

**West Point City  
Planning Commission  
3200 West 300 North  
October 11, 2018**

**Present:** Brian Vincent, Jeremy Strong, Brad Lee, Rob Ortega, Jeff Macfarlane, Korey Kap, Jake Shepherd, Boyd Davis – Community Development Director, Troy Moyes – City Planner, Michelle Bailey - Planning Commission Secretary

**Visitors:** Spencer Hawkes, Douglas Hawkes, Marge Hawkes, Johnny Willis, Duncan Barlow, Craig Haslam, April Haslam, Randy Holmstead, JoAnn Holmstead, Marilyn Fouwers, Dennis & Ralene Montgomery, Nancy Nelson, Nathan Montgomery, Louis Micallef, Chad Lewis

**WORK SESSION**

- 1. Discussion regarding the rezone of two parcels of property from A-40 Agricultural and R-2 Residential to R-1 Residential while maintaining those portions that are currently zoned R-2, located at approximately 40 South 4500 West, Barlow Corporation, Dale Corp., Green Bell, LLC, and others listed as parcel owners, applicants.**

Brian Vincent said a Public Hearing was held for this on September 27, 2018, but everything wasn't accurate on the application so the item was tabled until that could be corrected. Another Public Hearing is scheduled for this meeting.

Boyd Davis said Staff's recommendation for this is to table it due to some additional information they have received. There are two different applications for the rezones. Staff has checked all the parcel numbers, owners and so forth. Everything looks correct. The two parcels that are being considered for rezone are 12-042-0116 and 12-042-0027. Parcel 12-042-0116 is owned by the Barlow Corporation and others; there are eight owners total of that property. Parcel 12-042-0027 is owned by Green Bell, LLC. All nine owners have signed the application. Both parcels have split zoning on them currently. A portion of both parcels is zoned R-2 with the remaining portions being zoned A-40. Staff talked to the developer about the portions that are currently zoned R-2, and he decided he would like to keep those as R-2. It is being proposed to leave those portions zoned R-2 and rezone the remaining portions R-1. The General Plan calls for all of the property in that area to be zoned R-1. Their request is consistent with the General Plan. The R-2 portions are the only difference.

Following that last Planning Commission meeting, two residents approached Staff and brought up some issues. Mr. Craig Haslam said that he owns a 10-foot strip within the boundary of one of the parcels. He brought a deed in his name that shows he owns that. Staff went to the County Surveyor's office to find out what is going on. The County deleted that parcel; it was on the County ownership maps for several years and then it was deleted. The surveyor gave two reasons for why it was deleted. First of all, the legal description for that property was invalid; it actually doesn't close, it doesn't describe any property, the legal description is simply not valid. Second, Staff got a title report and information from that report claims that there is no chain of title going to Mr. Haslam.

Although that parcel showed up on his deed, it was incorrect. Several owners prior to Mr. Haslam, sold the property to someone else and it is part of the Barlow property. According to the County Surveyor and the title report, it appears that Mr. Haslam does not have a claim to that 10 foot property. Staff believes that issue is resolved; there's not actually a 10 foot parcel there. The other issue is on the east side of the property. The Montgomery family approached Staff after the meeting and said they had looked into the legal description of that property and they believe there is a gap between their property and parcel 12-042-0116. Staff spoke to the County Surveyor about that and he agreed; he said there is likely a gap there. It is up to the two property owners to get together and resolve that. For that reason, Staff recommends the Commission holds the Public Hearing tonight, but that they table any action on this item until that boundary issue can be resolved. Staff recommends that the Commission makes it clear that this will be their only opportunity for a public hearing; this is their opportunity to bring up any concerns they have with this rezone. Brian Vincent said the gap could be up to 20 feet in size. Boyd Davis said Dennis Montgomery's parcel is referenced back to a survey monument that is on 4500 West. Barlow's property is referenced to a survey monument that is on the west side. The County Surveyor said the surveyors assumed that the distance between the two monuments was exactly one-half mile, but it is not. It's greater than one-half mile. The surveyor said it is probably 20 feet longer than a half mile and that's how gaps are created.

