

Murray City Municipal Council Chambers Murray City, Utah

The Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah, met on Tuesday, the 6th day of December, 2016 at 6:30 p.m., for a meeting held in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Roll Call consisted of the following:

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Blair Camp, | Council Chair |
| Brett Hales, | Councilmember |
| Diane Turner, | Councilmember – Conducted |
| Jim Brass, | Councilmember |
| Dave Nicponski, | Councilmember |

Others who attended:

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Ted Eyre, | Mayor |
| Jennifer Kennedy, | City Recorder |
| Frank Nakamura, | City Attorney |
| Janet Lopez, | Council Administrator |
| Janet Towers, | Executive Assistant to the Mayor |
| Craig Burnett, | Police Chief |
| Joe Tarver, | Deputy Police Chief |
| Josh Haskell, | Police |
| Bryce Howard, | Police |
| Gil Rodriguez, | Fire Chief |
| Doug Hill, | Public Services Director |
| Tim Tingey, | Administrative and Development Services Director |
| Mike Terry, | Human Resources Director |
| Kim Fong, | Library Director |
| Scouts | |
| Citizens | |

5. **Opening Ceremonies**

5.1 Pledge of Allegiance – Aiden McKay, Troop 1909

Ms. Turner asked the scouts in attendance to introduce themselves and state their troop number and the badge they are working on.

5.2 Approval of Minutes

Ms. Turner asked that both sets of minutes be taken together, no objections were made.

5.2.1 Council Meeting – November 1, 2016

5.2.2. Council Meeting – November 15, 2016

Mr. Camp made a motion to approve both sets of minutes
Mr. Hales seconded the motion

Voice vote taken, all “ayes.”

5.3 Special Recognition

5.3.1 Swearing-In new Murray City Police Officer, Bryce Howard.

Staff Presentation: Chief Craig Burnett

Chief Burnett told a little bit about Mr. Howard’s prior police experience and the Swearing-In Ceremony was conducted by Jennifer Kennedy.

6. **Citizen Comments** (Comments are limited to 3 minutes unless otherwise approved by the Council.)

Lee Siegel – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Siegel said he noticed looking through some agendas and related materials something about a 2.5 million dollar storm water bond. Since his area was annexed, they have been paying storm sewer fees and don’t have storm sewers. He asked if the City was planning on installing some.

Doug Hill, Public Services Director responded saying there are three capital projects where the City plans on upgrading existing storm sewer. These three projects have resulted in flooding to residential and business properties for many years. The City does not have enough money in reserves to take on these projects so we are borrowing the money which in Government terms means we are taking out a bond. None of the projects are in the annexed area.

7. **Consent Agenda**

7.1 None scheduled.

8. Public Hearings

8.1 Public Hearing #1

8.1.1 Staff and sponsor presentations and public comment will be given prior to Council action on the following matter:

Consider an ordinance relating to land use; amends the Zoning Map for property located at approximately 1500 East Vine Street, Murray City, Utah from R-1-10 (Low Density Single-Family) to R-1-8 (Low Density Single Family). (Adam Nash applicant)

Staff Presentation: Tim Tingey, Administrative and Development Services Director.

Frank Nakamura, City Attorney gave background information on this item. This item has previously been before the Council but the Council's decision was unclear to some. In the November 1st meeting, the request for a rezone died for a lack of a second to a motion to grant the request. Although it was stated in the November 1st meeting that the request was denied, some may have been confused as to the Council's final decision. Because of how important this decision is to all interested parties, Mr. Nakamura stated that the Council like to err on the side of making sure the decision, and the reasons for it, are clear and thus the matter is being reconsidered.

Mr. Tingey said this item was first considered by the Council during the November 1st Council meeting. On November 15th, a resolution was passed by the Council to provide a more definitive decision on this issue.

This item is requesting a rezone. The existing zoning of this property is R-1-10, low-density residential that requires 10,000 square foot lots. The request is for the zoning to change to R-1-8, which is also low-density residential, requiring 8,000 square foot lots. This item went to the Planning Commission back in September where they gave a recommendation to approve the request by a 4 – 2 vote.

