

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on Thursday, November 18, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. in the Murray City Municipal Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

The public was able to view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. Anyone who wanted to make a comment on an agenda item may submit comments via email at planningcommission@murray.utah.gov.

Present: Ned Hacker, Vice Chair
Travis Nay
Jake Pehrson
Lisa Milkavich
Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager
Susan Nixon, Associate Planner
Briant Farnsworth, Deputy City Attorney
Citizens

Excused: Maren Patterson
Sue Wilson
Jeremy Lowry

The Staff Review meeting was held from 6:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The Planning Commission members briefly reviewed the applications on the agenda. An audio recording is available at the Murray City Community and Economic Development Department Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Travis Nay made a motion to approve the October 21, 2021 minutes, seconded by Jake Pehrson. Voice vote of 4-0.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT

No Findings of Fact to be approved.

SPINE INSTITUTE – 5775 South Fashion Blvd – Project #21-118

The applicant is requesting Conditional Use Permit approval to allow the construction of a new 2-story medical office building on the subject property. Jared Hall presented the request. The property is the north part of what had looked like a parking lot. It is in the G-O zone situated at the northeast section of the TOSH building with residential behind and to the north. The new building will be for medical offices and will have a basement level, a ground floor and a second floor. There will be two entrances, the existing one and another will be shared with the building to the south. The parking on the south will be re-stripped in conjunction with the development of the new parking lot on the north. 162 parking spaces will be required based on the square footage. The two parking lots combined will provide 172 parking spaces. The building is located along Fashion Boulevard with the parking in the rear and puts some space between the building and the residential properties to the east. The landscaping plans meet the

requirements. Along the east side where it is adjacent to the residential must be buffered with at least 10' of landscaping and 6' masonry wall. The recommendation is for an 8' masonry wall to increase the buffer. There is a lot of circulation, lobby, and open space in the floor plans. Entrances to the building on the north and south will face the parking lot but the building will orient toward Fashion Boulevard. The sidewalk is heavily trafficked with many children and the suggestion is to delineate the sidewalk and driveways well for that reason. Mr. Nay asked if engineering could look at the wide curbing there. Mr. Hall stated staff found that this is an appropriate use in the G-O zone and is consistent with the objectives of the General Plan. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve a Conditional Use Permit for the construction of a two-story medical office building at 5775 South Fashion Blvd.

Applicant, Justin Hohl stated his address as 5770 South 250 East, and stated his willingness to comply with the conditions. Mr. Hohl indicated he is a spine surgeon, and this new building will serve as the new medical office for The Spine Institute and will be closer to the surgical center.

Mr. Hacker opened the meeting up for public comment. The following comments were made:

Candace Penrod, 354 East Bridlewalk Lane

My property is adjacent to this project, it's been very concerning to me and I wanted to thank Jared Hall who has been very kind to help address my concerns. I really appreciate him addressing the school children, there are a lot of children that walk from the neighborhood and the apartments that are on the other side of Fashion Boulevard. I am very concerned about the parking situation; this is a very busy parking lot. I have another concern about my property line, if you look at the two properties there is a mismatch in the fencing, and I am not the original property owner but have been told that the fence is not on my property line but veered off my line. I would like to request having it surveyed before putting up a masonry wall and some clarification on the wall that is there now, will it be removed and replaced. I have mature trees on that property line and Jared has assured me that Murray City is cognizant of that.

Jason Neal, 5801 S Fashion Boulevard

I am also in that building in Suite 290, I am an owner there and on the board. Speaking as an owner and on behalf of Midvalley Medical Board. The biggest concern is the parking, there are days now where that parking lot is pretty full with no existing building. My biggest concern is to make sure that we have the right allocated parking stalls based on Murray Code and for a medical use building. There is concern with the kids and the traffic. We have all sorts of people driving in and out, some elderly and some who have hit our building where they overshot the handicap parking. Safety and visibility are a major focus.

