Engineering Staff. Chairman Jordan asked City Engineer Hansen if there was anything within the plan that concerned him and City Engineer Hansen replied that Engineering would typically require a traffic study and noted that the nearby intersection already had problems with traffic. City Engineer Hansen said he also would usually require enhancements to the curb and gutter if the development was permanent. Chairman Jordan clarified that any issues with traffic and streets would still be the same, regardless of whether the development was permanent or temporary. City Engineer Hansen stated that there were no documents which indicated that temporary developments should be considered with a different set of standards than a permanent development.

Planning Manager Baron went over the new proposal. He stated that per the previous Commission discussion about this item, the proposal had been updated to include the requirements that 'temporary' should be defined as no more than five years, that a sunset clause needed to be included in the MDA, and that permanent bathrooms needed to be installed a year after the food court opened. Planning Manager Baron listed the waivers that had been requested by the applicant, which included waivers for lighting and landscaping standards, Storm Water design manual compliance, escrow fees, and adjoining street expansion and improvement requirements.

Planning Manager Baron concluded that City Staff recommended approval of the plan and found it to be in compliance with the General Plan, though some concerns remained which would need to be addressed in the MDA. He specified that the development would also need to minimize the impact on neighbors. He said that an MDA was required in order to move forward, in which all concerns and conditions of Staff needed to be addressed.

Mr. Bancroft expressed he was willing to answer questions.

Matt Hansen introduced himself as the general contractor for the project. Mike Johnston introduced himself as a friend of Mr. Hansen's and said he had offered to help him with the project. Mr. Johnston clarified that he was present that evening solely as an engineer, not in a formal capacity as a City Councilmember. Mr. Johnston confirmed he was not voting on this item in the Council due to the conflict of interest. Mr. Johnston stated the only question about this development was that there was no physical building on the site, which was a requirement for a food truck to be present. Mr. Johnston listed several locations in town that had food trucks located on lots that did not have permanent businesses to illustrate that there was a precedent for this situation. He listed the conditions that the applicant had expressed willingness to accommodate. He also mentioned that he had recently hosted the owner of a food truck court in Moab, who had provided him information about how to accommodate ADA accessibility and facilities.

Mr. Johnston said there would be a temporary fence, which would help give the neighbors privacy. He clarified once the food truck court was dismantled, the fence would be taken down. He continued to overview the changes that Mr. Hansen had made to the original proposal, which he opined addressed all of the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Johnston said they could get rid of the word ‘temporary’ and refer to the development as a five-year development with a sunset clause. He then discussed the water consumption and disposal methods that the food trucks would use, and noted that the City would meter the water usage so that they could evaluate water use after one year of operation.

Mr. Hansen stated that he had already begun design for a multi-use building on this lot and emphasized that he did not anticipate using this site as a food truck court forever. He said that he hoped to be done with this concept in three years and begin working on the permanent building. He explained that he had requested the waivers since the food truck court would not yield a lot of revenue, which he would need in order to cover the cost of the City’s requirements.

Mr. Johnston asked if parking lot lighting was required in the Code and Planning Manager Baron replied it was not, but if there was any lighting it needed to be in compliance with the Code. Mr. Johnston said any lighting they had would be Dark Sky compliant, and he also noted they planned to close at 9 PM so minimal lighting would be needed.

Mr. Johnston stated that the trucks could be parked overnight, though that was left to the discretion of the truck owners and it was not a requirement for trucks to be left. Mr. Johnston also stated he would provide power for the trucks, and said that since most of the food was prepped off-site, the power required would be minimal, with two trucks sharing a 50 amp pedestal.

Chairman Jordan commented that food trucks were popular and he did not think it was a bad idea to have trucks concentrated in one area.

Chairman Jordan asked about what kind of things were required to be granted an event permit. Planning Manager Baron listed that some of the things required included having bathrooms, a business license, and management of street closures. Planning Manager Baron elaborated about how there were different requirements depending on the type of permit. Planning Manager Baron added that a site plan was typically required, depending on the type of event. Chairman Jordan asked if there was generally a lighting requirement and Planning Manager Baron said he would have to look into those requirements. Vice-Chair Broughton noted there was no lighting at the fair that had been held the previous week. Planning Manager Baron commented that generally they only had maximum lighting requirements, not minimum. Chairman Jordan said the City could assess fees and requirements based on the scale and timeframe of the event, and commented that the requirements for the upcoming Olympic Games were substantially different than smaller events.