This property, and the majority of the properties in the area around it, are zoned R-1-10. There are also R-1-6 and R-1-8 zones in the area. The existing General Plan requires the future land use of this property to be low-density residential which includes 8,000 and 10,000 square foot lots. Therefore, the General Plan supports both R-1-8, 8,000 square foot lots, and what is currently there, R-1-10, 10,000 square foot lots. This is not a request for a General Plan amendment.

The General Plan is a document that gives the City direction when a rezone is requested. It is the Council's decision to determine if it is necessary to change a zone or not. There are different lot sizes in this particular area, R-1-6 and smaller lot sizes, lots zoned R-1-8 and R-1-10, and with duplexes on them as nonconforming uses. However, there are also lots that are 10,000 square feet and larger. The majority of the lots in this area are 10,000 square feet.

The burden is on the applicant to prove there is a need for this rezone. The Council can decide to change the zone or not to change the zone based on land use reasons. The Council can decide to maintain the status quo if there is not compelling information to make this change.

Applicant Presentation: Adam Nash

Mr. Nash said he is the owner of this property. He said zones R-1-8, R-1-10, and R-1-12 are all considered low density residential under the City's Master Plan. He gave a description of the types of properties that are around this property. There are lots that are as small as 4,000-5,000 square feet already in this area and there are also several non-conforming duplexes and triplexes throughout the area.

Mr. Nash disputes that most of the lots in this area are R-1-10. He has done a count of the lots that are within a half mile of this property and over 65% of the lots are under R-1-10. Allowing him to zone this property and develop it the way he has proposed is a right that is possessed by other people in the same area and the proposed use is not detrimental to the public's safety or welfare.

Mr. Nash stated that enforcement of the R-1-10 zone causes a hardship for him, the applicant, because he's being held to a standard of use and development that other properties in the immediate vicinity, the general area and the Master Plan, are not being held to. During a prior hearing someone said that an R-1-8 zone is 5.5 units in an acre and an R-1-10 is about four, which is not true. In development standards the R-1-8 is 3.6 lots per acre by the time you take out dedication to roadways and sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Nash said numerous properties in the R-1-10 overlay district are unique in their circumstances. They are not conforming to the General Plan or to the zoning ordinance that was overlaid on top of the neighborhood when it was annexed into Murray City. This property was not developed in the R-1-10 zone, it was developed in the County in an R-26.5 zone with other zones interspersed throughout. The project to the north of this property was originally in an agriculture zone. It was zoned R-M with ten units to the acre; much denser than this project, and it is directly across the

street from this property.

Mr. Nash said this is a pretty simple application. He wants to support the City's Master Plan that discusses the reconfiguration of lots that are poorly configured and re-platting them. These are things that developers are led to do in their business. Mr. Nash feels granting this zoning request is in line with the General Plan and HUD's objective to include a variety of lot sizes, dwelling types, densities and price points with infill development which this and other properties in the area will be in the near future.

Public Hearing Open for Public Comment

Laurence Burton – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Burton said he has owned his home for more than 27 years. In that time, he has seen the whole area become more and more developed. For a long time behind his home, there was open agricultural space. That space has been cut up and parceled out into small lots. He has seen this happen in multiple places throughout the area. He asked the Council to not approve this zone change. If this change is allowed to occur, it will change the nature of the area. He thinks it is okay to take a break from development and consider the quality of life; that is what Murray is known for.

Roger Haglund – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Haglund said he moved to this area when it was still part of the county. When the county was in charge of this area, it was very easy for people to get zoning changes and planned urban development's done because it was difficult for people in the unincorporated county to know what was going on. He put an addition on the back of his house and had to notify everyone within about 600 feet of his property what he was doing.

When Murray took over this area, a blanket R-1-10 zone was put over it. The area that is being talked about tonight is filled with homes that have larger than 10,000 square foot lots. The lots that Mr. Nash is talking about are to the west and south of this area. The new Murray General Plan has not yet been approved, therefore, the R-1-10 zone still stands. The lot in question is currently allowed to have one house on it. If the zoning in changed, it could have two.

Who is benefited by this change; the builder. This change does not stabilize the neighborhood. The street is not big enough for the new density that is being pushed into this area. Mr. Haglund said he hopes the Council does not grant this zone change and that they put a policy in place stating the City does not grant individual rezones.

George Katz – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Katz read some ordinances he took from the Murray City Code: 16.16.09 and 16.16.140. He said because the back lot of this property does

not abut the main street, it has to have an access strip. The main lot size of this property is .44 acre, not even half an acre. Adding in an access strip, makes the lot less than 8,000 square feet.