The following emailed comment was received:

Rebecca Williams, 5801 S Fashion Boulevard

Since I'm not able to attend the meeting this evening I'm hoping to express my concerns through this email. My office, Great Expectations BirthCare, is the closest to the proposed new building. Many of my maternity client's park in spots which will no longer be available. I'm very concerned with the loss of parking from both a quality and quantity point of view. They will have to walk further, many with a cluster of little kids and a baby in a car seat. During construction not only will the parking lot be torn up but workers, equipment, and building supplies will limit parking. The building plan appears to have landscaping along the neighbor's wall which will impact snow removal and lose parking spots. The new building will add congestion and complexity to an already busy school crossing which heavily impacts our parking lot. How many

parking stalls will be lost and how many parking stalls does the new building need with this shared lot?

No further comments were made and the public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Hall addressed the masonry wall concern. The section of wood would be replaced with the new masonry wall. The existing wall that is 6' wall could have additional block placed along the top and in addition to that the grading and drainage preliminary survey work done, when that parking lot goes in the drain will need to do what it does now, with new construction that will mean that survey crews will have to be out there when its being re-paved and re-striped to make sure that grading still happens. There will be surveys at that time and available to make sure that line is in the right place. If the line is not in the right place there are few ways it can be addressed between the property line. The building was kept to a size that would not impact the required number of stalls. Medical offices in Murray do require more parking than other offices. General offices are one space to 250 ft² of net usable space, Medical offices are one space per 200 ft² of net usable space.

Ms. Milkavich asked about the trees. Mr. Hall stated there is an ordinance that says that any development done should avoid the unnecessary destruction of mature trees. The trees appear to be on Ms. Penrod's property and new footings need to be installed for a wall and those footings need be done in a way that doesn't damage the tree roots and that workers do not stack equipment over the root system on that side of the wall.

Ms. Milkavich made a motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of the proposed medical office building for The Spine Institute on the property located on 5775 S Fashion Boulevard subject to the nine conditions:

1. The project shall meet Murray City Engineering requirements including the following:
 - a) Meet City storm drainage requirements. On-site detention is required. Implement Low Impact Development (LID) practices where applicable.
 - b) The adjacent office building and parking lot drain across the proposed project site, and existing drainage patterns must be maintained.
 - c) Replace any damaged curb + gutter and sidewalk along the project frontage of Fashion Boulevard.
 - d) Obtain a City Encroachment Permit for work in the Fashion Boulevard right-of-way.
 - e) Develop an erosion control plan and implement prior to beginning site work.
2. The project shall follow all 2018 IFC code requirements and shall meet all department regulations for medical gas usage and storage.
3. The project shall meet all Murray City Wastewater Division requirements
4. The project shall meet all Murray City Water Division requirements.
5. The project shall conform to the requirements of the G-O, General Office zone, and other regulations of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
6. The project shall include the re-striping of the existing parking lot for the building at 5801 South Fashion Boulevard to provide the 172 parking stalls in conjunction with the

construction and occupancy of the proposed building at 5775 South Fashion Boulevard.

7. The project shall include raised or distinctively marked crosswalks where the project accesses at the north and south of the building cross the sidewalks on Fashion Boulevard.
8. The project shall include an eight (8) foot, solid masonry barrier along the east property line adjacent to the residential zone.
9. The applicant shall work with City Planning Division staff to take measures to assure the preservation of existing mature trees in the residential buffer area during the installation of the landscaping and masonry wall.

Seconded by Jake Pehrson.

Call vote was recorded.

 A Ned Hacker
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 4-0.

BULLION PLACE – 935 West Bullion Street – Project #21-090 & 21-092

The applicant is requesting approval to develop a planned unit subdivision of both single-family detached housing and townhomes on the subject property. Susan Nixon presented the request. In June of this year the City Council changed the zoning from agricultural A-1 to R-1-6 on the northern half and R-M-15 on the southern half. In September, The Planning Commission approved a pre-liminary PUD subdivision and now he has submitted for a final. The existing site was formerly US Satellite property and the west part is an open field with a change in grade and a fence in the upper right corner. It has a simple layout with a couple of looped roads to the south. To the west of the development is the Rocky Mountain Corridor and that right of way provides a natural buffer from any residence of the neighbors to the west and that right of way wraps around the development and continues to the south. The Bullion Place subdivision is a total of 74 units, 20 single family homes on the north half and 54 town homes on the south half. There is a looped road off of Bullion Street that will be called Bellshill Street. Off Bellshill Street will be a looped private road called Coalburn Street that will serve [JP1] the 54 town homes. Planned unit developments allow the developer the flexibility to modify the setbacks for single family or the lots as long the overall density is met by the underlying zoning. The R-1-6 zone allows the flexibility to change the lot sizes slightly as long as the average of the lots are 6,000 ft². All the homes in the R-1-6 Zone meet the setback requirements and exceed them in the front. Planned unit development requires that the developer submit color schemes and materials for the homes. Buildings are all muted earth tones, black roofs, fiber cement siding, wood-look concrete veneer and stucco. They did change the units from three-unit tri-plex to four and five-plex units. They removed one of the units to meet the density. RM-15 density allows up to 12 units per acre permitted outright and if they want to increase to 15 units per acre they have to meet incentive density criteria. This proposal is well under the density maximum. The height of the town homes are also lower than what is allowed at 34' and 35'. There are two roof designs, gable roof style and shed roof style. The town homes are three levels, the first floor is