Jeremy Strong asked about the parcels they are requesting to maintain as R-2. Do they have to zone them to R-1 as well? Boyd Davis said they can keep them as R-2. Jeremy asked that because R-2 zoning doesn't meet the General Plan for that area. Boyd responded saying there are other instances within the city where they have done the same thing. They can request to keep the zoning as it is on that portion. Jake Shepherd commented that they could resubmit their application and only ask to rezone the A-40 area and then the R-2 would stay the same. It wouldn't matter either way, they can keep the R-2 portions because they are already zoned that currently. There was a brief discussion on the sizes of lots that could be on an R-2 in that area. Boyd Davis said the developer wouldn't get much advantage, if any, in keeping this area zoned R-2. He might gain some flexibility, but he wouldn't gain extra lots.

Korey Kap asked about the first issue with Mr. Haslam's property; how does a gap just go away? Boyd Davis said that is not a City determination, it is a County determination. Mr. Haslam said, "If it's been there for years and years and years, how do you just delete it? I've got tax assessments, titles and deeds." Boyd Davis told Mr. Haslam that he would be happy to talk with him after the meeting. Boyd said, "In the past, there was a 10-foot strip of property and there was a parcel number assigned to it. It was within the boundaries of this parcel, 10-042-0116. The County realized there was an issue with it; I don't know what brought it to their attention. Once it was brought to their attention, they investigated it and found out that the legal description for that parcel is invalid. It doesn't describe any property and the boundary of it doesn't close. That legal description doesn't close. It crisscrosses itself. There is no title work for it. There was title work done for this property, and according to the title work done on that property, there is no clear chain of title giving it to the Haslams. The Haslams do have a deed that includes that parcel. For several years, on County maps, it actually showed a 10-foot strip that was owned by the Haslams. The County said that was an error and they deleted it." Haslams said they have

gone to the County, and they won't give them records that it was deleted. They claimed they have nothing on file as to why it was deleted. Mrs. Haslam said she has a recording on her phone that Max Elliott called and said they thought it was just a tax deed, it's a quick claim deed, so we put it back in. A couple of hours later he called back and said they had changed their minds. Boyd Davis said their best information, after talking to the County Recorder's office and the County Surveyor's office, is that it was deleted and that it was done properly. Brian Vincent told Mr. Haslam that they would be happy to speak with him after the meeting and discuss the information they received from the County.

**2. Discussion regarding a Conditional Use Permit for an accessory building located at 522 North 3650 West, Jake Shepherd, applicant.**

Jake Shepherd is seeking a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 112' x 54' (6,048 square foot) accessory building on an additional parcel of land he owns directly to the east of his home. This parcel is located behind the parking lot of the Loy Blake Park. West Point City Code states, "Accessory buildings on a vacant lot shall not be allowed except in agricultural zones." The applicant has submitted an application to the City to amend the existing plat to combine this parcel into his existing lot. Mr. Shepherd, who currently serves on the Planning Commission, is petitioning the Commission to consider granting the Conditional Use Permit with the condition that construction of this building will not occur until the amendment is completed and approved by the City Council. Troy Moyes showed the parcels that Jake Shepherd is requesting to be combined. The application is with City Council right now. This can go through the process as with any other Conditional Use application but the motion would need to state that it is being granted under the condition that City Council approves the amended plat if they choose to approve it. Troy Moyes reviewed the requirements in the Code that apply to a building this size. The applicant has met the requirements for accessory buildings, however, the roof height of the building is 30' and the copulas are an additional two feet in height. The applicant said he could remove them on his design. There is a section of Code that allows for "height limit exceptions" found in 17.45.020. It reads: "Roof structures for the housing of elevators, stairways, tanks, ventilating fans, or similar equipment required to operate and maintain the building, skylights, steeples, chimneys, antennas, or similar structures may be erected above the height limits herein prescribed, but no space above the height limit shall be allowed for the purpose of providing additional floor space." Troy Moyes said this meets the Code requirements. It will be next to the parking lot of the Loy Blake Park. He is proposing a 12 foot setback due to a utility easement. Brian Vincent asked Jake what he is planning to do between the building and the fence along the parking lot. Jake responded that there is a 12 foot easement for the irrigation ditch. He would like to be able to plant some trees along there but that won't work with the irrigation ditch running down the length of the property. He would like to do a buffer of some sort along there though. The fence is leaning into Jake's property quite a bit because people keep backing into it. Jake would like to do something different with the fence but he doesn't want people backing into it. He is willing to work with the City on that issue. He feels that it would look nice to have some trees there to create a buffer. There may need to be some parking curbs installed or something to maintain the fence. Troy Moyes said the applicant wants the building to look nice so he has added architectural features to enhance the aesthetics of the building. Korey Kap asked if this building would be accessed from the driveway to his home. Jake Shepherd said that is his