Lori Haglund – Murray City, Utah

Ms. Haglund asked the Council not to approve this zone change. She feels she lives in the nicest part of Murray and it's that way because the lots are big and there is green space between houses. It's quiet and safe and changing the zoning on this property starts a slippery slope.

Ms. Haglund noted that there was a split decision at the September Planning Commission meeting where this was approve. It was not a unanimous decision and people on the Planning Commission spoke out against this change. She thinks flag lots in general are a bad idea. They are dangerous for emergency vehicles. To say there were errors originally when this area was zoned is not a reason to continue to make mistakes. She asked the Council to value what she has to say. The developer is not their neighbor. He's not going to live in this property; he's going to sell it and leave.

Lee Siegel – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Segal read from a letter he wrote to the Council (see Attachment 1).

David Sollis – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Solis showed a picture of a property located on 5900 South which he feels is an excellent size house for the size of the lot it's on. It's a large house and the first 200 feet of the property are landscaped. He believes development like this improves the neighborhood rather than capitalizes on it. He then showed a picture of a property which he feels is too big for the lot it's on. He and his neighbors try to make their neighborhood attractive and a place that people want to live.

Beverly Crangle – Murray City, Utah

Ms. Crangle believes the slippery slope is what is happening. So many places around this area have been cut up into smaller lots and there is greater and greater density. There is no park in this area and the sidewalks are not contiguous for children walking to school. It seems like it would be against an existing ordinance that is already in place if two homes were put on this one lot.

Richard Crangle – Murray City, Utah

Mr. Crangle said he wanted to affirm all the statements that have been made tonight opposing this zone change. He said that Mr. Tingey mentioned that a rezone could take place if there was a showing of a need and necessity. No need and no necessity have been shown. People in this neighborhood want to live here because of the quiet and they enjoy the area. He urged the Council to deny this request.

Bonnie Johnson – Murray City, Utah

Ms. Johnson said Salt Lake City buys property to keep as open space so it doesn't get so congested. Over on 6400 South, two homes were built back to back. They sat vacant for a long time because no one would buy them. There was no yard and the driveway was right next to one of the homes.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Tingey said he wanted to clarify some of the points that were made during the public comment to make sure the Council understands some of the issues related to the code.

Mr. Tingey stated there were comments made regarding the public notice that was given. The City is required, under State Law, to provide noticing and adheres to those requirements. That doesn't mean we notice everyone in the City every time there is a rezone request, with the exception that these items are placed on agendas which are noticed publicly. Written notices are given to anyone within a proximity of 300 square feet from a rezone request.

There was reference during the public comment about not allowing individual lots to be rezoned. State Law allows individual lots to be rezoned. The City could not change our code on that unless we want to be against what the State Law says and we will not do that.

Mr. Tingey discussed some of the important points regarding flag lots. Flag lots have to go through a subdivision process. The Planning Commission determines whether a flag lot will be approved or not within the standards of the ordinance. Flag lots are allowed as long as they adhere to the City's standards. Mr. Tingey went over some of the size and landscaping requirements the City has for flag lots.

Mr. Tingey noted the vote from the Planning Commission on this item was 4-2.

8.1.2 Council consideration of the above matter.

Mr. Camp made a motion to approve the ordinance
Mr. Brass seconded the motion

Mr. Brass said he agrees there is a variety of different uses in the area being discussed. He has seen a lot of different zone changes but one thing he has not seen is the City down zone a property for the purpose of accommodating a flag lot. The City has a lot of flag lots, but this request is to rezone the property from R-1-10 to R-1-8 and then do a flag lot; he doesn't like that.

Mr. Hales said density has been a big issue. There are a lot of people in

attendance tonight from his district. He agrees with the reasons given by the citizens from the area in the public hearing as to why the property should not be rezoned.

Ms. Turner said this is her neighborhood. She lives in a condo development that is right across the street from this property. She appreciates all the people who came out tonight and made comments and agrees with the comments made by the citizens and why the property should not be rezoned.