garage, second floor has a kitchen and half bath, third floor has 2-3 bedrooms and 1-2 bathrooms. The single-family homes are similar in architecture, style and color with staggered 1-2 car garage units. The town homes will have transom windows for privacy but will let in natural light.

The landscaping is laid out very well. There is a detention basin on the west side and in the center of the development will be an open space landscaped area. There is an existing cell tower on the far east side that will remain there. The one change from the preliminary to the final is the connection for sidewalks.

The property is a former contaminated site and Mr. Brodsky is working with DEQ, Department of Environmental Quality and is part of a voluntary cleanup program and in order to do that they have to meet many criteria and regulations that are very detailed. They are proposing to have a repository for the contamination which has to be approved by the DEQ.

Initially, when the zone was changed there was a traffic study done on Bullion Street. There is an average of 1900 daily trips and that road itself is designated to accommodate 4000-6000 average daily trips. Bullion Street is more than adequate for this subdivision. Parking for multi-family zones does require 2.5 stalls per unit, two can be enclosed in garages and then the other half is for visitor parking. Since there are 54 townhomes the minimum requirement would be 27 stalls, they have provided 30 stalls. Mr. Hacker asked if there would be parking allowed out on the streets. Ms. Nixon verified it is not usually allowed because of the narrower street width and is the reason the added visitor parking is required. Staff is recommending the Planning Commission grant Final Subdivision for a PUD known as Bullion Place.

Ms. Milkavich asked about the white vinyl fencing and if it will be around both single family and multi-units. Ms. Nixon clarified the fencing will be around the entire subdivision except for the cell tower which will have its own containment.

Applicant, Michael Brodsky at 84 West 4800 South stated he will comply with all the conditions. The purchase of the property will close on December 3, 2021 and have made arrangements with the Police Department and Fire Department to be able to use the existing building for training exercises before we start work on the site. Every precaution will be taken to preserve the trees along Bullion Street. The houses have been set back further in order to save them, although it is not guaranteed simply due to construction around them. The siting of the houses is designed to alternate elevations to provide an architectural street scape. Every other house will have 3 car garage and those are a little larger than the two car garage homes. There is a 165' separation from the cell tower to the closest house. Even though there is 100' between this subdivision and the adjacent community the homes will have transom windows placed higher for light and privacy between the town homes and the adjacent community houses. Parking is not permitted in the townhouse private roads but on the public roads parking is permitted. Approval has been given for the RAP, Remedial Action Plan and there has been extensive investigation of the property to understand the extent and type of contaminants and design a method to gather them and safely dispose and bury them in a repository. One of the precautions we will take during the construction is Fugitive Dust Monitoring to ensure nothing escapes the site as it is being constructed. The contaminants found are not soluble therefore will not seep into the water table which is considerably deep in this area. Hamlet development will be building and selling single family homes and Garbett will be building and selling the town homes. This is not a rental community; the town homes are intended to be sold as owner occupant homes. Ms. Milkavich asked if they will both be built at the same time or in phases. Mr. Brodsky specified

that due to the contamination on the site it will delay some timelines. Mr. Nay wanted to express his appreciation for all the accommodations that has been made for this project.

Mr. Hacker opened the meeting for public comment. No comments were made and the public comment portion was closed.