plan. He may have a discussion with the City Council to discuss accessing his property from the parking lot if it is available. Obviously he knows the City owns the property, and it is a parking lot, but he would be open to accessing it either way. The submitted plan doesn't have anything on it right now as far as an access through the parking lot.

### 3. **Discussion of West Point City Code regarding residential brick standards.**

This item has been discussed at length during several of the past meetings. Brian Vincent commented that he feels they have come to a good consensus except for on a couple of items. Those would be how to deal with the corner lot homes and what to do with the wainscot requirement. Troy Moyes stated that City Council will be holding a Public Hearing regarding this item during their next meeting. The existing standard requires all new construction to be 40% brick, stone or rock on the front façade, and a three-foot wainscot to be used on the sides of homes and 40% of the same materials on all street facing facades on corner lots. Staff has done some research and preparation for the meeting by taking pictures of homes that meet the existing 40% brick requirement and homes that are in Clinton that do not meet this requirement. Staff has also presented a few scenarios to consider in preparation to submit their recommendation to the City Council. Staff proposed four scenarios for consideration. Troy reviewed those scenarios. They are as follows:

**Scenario 1:** The Planning Commission will send to the City Council the revised brick standard that would allow for two options as presented and keep the requirements the same in option one that would require the 3' wainscot and 40% brick on corner lots.

**Scenario 2:** The Planning Commission will send to the City Council the revised brick standard that would allow for two options as presented and modify the requirements in option one that would remove the required the 3' wainscot and keep the 40% brick on corner lots.

**Scenario 3:** The Planning Commission will send to the City Council the revised brick standard that would allow for two options as presented and modify the requirements in option one that would remove the required the 3' wainscot and 40% brick on corner lots.

**Scenario 4:** The Planning Commission will send to the City Council the revised brick standards that would allow for two options as presented and modify the requirements in option one that would remove the required the 3' wainscot and modify the 40% brick on corner lots to only require a 4' wainscot on corner lots.

Troy Moyes reminded the Commission that there are other things they may choose to do; these are only suggestions. Also, whenever Codes are changed there are impacts. There are homes that have been following the rules for quite some time, then when the rules are changed, people feel like it's not fair. Brian Vincent asked for a quick straw vote regarding the four scenarios presented before they discuss it. Jeremy Strong said he likes Scenario 3. Brad Lee likes Scenario 3. Jeff Macfarlane was still deciding. Rob Ortega likes Scenario 1. Jake Shepherd said he is deciding between Scenarios 1 and 4. Jake said what he worries about on a corner lot is the side load garages because of visibility. He feels there are situations, like that, where a corner lot should have 40%. There are other corner lots that the brick isn't seen because of a fence. If it is a side load garage, it won't have a fence. Korey Kap said he ok with changing the 40% rule but wondered if they wanted to lower that number or say they can do whatever they want. Brian Vincent likes Scenario 4. Jeremy Strong said he agrees with Jake Shepherd that if there is a side-load

garage, the 40% brick rule should apply, otherwise he feels that the requirement should be gone. Brian Vincent commented that it all comes down to personal preferences. Discussion took place regarding the look of the homes in the pictures and opinions on what is necessary to look nice and what is just an unnecessary cost to a homeowner. Brad Lee said his reasoning for getting rid of it all is that it is an added cost to the buyer. He feels we are trying to micro-manage this. Ninety-five percent of the people will put up a fence and the side of the home won't be seen. Brad feels sometimes we get caught up in regulating things and it is just an added cost. Brad said he feels allowing for the new materials to be options is a good thing because times change, preferences change and new materials come out. Homeowners should have options. Jake Shepherd said he feels the City needs to stay away from the "thou shalt" and let the CC&Rs of the subdivision steer some of these things. He said he would be more along the lines of getting rid of some of these things. On a side load garage he feels we should stick with the 40% rule just like the front of the home, because that's what it looks like. Rob Ortega said he still feels like he has all along; it looks better with the wainscot. Those are the standards we have had and he doesn't like the idea of chipping away at our standards. The flip side of the coin to trying to save people money is telling people their house won't be worth as much in 10 years because we wanted to save these people money. That's not fair. He doesn't like removing the standards. Jeff Macfarlane said he understands where Rob is coming from. It's tough to come up with a standard that will cover everything. He said he is leaning toward Scenario 4. Rob Ortega also commented that he feels we have had a lot of luck in the city with some builders that are local and want to do a good business and build some nice looking homes when they didn't have to do as much as they did. Although, as property values continue to go up, we can't stop that. We will see more national company types of investors buying up these properties and trying to build houses as cheap as they can. That is what these standards will protect us from. Rob said he isn't trying to raise the standards, but he doesn't want to lower them.

Boyd Davis asked for a straw vote so they could pass something on to the City Council. Everyone liked Option 2. Regarding the wainscot on interior lots, Rob Ortega was the only person who wanted to keep that in the Code. Everyone else wanted to delete that. In discussing the 40% brick rule on corner lots, Jake Shepherd said he could go either way. He feels it is important to have the brick if it is seen as the front of the house, such as with a side load garage. Korey Kap said he feels they all kind of like the 40% brick, but they know there needs to be some changes made. He feels they should hold it to 40% or remove it all. Jeremy said he feels the other option to that is if it is a side load garage it could be required, otherwise, delete the requirement. Many of them are ok with dropping the 40% rule unless there is a side load garage. The straw vote on the 40% rule is again, 6-1. Rob Ortega wants to stick with Option 1, the rest want to drop the 40% rule unless there is a side load garage then the 40% rule must be followed.

#### **4. Discussion regarding amendments to West Point City's General Plan.**

There was not time to discuss this item during the work session.

## REGULAR MEETING

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Prayer:** given by Brad Lee
4. **Approval of Minutes from September 27, 2018.**

Brad Lee made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on September 27, 2018, as written. Jeremy Strong seconded the motion. All voted aye.

5. **Public Comments:** None given
6. **Public Hearing regarding the rezone of two parcels of property from A-40 Agricultural and R-2 Residential to R-1 Residential while maintaining those portions that are currently zoned R-2, located at approximately 40 South 4500 West, Barlow Corporation, Dale Corp., Green Bell, LLC, and others listed as parcel owners, applicants.**