Call vote recorded by Jennifer Kennedy

| | |
|--------------|---------------|
| <u> N </u> | Mr. Hales |
| <u> N </u> | Mr. Nicponski |
| <u> N </u> | Mr. Camp |
| <u> N </u> | Mr. Brass |
| <u> N </u> | Ms. Turner |

Motion denied 0-5. Mr. Nakamura stated, so that there is no misunderstanding, that the Council decided to deny the request for a rezone leaving the property zoned at R-1-10.

9. **Unfinished Business**

9.1 None scheduled.

10. **New Business**

10.1 Consider an ordinance amending Chapter 2.62.120 of the Murray City Municipal Code relating to holidays.

Staff presentation: Mike Terry, Human Resources Director

Mr. Terry said the City Code lists the holidays that the City is closed that employees are paid for. In addition to that, there are two floating holidays which are extra holidays employees can use for birthdays, anniversaries, etc. Over the past few years, the Mayor has given employees a third floating holiday. This policy change is clarifying that employees get three floating holidays per year. The term floating holiday is being changed to Employee Appreciation Day. Employees will have through the end of the year to use Employee Appreciation Days.

Some of the wording in the code is also changing such as changing Washington's Birthday to Presidents Day.

Mr. Brass made a motion to approve the ordinance
Mr. Hales seconded the motion

Call vote recorded by Jennifer Kennedy

A Mr. Hales
A Mr. Nicponski
A Mr. Camp
A Mr. Brass
A Ms. Turner

Motion passed 5-0

- 10.2 Consider a resolution approving an Interlocal Cooperation agreement between the City and Salt Lake County (“County”) for the First Class Highway Project Fund.

Staff presentation: Doug Hill, Public Services Director

Mr. Hill stated agreements like this have been done in the past and he gave some background information on this agreement. For every motor vehicle registered in Salt Lake County a fee is charged that goes to Salt Lake County to be used in the County Transportation Fund. That fund is comprised of the fees charged with motor vehicle registration as well as some other sales and use taxes. The County has discretion as to how they want to distribute this money. In the past, Murray City has received funds from the County for projects such as 4800 South, and 5900 South. This year, the City received 1.2 million dollars from this fund to use on a number of neighborhood roads.

The difference between this agreement and previous agreements is that the County is specifying the exact location where these funds need to be used. This agreement is for \$250,000 which the County will send to Murray City. The agreement says the City will use the funds for expenses associated with widening the road at Commerce Drive and Vine Street in Murray City. In the past, the County has not specified the exact location of where the funds would be used so the City was able to determine where to spend the money, based on our own priorities.

Mr. Hill explained how this came about. There’s a development at Commerce Drive and Vine Street. The City is requiring the developer to make a number of improvements at this location to accommodate the development, which is standard practice for the City. The City often requires developers to dedicate property to the City, provide wider roads, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and utility relocations. In addition, the developer will have additional expenses because the development is adjacent to a railroad crossing. The State of Utah requires any development within so many feet of a railroad crossing to make certain improvements to that railroad crossing. The developer went directly to Salt Lake County and asked them to help with these costs. The County said they would help by transferring the money to Murray City specifically for this project. That is why the language is very specific as to where the funds will be used.

This agreement is between the City and County for the City to accept these funds. The City will have some conditions by which the developer would be allowed to use these funds. The City and the developer will want to enter into an agreement with each other that states the terms by which these funds can be used. Some of the terms in that agreement should be:

- An acknowledgement that the developer requested the funds from the County and the County directed the funds to be used on the developer's project near the corner of Commerce and Vine.
- The developer shall use the funds only for public infrastructure related to road improvements which is required by State Law.
- All work for public infrastructure related to road improvements the developer seeks for reimbursement must be bid consistent with the City's procurement processes. The developer will be required to follow an open procurement process just like the City does.
- The developer will hold the city harmless from any and all liability related to the use of the funds.
- Before the City reimburses the developer, the developer must present to the City sufficient documentation demonstrating the costs incurred, how the costs relate to road improvements and that the work was bid consistent with the City's procurement processes.
- The City reserves the right, in its discretion, to decline a reimbursement request if sufficient written documentation is not submitted to support a reimbursement.
- The City has no obligation to expend all of the funds allocated by the County to the City for the developer's project.

Mr. Nakamura stated he thinks this is unusual and asked Lincoln Shurtz, who is here on behalf of the developer, Kimball Investment, to speak.

Mr. Shurtz said the terms that were outlined by Mr. Hill are appropriate and are the terms that the developer agreed to regarding the expenditure of the funds. The developer was able to get the funds from Salt Lake County to promote both economic and transit oriented development in the area. Part of the new zoning criteria in this area requires a mixed-use development. Because they are the first in the area, they want to make sure as they are putting in the infrastructure they are supporting the infrastructure that will ultimately support a fifteen unit development.

Mr. Shurtz thinks other developers will benefit from the investments that are being made by Salt Lake County and the developer associated with this project. He reiterated they have agreed to the terms that Mr. Hill outlined.

Mr. Brass said he sees the logic of improving that area around the Trax station, especially as the hospital expands. It makes since to him.

Mr. Camp doesn't question that it makes since to do the improvements on the road. He is concerned because in the memo from the Attorney's office that the Council

was given it states, “*we have legal concerns about the agreement.*” That causes a red flag for him.

Mr. Nakamura responded saying he raised the legal concerns because this is something that we don’t do often. He also indicated in the memo that he thinks this is defensible. He felt compelled to raise some of the legal issues. He has discussed this at length with Mr. Shurtz about whether or not the money is a gift under Price vs. Orem City or whether we could do the analysis to support it. At the same time, the developer is willing to assume and hold harmless the City’s legal liability. He believes the legal issues are defensible.

Mr. Camp asked if it is true that this work would be required to be done by the developer with or without this money from the County. He also asked about the last condition that states, “*The City has no obligation to expend all of the funds allocated by the County to the City for the developer’s project.*” He asked if that meant that the City has leeway to decide if that money is to be spend on something else in that area.

Mr. Nakamura said no, it means that if the reimbursements and the expenses incurred by the developer are less than the total funds, the unused funds would likely have to be returned back to Salt Lake County. If they have \$200,000 in reimbursement and have done all the work they need to do, there is no obligation on the City or County to expend the money if the developer does not need it.

Ms. Turner verified that the City has never had the County tell us where to expend our road funds before.

Mr. Hill replied that was correct. The City has never had the County be this specific. They do put language in all their agreements that says we have to expend the funds for the purpose for which they are designated in State Law, which is primarily for road improvements. We have never had the County specify a location to where the funds have to be spent.

Ms. Turner said this makes her uncomfortable because there are other areas where we could spend \$250,000. It concerns her that we are not given the option; that we are being told by the County where we are going to expend those funds. One of the things she loves about Murray is that we are a pretty independent City and we make those kinds of decisions. She is concerned if this is approved, it may be setting precedent and other developers will do the same thing.

Mr. Nicponski stated he wants the road improvements and the money to do them with.

Mr. Nicponski made a motion to adopt the resolution
Mr. Brass seconded the motion

Mr. Camp asked Mr. Nakamura if he, as legal counsel, was comfortable with the language in terms one through seven.

Mr. Nakamura said as far as the legal side goes, it's defensible.

Call vote recorded by Jennifer Kennedy

 A Mr. Hales
 A Mr. Nicponski
 A Mr. Camp
 A Mr. Brass
 N Ms. Turner

Motion passed 4-1

- 10.3 Consider a resolution approving an Interlocal Cooperation agreement between the City and Trans-Jordan Cities ("TJC") for a temporary debris staging area in the event of an emergency.

Staff presentation: Doug Hill, Public Services Director

Mr. Hill said this is an Interlocal agreement with Trans-Jordan Landfill, which Murray City is a member of, formalizing the opportunity the City has to store debris from any type of emergency: wind storm, earthquake, large snow storm, etc. It provides the City an opportunity to store debris at the landfill, temporarily, until we can find a permanent place for it.

Although it's likely we would end up storing it permanently at the landfill, having a temporary place gives the City and opportunity to look at other options such as grinding up tree limbs, or recycling some of the debris rather than putting it into the landfill.

This agreement also helps the City to seek reimbursement from FEMA in an emergency.

Mr. Camp made a motion to approve the resolution
Mr. Hales seconded the motion

Call vote recorded by Jennifer Kennedy

 A Mr. Hales
 A Mr. Nicponski
 A Mr. Camp
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Turner

Motion passed 5-0

11. Mayor

11.1 Report

Mayor Eyre said yesterday there was a power outage caused by an excavator doing some work across the street from City Hall. The Power Department quickly restored the power.

The annual Christmas tree lighting took place last Saturday. It gets bigger and better every year, about 900 people attended this year.

Mayor Eyre said he has attended a D.A.R.E. graduation every day this week.

11.2 Questions for the Mayor

Mr. Brass commented on the power outage. He has a lot of experience in this and a lot of work went in to getting the power back on. Considering the amount of damage, the Power Department did a remarkably fast job in restoring the power.

12. Adjournment

Jennifer Kennedy, City Recorder

Attachment 1

Presented to Murray City Council, Dec. 6, 2016

Dear Council Members:

My name is Lee Siegel and I live at 6120 Rodeo Lane, on the southwest corner of Rodeo and Vine. The rezone at issue is several lots west of my home.

I moved to Utah 23 years ago to escape Los Angeles, and to my current home 15 years ago. Soon after I moved in, my neighborhood was annexed by Murray. My impression ever since has been that the City of Murray is doing a damn good job trying to turn itself into another Los Angeles.

Ever since annexation, we have seen little in our area from the City of Murray except for increasing housing density, and few if any accompanying infrastructure improvements. You are sharply reducing green space by approving huge homes on absurdly small lots, yet we have no park in our neighborhood. And because a few cranky people requested it, Murray asked Salt Lake City to fence off the 6400 South access point to the Salt Lake and Jordan Canal levee, eliminating what had been a nice green loop walk for much of the neighborhood.

You also started charging us for storm sewers year ago. Despite some street repaving to make drainage improvements a few years back, we still have no storm sewers. The water just flows into the canal system. And to add insult to injury, the city now is diverting storm sewer money to other purposes.

There still are no sidewalks on significant stretches of Vine between 1300 East and Van Winkle, making young school children walk on the shoulder of street with a constant speeding problem. And if you want the speed limit enforced on Vine, you have to call the police and specifically request it. They drive on Vine often, but I rarely see an officer clocking traffic on our part of Vine.

The most noticeable change in my area since annexation is increasing density with numerous waivers of existing zoning. The result: more and more large homes crammed onto ridiculously small lots with very little yard space. As I mentioned at the previous meeting on this proposed flag lot, the City of Murray has allowed incredibly ugly and crowded developments. They include five or six new homes jammed together at the SE corner of 6400 South and 1300 East – on a property that once held one or perhaps two homes. The development behind the new fire station is another ugly abortion of a development, with a street so narrow that access by fire engines is questionable.

And in addition to the flag lot at issue tonight, I already was aware of one farther west on Vine where a girls' group home is located behind another home. And farther west, I see yet another home under construction on a flag lot. I would have been here to oppose those as well, but never received notice because, apparently, the city provides notice of these proposed zoning exemptions only to homeowners in immediate proximity.

All this makes me wonder just who the City of Murray represents: developers hellbent on making money or the citizens who want to maintain their quality of life. From my perspective, the city seems distinctly biased in favor of the development in general and the rezone at issue tonight.

First, many neighbors attended a previous City Council meeting, where instead of voting the proposal down, the council let the motion to approve the rezone die without a second after hearing strong opposition from every speaker except the developer. I suspected at the time this was a ruse to let the issue return to you, and I seem to have been correct. The city's public notice for tonight's hearing cites the discussion of this matter on Nov. 1, and then says "the council believes that there needs to be more discussion and a more clear definitive decision." I'd like to know why this matter was brought up again at the Nov. 15 meeting as a "new business agenda item," which was presented by Mr. Tingey.

That gets to my next point: Why is city staff endorsing a developer's proposal to subvert existing zoning and proposing council reconsideration of it instead of standing up for the existing zoning – and our quality of life? I also note the map presented by city staff at the last meeting on this issue was extremely misleading in its color scheme. It showed lots the size of mine (about 10,000 square feet) in the same color as the much, much larger property across Vine owned by the Haglunds and equally large property next to it. Further, the map was truncated on the east side so it failed to show the large lots just east of us in the Newhaven community. The net effect was to emphasize the smaller lots to our west and not the larger lots on my street and to the north and east.

In addition, when I read news about the city, my impression is that all the mayor and council care about is development, development, development. I believe you need to start paying less attention to growth and economic development and more attention to maintaining our quality of life -- unless you want to be part of the new Los Angeles.\

Please reject this rezone.

Thank you.