Travis Nay made a motion The Planning Commission grant Final Subdivision Approval for Bullion Place PUD subdivision on the property addressed 935 West Bullion Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall meet all requirements of the Murray City Engineer, including the following:
 - a. Meet City subdivision and requirements.
 - b. Provide grading, drainage and utility plan and profile drawings.
 - c. Meet City utility standards.
 - d. Provide an HOA declaration for the common area maintenance and ownership. Include language for the inspection and maintenance of the on-site drainage system including the retention/detention area.
 - e. Obtain utility easement in the City's name from RMP for sewer and storm drain that extends west to Bullion Street.
 - f. Meet City storm drainage requirements, on-site retention of the 80th percentile storm and detention is required. Implement Low Impact Development (LID) practices.
 - g. Provide standard front rear and side yard PUEs on lots. Window well encroachments into 5' side yard PUEs not allowed.
 - h. Provide site geotechnical study based on the proposed fill, site grading and building plans and meet requirements.
 - i. Develop a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and obtain UDEQ approval for any site clean-up. A Certificate of Compliance will be required prior to recording a plat and City acceptance of any dedications. Permanent storage of contaminated material within proposed ROW's will not be allowed.
 - j. Raise or relocate the overhead utilities along Bullion Street to meet current clearance standards.
 - k. Street lighting type and locations need to be approved by Murray City Power.
 - l. Provide bond for subdivision improvements.
 - m. Restore utility cuts in Bullion Street asphalt surface to current or better condition.
 - n. Develop a site SWPPP and obtain a City Land Disturbance Permit prior to beginning any site grading and construction work.
 - o. Obtain a City Excavation Permit for work within City roadways.
2. The subdivision shall meet the requirements of the Murray City Fire Department. All accesses must meet the requirements of International Fire Code (IFC) 2018 appendix D.
3. The developer shall meet Murray City Wastewater Division requirements including the following:
 - a. The applicant shall relocate and adjust positions for manholes and laterals per notes of the Wastewater Division.

- b. The applicant shall include a note on plans indicating that all laterals must include a minimum of one clean-out.
 - c. No laterals may be run beneath driveways.
 - d. The required ten-foot (10') separation between water and sewer lateral will be maintained.
 - e. The applicant shall work with the Wastewater Division to provide an appropriate plan for sewer laterals serving the townhomes.
 - f. Page PP-5 profile view and plan view do not match. The new manhole added between manhole 2 and 3 is shown on the plan view but not the profile view. Both views must match. Include footages on this as well.
 - g. Include note for townhome laterals. If townhome laterals are run under driveway cleanout must include triangulated cast iron box over the clean out.
4. The developer shall meet all requirements of the Murray City Water Division.
5. The developer shall meet all Murray City Power Department requirements including the following:
 - a. Meet with Murray City Power to plan the new power service and equipment placement, including line extension costs.
 - b. Provide easements for equipment and lines as needed.
 - c. Maintain the easement for the underground power line on the south side of the project.
 - d. Remove the underground vault, transformer, and line feeding the satellite facility prior to development.
6. The applicant shall prepare and submit the final Home-Owners Association documents appropriately providing for the continued maintenance and care of commonly held property and improvements in the project for review and approval by City staff. Upon recordation of the HOA document, a copy is required to be submitted to the Murray City Planning Division.
7. The subdivision improvements shall include the installation of street trees as required by Murray City Code.
8. All units within the subdivision shall comply with the requirements of the R-M-15 Zone as outlined in Chapter 17.120, with the exception of the 13-foot side yard setback on the west boundary line of the R-M-15 area and as depicted on the site plan.
9. Comply with the requirements of Chapter 17.62, Condominiums, and Planned Unit Development as outlined in Chapter 17.60 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
10. The applicant shall prepare a Final Subdivision Plat which complies with all requirements of Title 16, Murray City Subdivision Ordinance.
11. The subdivision plat shall be recorded within one year of the final approval by the Planning Commission or the subdivision plat approval shall be null and void.

Seconded by Jake Pehrson.

Call vote was recorded.

 A Ned Hacker
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 4-0.