Brian Vincent said there will be no action taken on this item tonight. Boyd Davis said Staff has received two applications to rezone two parcels. Parcel 12-042-0116 is owned by Barlow Corporation and others. There are eight total owners of that property and each has signed the petition to rezone the property. Parcel 12-042-0027 is owned by Green Bell, LLC. Boyd displayed a map showing the current zoning which is A-40 and R-2 on both parcels. After talking with the developers, they have decided to keep the R-2 zones as they are and simply rezone the A-40 property to R-1 Residential. Boyd Davis commented that this request is consistent with the General Plan. The General Plan for this area calls for all of it to be the R-1 zone. There are a couple of issues that were raised by residents after the last meeting. One was concerning a 10-foot strip of property that Mr. Craig Haslam claims he owns. The County ownership maps have shown for several years, a parcel in his name. A few years ago, it was deleted by the County. Staff met with the County Surveyor, he explained why it was deleted. There with issues with the title on the property as well the legal description for the property. The County Surveyor and County Recorder deleted that parcel. According to the County, that does not exist. The other issue was brought to Staff's attention by the Montgomery family. They believe there is a gap between their property and Parcel 12-042-0116. Staff spoke with the County Surveyor about that, and he said there is very likely a gap between those two properties. The reason being that each property is referenced to different survey monuments. Because of that, there is very likely a gap there. Because of that issue, Staff recommends that the Commission table any action on this rezone until that gap can be resolved. Staff recommends that they Public Hearing be held tonight still but that the residents understand this is the only time they will have to give comments on this.

Duncan Barlow, representing the developer was present to answer questions. Brian Vincent asked if they were sure they wanted to maintain the R-2 zoning rather than rezone all of the property to R-1. Mr. Barlow responded that he isn't sure what the

reasoning behind leaving those areas zoned R-2 would be. He is at the meeting filling in for someone else and doesn't have an answer for that. Boyd Davis said the request to leave the R-2 zones as they are came from Mark Sandberg and he didn't give reasons for that.

#### **A. Public Hearing**

Brian Vincent reminded the public that this will be the last public hearing they will hold on this rezone even though they will not be taking action on it tonight.

**Dennis Montgomery – 200 South 4600 West, West Point** – Mr. Montgomery said that he has seen some of the plans. He asked if they are going to stay with the plans that they have or will they be changed? The response from Mark Sandberg's representative was that they are going with the plan that they have currently submitted to the City. Mr. Montgomery said that he thinks they ought to work that out with Craig Haslam. As far as the property not having an end, the city park doesn't have an end on the other side either. Several properties don't have an end. There are a lot of properties down there that have that. As far as the gaps, I believe that if you had brought the landowners in a little earlier and discussed it with the developers, it could probably have been solved. Also, regarding the brick standard that was discussed in the Work Session, he thinks they should list what materials may be used and let the landowner choose. It's his house, let him put up what he wants. We shouldn't overregulate things. Thank you.

**Craig Haslam – 4563 West 200 South, West Point** – Mr. Haslam said, "I own that strip that is being disputed. I've owned it since 2004. I have a deed. I've been paying all the taxes on it. How does it not exist? I'm disputing it! I want to know how it cannot exist. A piece of land we have been paying on and paying taxes on? Thank you.

**Duncan Barlow – 529 West Gentile Street, Layton** – Mr. Barlow said, "After he rudely accused me of taking his ground, this was over a couple of years ago, and as I was driving back home I was trying to think, 'What was it that happened?' At the time we were buying the Manning piece, the subject came up. So I had called our title company because we bought the piece just to the west of it and I said, 'Do you know anything about this gap because we are looking at buying the Manning piece.' They got with the County and talked to them and I think you had just asked earlier, 'Why is there a gap between Montgomerys and our piece?' It is because if you take the legal description from one point and you run it through, it will show one thing. If you take it from another point and you come through, they don't always add up. So on his piece, I believe he bought it from the LDS Church, the piece that he bought, 10 acres, my understanding is that they gave him a warranty deed to guarantee the title. There is a gap so the Church gave a quick claim deed on the gap. A quick claim deed basically says, 'We are leaving any interest we have in it, if we have any interest.' But he doesn't have interest, so that's my understanding why. I even talked to the County and said, 'I'm sure this isn't very valid, taxes aren't that much but whatever he has paid, he should be reimbursed for it.' So I even called down and told them. The reason he doesn't is that part was quick claimed because it is the same thing. We took the legal description from one point and you do it and you take it from another and that, as I recall, is what they informed me that they were able to correct that. Now on the other side, I'm sure it's the same thing. If they can, I'm

not sure what the gap is, but I'm sure the two owners could get together and do a boundary line agreement. Or they can just figure it out. The County did that, it wasn't us. The title company and the County want to make sure the legal descriptions are right. I just wanted to address that since I was rudely accused last week of stealing his property. Thanks"