Chairman Jordan felt there had been great effort made to meet the expectations for a permanent event. Chairman Jordan said that the use of the land was permitted by the City and that the food court created opportunities to engage the public downtown, which was a part of the City that they were working on developing further. He acknowledged there were several safety issues that needed to be addressed and thought it would be helpful for the food court to be inspected every year, not just the first year. Chairman Jordan added that they would need food handling permits and said compliance officers from the County would ensure that food safety protocols were met. He expressed

concern about the traffic in the area.
Vice-Chair Broughton thought the applicant had done a good job in addressing the concerns of the neighbors that they had heard at the last meeting, and opined that the addition of permanent bathrooms would help garner goodwill with the community as well as it improved the sanitation of the area. She felt that curb and gutter was expensive and did not think it was necessary at this time, although she highlighted a section where the sidewalk ended and anticipated that could pose an issue with street parking. She commented that in her experience, food truck courts did not become too congested or busy. Mr. Hansen replied he could block off the sidewalk so cars could not go over it and use the compacted blacktop to add to the sidewalk.
Commissioner Gunn opined that the City was negligent by not adding crosswalks at the nearby intersection and noted there were many car accidents in that area. He said the intersection should have crosswalks. Chairman Jordan said he thought that 100 West was due to receive additional stop signs, and Planning Manager Baron clarified that 100 West was undergoing a redesign, but he did not know if that plan included additional stop signs or stoplights. Commissioner Gunn noted that the City could not make any changes without UDOT approval. Chairman Jordan asked about accident rate and Planning Manager Baron said he could work with the police department to get some data. There was a short discussion about traffic calming devices.
Chairman Jordan asked if the food truck court set a precedent for a new type of land use. Planning Manager Baron replied that this was a legislative request, so it did not necessarily set a precedent and was not a text or Code amendment.
Commissioner McKinley asked about trash disposal. Mr. Johnston indicated on the map where the bathrooms and the enclosed dumpster would be located. Mr. Johnston said the frequency of trash pickup would depend on the volume of customers at the food trucks. Commissioner McKinley pointed out that if the trash sat outside for too long it could cause a smell that would disturb the neighbors. Mr. Johnston said the dumpster would be maintained, noting that smelly trash would also deter customers. Mr. Johnston said the standards for trash maintenance would be similar to restaurants.
Commissioner McKinley said the applicant had done a good job, and asked if the plan was for the food court to be open seven days a week. Mr. Johnston said he would leave it to the discretion of the food truck operators, and anticipated that many vendors would choose to be closed on Sundays due to low volume.
Commissioner Royall opined that the parking would be limited, even with eight stalls. He noted that the traffic in that area was already congested, even without the food court. He said he was in favor of waiving many of the requirements, but he was worried about public safety and thought a traffic study was necessary. He said there had been a big increase in traffic since 2010, when the last traffic study had been conducted. Chairman Jordan asked if Commissioner Royall thought that the need for a new traffic study was unrelated to the current proposal and Commissioner Royall said it was; he felt there were many streets in Heber that should be reevaluated.
Mr. Johnston agreed that traffic was a problem from Main Street to the intersection. He did not think First West was the traffic problem, he thought it was First South. Mr. Johnston imagined that more people would walk or cycle to the food court than drive. He also pointed out that the peak hours for the food court would be during lunchtime,

which was not during rush hour. Mr. Johnston discussed that the downtown area was being developed by the City and commented that the City's plan for 100 West was to be a slow, walkable street. He said it was the job of the City to figure out how pedestrians could move across town. He expressed this was a much bigger issue than just one development, and it was the purpose of the City Staff, Council, and Planning Commission to work on connecting the downtown area for residents.

Commissioner Royall acknowledged this point and agreed it was the responsibility of the City as well as the developer to ensure public safety standards. He clarified that the plan was for the food court to be evaluated after a year of operation and Planning Manager Baron said the frequency of inspection could be determined by the City. Chairman Jordan said the City had the right to conduct daily inspections of temporary events. Mr. Johnston relayed that Mr. Hansen was willing to have annual reviews.

Motion: Vice-Chair Broughton moved to forward a positive recommendation for the MDA approval for the Downtown Food Truck Court MDA, located at 89 W 100 S, with the findings and conditions as presented in the Staff Report and the addition of an annual visit and evaluation. Commissioner Gunn made the second.

Discussion: City Engineer Hansen asked the Planning Commission to provide more definition about water and sewer use requirements. He elaborated that the plan was to monitor the usage for a year so they could determine the appropriate amount of water rights that would need to be turned over for anything beyond the permitted usage. City Engineer Hansen also asked what the next steps would be after the first annual review and what specific things they should look for in the review. He summarized that his main question was definition about water usage, since they were currently operating on the applicant's guess about how much they were going to use.

Vice-Chair Broughton said she could to her motion that the annual review would include specific items determined by Staff and that those items could be outlined in the MDA.

Chairman Jordan expressed concern about setting a precedent for future food courts and said he did not want to keep amending the rules.

City Engineer Hansen explained it was standard operating practice to extract the amount of water that a development would use upfront, but in this case the applicant did not know how much water they would use. He said they would have to wait a year to determine usage. Mr. Johnston said he had expected this and agreed that a calendar year was an appropriate timeframe to determine the average, since they would not use a lot of water in the winter. City Engineer Hansen noted that if the food court used a lot of water, it would mean that the businesses were successful and thus had the revenue to pay the fees for water consumption. City Engineer Hansen said it should be easy to add a clause to the motion which clarified that after one year of operation, the water use would be evaluated and any additional impact fees for sewer and water be paid.

Chairman Jordan asked clarifying questions about the documents included in the Staff Report and Planning Manager Baron confirmed that all documents included in the Staff Report would be a part of the motion.

Sara Nagel, City accountant, made a comment from the audience. Mrs. Nagel asked if the food trucks would work under one sales tax number. Chairman Jordan replied each food truck was a separate business, so they would each have their own number. Mr. Johnston added that the sales tax was paid wherever the food truck was parked.

City Engineer Hansen clarified that the annual review would include all operations, not just sewer and water. Planning Manager Baron confirmed that the Staff Report included the requirement that all operations be inspected.
Vice-Chair Broughton added to her motion that the annual review would be of specific items defined by City Staff, and that the review would include an assessment of the water and sewer usage. The second from Commissioner Gunn stood.
Voting Yes: Commissioner Gunn, Commissioner Jordan, Commissioner McKinley, Vice-Chair Broughton.
Voting No: Commissioner Royall. The Motion passed 4-1.
Chairman Jordan emphasized that the Commissioner's concerns about public safety were about this area as a whole, not this one development specifically.   Chairman Jordan commented that any developments in this area would need to be carefully evaluated from a public safety perspective because of how trafficked the street was. He said there would be a lot of pedestrian foot traffic as well, so lighting was important and should perhaps be required in the dark winter months. He suggested to City Staff that lighting requirements be added in the future.

4. Work Meeting: N/A

5. Administrative Items:

Jamie Baron explained the Admin Item
Phil Jordan asked what live/work means. Baron answered.
Robert McKinley asked about property. Baron answered.
Tori asked if live/work does not have to be commercial. Baron answered.
Phil asked follow up question. Tori Answered, Jamie answered
Discussion continued
PHil asked PC if they would agree with a City Traffic Study and to ask CC if they would do a traffic study on 1st and 1st , all commissioners agreed they would support that request from City Council
Greg Royall asked City Engineer how they conduct a Traffic Study, Ross answered. and added a TIS is done to analyze what a development impact will have on rds. Ross continued
Phil responded to Ross's comment, basis is 16 parked cars .... Phil continued... Baron stated it would be the applicant who would need to conduct the traffic study. Ross continued.
Phil decided that they would like staff to carry forward the PC suggestion for a traffic forecast. Jamie Baron responded.
Robert McKinley commented ...

Planning admin Meshelle Kijanen mentioned...

I. City Council Communication Item

Planning Manager Baron presented a summary of the most recent City Council meeting. He commented it was a relatively short agenda, and noted he had given a monthly development report in the meeting and could give that presentation to the

Commission as well. He reported there had been a presentation about UDOT's traffic mitigation measures. He said the Council had adopted a process that set forth standards for converting private roads into public roads. Planning Manager Baron said the CRA had discussed next steps for moving forward with a revised plan that was slightly smaller than the original proposal.

Planning Manager Baron went over the development report. He noted they were slightly behind than where they had been last year in terms of applications. He said there were currently around 70 open applications that were in various phases of development. He explained that not all the applications were for large projects; some were very small and he also noted that some applications were continuations from the previous year. Planning Manager Baron commented on some of the current applications that were in various stages of development, including plat amendments, development agreements, and site plans.

Chairman Jordan asked about the definition of 'live-work.' Planning Manager Baron explained that live-work units had both commercial and residential spaces within the same unit. He explained that live-work units were distinct from mixed-use zones. Vice-Chair Broughton asked if the units had to be commercial and Planning Manager Baron replied they did not. Planning Manager Baron elaborated that in a live-work space, a business owner could live on the floor above their business, although they did not have to.

Planning Manager Baron explained that live-work spaces had both residential and commercial allowances within the same unit, whereas in mixed-use zones the individual units were either residential or commercial. Planning Manager Baron noted there were some areas in Heber City that allowed for live-work spaces, although they were primarily only used for residential uses. He listed that live-work was not permitted in R-2 and R-3 zones, although those zones did allow for home occupation. Planning Manager Baron stated that live-work was permitted in the planning community mixed-use zone and the North Village overlay.

Chairman Jordan asked Planning Manager Baron if the Commission could have a discussion that resulted in a motion for a recommendation to the Council, or if they needed to add it to a future agenda. Planning Manager Baron said a formal agenda was not required if the Commission wanted to ask the Council to consider a certain item, and he explained that either the Staff could relay that message, or Chairman Jordan could communicate to the Council directly as the Chairman of the Commission.

Chairman Jordan spoke about public safety on 100 West and said the City had a responsibility to consider the development of that area moving forward. He said they should think about conducting a traffic study in that area. Planning Manager Baron said Chairman Jordan could reach out to the City Council to tell them that the Commission wished to have a traffic study done. Commissioner Gunn commented that Chairman Jordan could attend a City Council meeting and make a comment during the public hearing portion of the meeting. Chairman Jordan thought it was more effective to communicate the message in his capacity as a Commissioner and not just a member of the public.

Chairman Jordan asked the Commissioners if they were in favor of a traffic study for 100 West and 100 South. Commissioners Broughton and Gunn affirmed that they were in favor. Vice-Chair Broughton asked if a traffic study was already being done as part of the 100 West redesign and Planning Manager Baron replied he was not sure if Horrocks was doing a study. Vice-Chair Broughton said a traffic study should be done in conjunction with the design. Commissioner McKinley thought a traffic study was a good idea as well.

Commissioner Royall asked City Engineer Hansen how much area was considered in a traffic impact study. City Engineer Hansen replied that all the neighboring affected intersections were considered in the study. City Engineer Hansen said that typically a traffic impact study was done to analyze the impacts that a new development would have on an existing road. City Engineer Hansen said that in this case, the Commission would ask for an existing conditions study, as the new development was not yet in operation. Chairman Jordan thought an existing conditions study would not be sufficient because they were considering a change in land use.

Chairman Jordan felt it was the responsibility of the City, not the individual applicants, who needed to consider the projected usage of that intersection. Planning Manager Baron replied it was generally the responsibility of the applicant, since their business created an impact on the traffic. City Engineer Hansen concurred with Planning Manager Baron and added that each applicant did not necessarily have to conduct a traffic study; in some cases it was sufficient to use a traffic study that had been conducted by a neighboring business.

Chairman Jordan acknowledged these points and said the Staff should direct the Council to look at traffic forecasts at that intersection. Planning Manager Baron replied he could do so, and added that it would be appropriate for a member of the Planning Commission to communicate this issue to the Council directly, or appear in person at a Council meeting and pose the concern during a public hearing. Planning Manager Baron said he could put this item on the Council's agenda as a communication item, but it would likely not be a formal work meeting item for the Council. Planning Manager Baron again recommended that Chairman Jordan communicate with the Council and Chairman Jordan said he would email the Council.

Commissioner McKinley recalled that the Commission had debated creating a separate zone for the airport at a meeting several weeks ago, and he asked if anything had ever come from that discussion. Chairman Jordan clarified that the City's airport manager had suggested this, although there was no formal proposal to create a new zone. Planning Manager Baron said the Staff could bring the airport item back for more consideration, but he noted that Staff was still researching this item. Planning Manager Baron summarized that the proposal was to create a different airport zone that had different uses, setbacks, and recommendations.

Vice-Chair Broughton asked when the CHOZ would be discussed next and Planning Manager Baron replied the Council would consider it next week.

Planning Admin Kijanen reminded the Planning Commission that they would present to the City Council Planning at the end of the year. Manager Baron elaborated that every year in December, boards and committees in the City made a presentation to the City Council that summarized their main goals and issues for the upcoming year and their accomplishments of the current year.

Chairman Jordan commented that the Planning Commission wanted to move ahead with the elements of the CHOZ that had been pulled out for historic properties. Planning Manager Baron clarified that Chairman Jordan wanted to bring those items

back to the CHOZ and Chairman Jordan confirmed, explaining that they had pulled them out because the CHOZ was such a large project. Chairman Jordan noted he had communicated with Planners Kohler and Janson about this issue.
Planning Admin Kijanen noted that Vice-Chair Broughton had indicated she was going to attend the EPA conference. Commissioner Royall said he would go as well. Planning Admin Kijanen commented that Commissioners McKinley and Chairman Jordan were unable to attend.

6. Adjournment:

Motion: Vice-Chair Broughton moved to Adjournment:. Commissioner Gunn made the second.

Discussion:N/A

Voting Yes: Five. **Voting No:** None. The Motion 5-0.

______Meshelle Kijanen_______________
Meshelle Kijanen, Administrative Assistant