AFTON ENGLAND FLAG LOT SUBDIVISION & CARRIAGE PARK – 1776 East Vine Street & 6160 South Carriage Park Circle – Project #21-115

The applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Flag Lot Subdivision approval for property in the R-1-10 Zone located at 1776 East Vine Street. Jared Hall presented the request. There is an existing house on the property and the back lot portion is where the flag lot would be created, the front home would have access onto Vine Street and the rear home would have access to Park Circle. The property is zoned R-1-10, 10,000 ft² per lot as a minimum. The easement area was included as part of the subdivision when it was built. It was annexed into Murray City and requirements for flag lots are different than the county. The county required 20' but Murray City requires 28'. The additional 8' is for 4' of landscaping on either side to provide a buffer from the driveway to the adjacent properties. In this case the 20' is for pavement and emergency access. The applicants made a petition to the Hearing Officer to get a variance from the 28' to 20' which was approved. Flag lot subdivision rules require that the rear lot or flag lot be 125% of the requirement of the zone. The applicants lot area is over 15,000 ft² and 13,000 ft² excludes that 20' of access. Staff finds that the application does meet the requirements for flag lot subdivision and recommend that the Planning Commission approve the flag lot subdivision subject to the six conditions.

Applicant, Alex Butterfield at 1776 E Vine Street stated his willingness to comply with the conditions. This plan was made in 1991 and he desires to carry out that plan. The back half of the lot was sold to the Carriage Park Circle developers for a small amount of money for a flag lot to Carriage Park Circle. This was approved in that original agreement and again approved by the county in 2003. This didn't get recorded and want to get final approval and recording of the flag lot.

Mr. Hacker opened the item for public comment. The following comments were made.

Jennifer Fuller, 6154 South Carriage Park Circle

I have some pictures to show how that fence is 16' at the opening and how it carries over into our front side yard. After the last meeting I had some concerns about whether we would have an issue of a boundary by acquiescence or prescriptive easement and consulted with an attorney and sent a letter. My attorney has researched and under Utah law we own that property by boundary of acquiescence in our yard based on that fence. I was able to talk to the previous owner and the fence has been in that place since before 2001, we bought the house in 2015. I have a Utah case on point that is a similar case to ours and we haven't consented or come to an agreement with the applicant for anything to happen with the property. I have tried multiple times to talk to him, he came to our house and talked to my husband and I, we tried to arrange a meeting with a prospective buyer to talk about things so we could come to an agreement. We are preparing to bring a lawsuit to court to confirm that we own a portion of property. We feel like the approval of this application would be premature and ask that you stay the approval of

this so that we can reach either an agreement or the court can make a decision.

Randy Coke, Attorney for the Applicant

I have spoken to the third attorney involved in this today. I wholly disagree with the legal conclusions they have made. I have spoken with the owner who owned the property with the original owners after Carriage Park which was Afton and Glade England and a man named Stan Wright, he will testify if and when necessary that an arrangement was made to save that pine tree on a temporary basis and accommodations made to jog a fence around that until the property was ultimately developed. There has never been any possible way to prove an adverse possession unless there is a mutual agreement by prescriptive right which means against the ownership interest and when you allow someone to use your property and jog a fence with your permission you can't assert boundary by acquiescence. It is about the last 16' of the fence where it jogs out. Mr. Wright was the original co-owner of the property he is the one who sold the property to your applicant. He is fully aware of what this arrangement was back in the early 90's. I believe it is a private matter as pointed out by Mr. Hall.

Peter Cornish, 6134 Carriage Park Circle

I think this situation based on where this fence is the variance doesn't make sense because it is not 20' so it is not safe. I don't think it's the mistake of anyone in this room that this has happened. But it is ludicrous that we have attorney's involved, I don't understand why the Butterfields haven't been talking with the Fullers. I think it sets a bad precedent for the neighborhood. This is a crazy situation and childish.

Rick Butterfield

I built the home in 2003 adjacent to the England property. I did the surveying and the subdividing we did everything but record it because Afton England was alive and was on a fixed income and didn't want to pay two property taxes and everything was set the way it is now just needs to be recorded. Peter had a good comment, the reason why it has gotten to this point is not because of the Butterfields. At the beginning we went to the variance meeting not one neighbor communicated with us and had a coup against us. Step two was an attorney paper with a summary of what they believe was their right, but it doesn't make it law, just a point of interest. A fence line around a tree to save a tree that they have enjoyed, nothing has changed from the developer that fence will be gone, and the day is here, and it is going to be improved as a lot and there is value there to take that value away from anyone without paying for it, I don't think is fair. This is just finishing what they were promised when they sold to the developer. This is a beautiful neighborhood and community; this is the first issue I have seen in our neighborhood and understand that changes are uncomfortable but to the point of attorney's and to the point of not communicating originally. Were excited to see it fulfilled and feel it's the best for the neighborhood and is going to clean up this open lot that has been there.