**Craig Haslam – 4563 West 200 South, West Point** – Mr. Haslam said, "I want to thank you for telling me you talked to the County because he told me he had never talked to you." There were random comments made from the audience that were inaudible.

**Randy Holmstead – 31 South 4500 West, West Point** – "The question I have, or concern, is on the one map where the other gap could be from 10 – 20 feet or whatever was discussed earlier. Does this only go to the half point or does it go clear along that plot of 12-042-0116. Because that also would affect our property. We are concerned about that. The other issue is we need irrigation for our property. We have water rights and we are just concerned about those water rights continuing. Thank you"

**Marilyn Fowers – 54 South 4500 West, West Point** – "I just have a couple of questions. We have barns behind ours. Is there an ordinance in place that says buildings have to be 150 feet away from those existing barns?" Brian Vincent said they could review the ordinance after the meeting with her. She also asked, "So are they going to put a fence down between that one that ends in 27 all the way down and across the back? And what kind of a fence?" Brian Vincent responded that they are required to have a fence around their project and the Commission doesn't know what type of fence that will be at this time. She also asked if they can still be agricultural. Brian Vincent responded that this does not change her zoning.

**Louis J. Micallef – 45 North 4500 West, West Point** – Mr. Micallef said they own two properties there so this disputed strip of land, if it does continue to the north like we think it does, will also affect his property as well. He would like clarification for that. Eventually he would like to develop a portion of his property creating two or three building lots for his family. He is wondering if he will be landlocked by this. Brian Vincent said they have not addressed any conceptual plans on the property at all; they are only addressing the rezone of property right now.

Jeremy Strong made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Korey Kap seconded the motion. All voted aye.

**Douglas Hawkes – 75 South 4500 West, West Point** - (Comment was given after the Public Hearing was closed and agenda item 7 was being discussed but it was related to the Public Hearing) Mr. Hawkes said, "We can't hear in the back." Brian Vincent apologized. Mr. Hawkes said, "You've said that twice before and I'm telling you we can't hear in the back. So when you close this or close that, people that have some kind of comment but can't hear, which I do, I can't hear you. You're mumbling." Brian Vincent said they waited and no one else got up. Mr. Hawkes said, "I don't care whether you waited or not, I'm telling you that you can't be heard in the back. How many times do I need to tell you that?" Brian Vincent asked how many times they waited. Mr. Hawkes responded, "Once, but what the hell? Anyway, my name is Doug Hawkes. I live on 93



South 4500 West. Has there been any traffic studies done for what this project is going to dump on to the roads down there?” Brian Vincent asked if that was a question. Doug replied, “Yeah, it sounded like a question. ‘Has there been’ starts a question.” Brian Vincent told Mr. Hawkes they would discuss this with him afterwards.

**Marge Hawkes – 75 South 4500 West, West Point** - (Comment was given after the Public Hearing was closed and agenda item 7 was being discussed but it was related to the Public Hearing) Ms. Hawkes said, “Fourteen years ago, when the project on 25 was done, we were told everything was fine and it wouldn’t affect us. As soon as that cement got in, driveways got in, and Alan Bennett watered, it flooded our basement. We had lived there for 40 years and we’ve never had a problem. Have water studies been done? Does the developer know that he is around agriculture people? And the people they sell their homes to, do they know there are agriculture people that have horses? We have horses. We have people from 25 throw stuff in the field, out playing with the horses. The people need to know. You gave a lovely prayer and the prayer said best interest of the people. We have been there, I have been there for 70 years. I hope you have my best interest. I don’t think you’ve been here very long. But have the studies been done? Have the people been notified? We have the right to know that. She needs to know what kind of fence. She has a right to know.”

## **B. Action**

Brad Lee made a motion to table this item. Jeff Macfarlane seconded the motion. All voted aye.

### **7. Conditional Use Permit for an accessory building located at 522 North 3650 West, Jake Shepherd, applicant.**

Jake Shepherd recused himself from the discussion and vote. Troy Moyes reviewed the application information. Jake Shepherd is seeking a Conditional Use Permit to construct a 112’ x 54’ (6,048 square feet) accessory building on an additional parcel of land he owns which is directly to the east of his home. This parcel is located behind the parking lot at Loy Blake Park. West Point City Code states: “Accessory buildings on a vacant lot shall not be allowed except in agricultural zones.” The applicant has submitted an application to the City to amend the existing plat to combine this parcel with his existing lot. Mr. Shepherd, who currently serves on the Planning Commission, is petitioning the Commission to consider granting the Conditional Use Permit with the condition that construction of this building will not occur until the amendment is completed and approved by the City Council. All of the setback and open space requirements have been met. Brian Vincent mentioned the height requirement that was discussed in the Work Session. Troy Moyes responded that there is a section in the Code for “height limit exceptions” Mr. Shepherd meets these requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Jeff Macfarlane made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for an accessory building located at 522 North 3650 West, Jake Shepherd, applicant, contingent upon approval from the City Council to amend the existing plat and combine the parcels. Korey Kap seconded the motion. All voted aye.

## **8. Planning Commission Comments**

Jake Shepherd said it's great to have public comments and questions, but he wanted to let the public know that a Public Hearing isn't a forum where they can answer questions. He wanted them to understand that they were not being obstinate or uncaring. This was simply a rezone of property, and every property owner has the right to rezone their property. The questions asked were great questions. He encouraged the public to continue to come to the meetings as they go through the development process. No one is here trying to avoid their concerns.

Brad Lee had no comments.

Korey Kap said it is good to have the public here. The world changes, things change, land changes. We all want to move into our properties and hope the building stops. That is not the reality of what we deal with in this world. We feel your concerns. Korey also thanked Staff for all their hard work and research to be prepared for these meetings.

Jeremy Strong had no comments.

Jeff Macfarlane had no comments.

Rob Ortega had no comments.

Brian Vincent echoed the comments given. He apologized for seeming short. There are processes that the Commission learns about as they happen and how these projects go forward. Tonight the item was just a rezone of the property. There is nothing for the Commission to discuss about what is on the property, how it will be constructed, what the layout will be, or what the construction materials will be. None of that has been presented to the Commission. Brian said he senses the frustrations. He realizes when it comes to property that has been in a family for centuries, emotions get high. It's hard to see change happen. We want this to be a place where you can come and discuss your questions and receive answers. The Commission is bound by the process they have to go through. They are open to having discussions after the meeting with people who have questions.

## **9. Staff Update**

Boyd Davis thanked the Commission for all that they do. Also, Boyd let the public know that Staff is available during the day and people are welcome to come to the office to discuss any questions they may have. At the last City Council meeting, Staff gave an update to the Council on the brick ordinance. The Council is happy with the work the Commission has been doing on that. They also had a discussion regarding this rezone and where it is at in the process. The Council will be holding a Public Hearing as well on Tuesday, October 16, 2018. Notices have been mailed out on that. They also discussed the Sun Meadow Subdivision and the Isla Vista Subdivision. They will vote on those subdivision at their next meeting.

**10. Adjournment**

Jeff Macfarlane made a motion to adjourn at 7:40 p.m. Brad Lee seconded the motion.  
All voted aye.

  
Chairperson – Brian Vincent

  
Secretary – Michelle Bailey