Mike Katsenevas, 1798 South Carriage Park Circle

This has been a little odd for me, for ten years I sat up there for the City of South Salt Lake and for nine of those years I was the chair. You've gained a good planner in Jared. Based off my experience and knowledge this meets the criteria. I feel bad for our community of neighbors that this has gone this far. But the law is the law, and it meets all state and city ordinances and requirements. If you are giving me a choice between having a pine tree and a family with children and life, I would take the latter. This is a no brainer it does meet all the criteria. The Butterfields have been communicative. I have had questions for them, they answered them. I have reached out to the city on a few matters regarding this. I don't have any issues or concerns. This is pretty straight forward.

Peter Cornish, 6134 Carriage Park Circle

I just would like to add that you Rick that you guys initiated this project and said that we didn't communicate, you didn't communicate to us before we found out there was a variance request. I am not concerned about the fact of splitting the lots. I am concerned about the situation that we have where these guys through no fault of their own are in a situation where they are losing land. In that case because of the fence, you said yourself the fence will get moved and who pays to move the fence and sprinkler system?

No other comments were made, and Mr. Hacker closed the public comment portion of this item.

Mr. Hall stated there aren't any issues related to the subdivision rules. Briant Farnsworth, Deputy City Attorney, stated most of the comments here have been off topic and on the wrong issue. This is to review the application and the ordinance to see if it complies, review the application as it is given and the owners affidavit and take that at face value. There is no investigation that The Planning Commission does. They look at what is on the plats, what staff has shown from their research and makes a decision based on that application. The commission does not have the position to rule or give an opinion on any sort of private land disputes. One of the comments was about a prescriptive easement, you don't have a prescriptive easement unless a judge says you do, so those are claims and are not something that The Planning Commission rules on.

Mr. Hacker reiterated that there are already attorneys involved which will need to take place outside of this setting.

Lisa Milkavich made a motion The Planning Commission approve a flag lot subdivision for the Afton England two-lot subdivision located at 1776 East Vine Street subject to the six conditions.

1. The applicant shall meet all requirements of the City Engineer, including the following:
 - a. Meet City subdivision requirements.
 - b. Provide standard public utility easements on both lots.
 - c. Plat must include a vicinity map.
 - d. Show correct signature blocks (Cottonwood Improvement, Salt Lake City Water, Rocky Mountain Power, Health Department).
 - e. Show addresses for proposed lots.
 - f. Include signature lines for Comcast/CenturyLink/Utopia/Dominion.
 - g. Include township, base, and range below main title.
 - h. Show adjacent parcel data per Salt Lake County requirements.
 - i. Include property corner mark callouts per Salt Lake County requirements.
 - j. Add printed name for Acknowledgment per Murray City sample plat.
 - k. Ensure enough acknowledgements for all signatories.
2. The applicant shall prepare a Final Subdivision Plat which complies with all requirements of Title 16, Murray City Subdivision Ordinance.
3. The Final Plat shall adhere to the requirements for Flag Lot Subdivisions contained in Section 17.76.140 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance and as outlined in the Staff Report.

4. The applicant shall provide and maintain a minimum 20' access of hard surface (asphalt or concrete) per the August 2021 variance, which must be provided for emergency access prior to any combustible construction on proposed Lot 2.
5. The applicant shall meet all applicable Building and Fire Codes.
6. The applicant shall provide complete plans, structural calculations and soils reports stamped and signed by the appropriate design professionals at the time of submittal for building permits.

Seconded by Travis Nay.

Call vote was recorded.

 A Ned Hacker
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 4-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Hall indicated the December 2, 2021 meeting would be cancelled. We will meet on December 16, 2021. He added that Sue Wilson is resigning from the commission and that will be her last meeting.

There was no other business.

Jake Pehrson made a motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by Travis Nay. A voice vote was made, motion passed 4-0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.



Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager