

# FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Wednesday, December 11, 2002

---

## CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION/CITY CHAMBERS

**PRESENT:** Council Members David Hale, Bob Hasenyager, Larry W. Haugen, Susan T. Holmes, Edward J. Johnson, City Manager Max Forbush. Mayor Connors was excused because he was attending a special Planning Commission meeting. City Planner David Petersen attended the last half of the work session.

### Conservation Trusts and Trail Issues

The purpose of the first part of the work session was to hear a report by David Petersen and George Chipman who had taken a fact-finding trip to New Hampshire and Massachusetts (specifically the cities of New London, Tamworth, Concord, Xerter, and Gilford) regarding conservation commissions and trail uses.

**Mr. Chipman** expressed gratitude that City Officials were supportive of open space and trail development as evidenced by allowing the trip. Mr. Chipman stated there really was no substitute for on-site research. He talked about the different types of trails in the two states visited: wilderness trails, urban trails, historical trails, mountain trails, wetland trails, and multi-use trails. As Mr. Chipman reviewed the different types of trails studied, he related each to Farmington's situation and how what was learned there could be used in Farmington. He showed pictures of signage types and trail features. People using trails in New Hampshire were proactive in maintenance and in promoting conservation and use. Litter was seldom seen because users are so conscientious about trail care. Mr. Chipman discussed one major difference between the open space land maintenance in the east as compared to local conditions. The ability of the land to heal itself from scaring was evident in the heavily forested country side of the east coast where in the desert areas of Utah, that would not be the case.

Mr. Petersen reviewed interesting facts about the country they saw on the trip. He talked about characteristics of conservation plans in different towns and explained briefly how land trusts had been established, how they had obtained funding, and how they were organized. Land acquisition and land management were also summarized. He suggested there be another session on specifics and organizational instruments. He emphasized that land acquisition had been accomplished by the conservation commissions and not by city funds and that maintenance was done by volunteers and not by public works departments. In some instances cities donated to the conservation commissions, but city contributions were a small portion of the total conservation budget. Mr. Petersen pointed out that there were some similarities between Farmington and towns visited—most specifically that people were interested in preservation and open space. Both Mr. Petersen and Mr. Chipman had pictures and other documents for use by City officials as they explore possibilities for increased conservation and trail construction in Farmington.

**Review of Agenda Items**

**Mr. Forbush** reviewed several agenda items for the City Council. Of specific note was the discussion regarding selection of Planning Commission members.

**Mayor Connors** stated that the selection had been especially difficult because of the quality and capability of the applicants. He reviewed the process of selection and stated he would nominate two names during the regular session. The Mayor wanted to see those not selected encouraged to contribute to City functions in other ways. They would possibly be good candidates for the proposed Conservation Commission.

**REGULAR CITY COUNCIL/CITY CHAMBERS/CALL TO ORDER**

**PRESENT:** Mayor David M. Connors, Council Members David Hale, Bob Hasenyager, Larry W. Haugen (Mr. Haugen was excused for the first hour of the meeting), Susan T. Holmes, Edward J. Johnson, City Manager Max Forbush, City Planner David Petersen, City Recorder Margy Lomax, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman.

**Mayor Connors** called the meeting to order at 7:10 P.M. and excused Mr. Haugen for the first portion of the meeting. The invocation was offered by Max Forbush and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Connors

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Minutes of the December 4, 2002, City Council Meeting will be presented at the meeting on January 8, 2003.

**REPORT OF PLANNING COMMISSION (Agenda Item #3)**

**David Petersen** reported proceedings of the Planning Commission meeting held December 4, 2002. He covered the following items:

- ▮ Stephen White gained a recommendation from the Planning Commission regarding the creation of a proposed flag lot located at approximately 1283 South 200 East in an LR-F (and A-F) zone (S-6-02).
- ▮ The Planning Commission reviewed a request from Richard Prows regarding the rezone of .26 acres located at 1092 1099 West Shepard Lane. Mr. Prows has since withdrawn the request.
- ▮ The Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider amending the minimum residential density requirement in a BP zone from 8 to 10 dwelling units per acre and amending the minimum parcel size requirement from 5 to 3 acres to allow a multi-family development proposal located at approximately 375 South 200 West south of the LDS Steed Creek Chapel (ZT-6-02). Neighbors

demonstrated a great deal of interest in the request and many attended the meeting. The request was denied.

- ▮ The Planning Commission recommended a proposed road cross section alternative, for use specifically in west Farmington. The Council will consider the proposal later in the meeting.
- ▮ Commissioners discussed at length whether or not to recommend the purchase of real property by Farmington City. The issue will also be considered later in the meeting.
- ▮ Mr. Petersen asked if all or some City Council members wished to hold a joint study session with the Planning Commission to hear information from Dan Lofgren about an apartment complex proposed for Burke Lane. Mayor Connors asked if the request could be considered during the Miscellaneous portion of the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF INPUT INTO DESIGN OF HERITAGE PARK (Agenda Item #4)**

**Mayor Connors** stated the City had received active participation by citizens regarding the proposed Heritage Park. Representatives of the citizens were present and would be invited to present recommendations for additional features for the park.

**David Hale** reviewed the park site plan and discussed features such as the basketball court, access trail, tot lot, etc. He introduced John Swain, landscape architect, who had helped a great deal with the design of the park.

**Mayor Connors** opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING* and reminded citizens of the Farmington tradition for respect and decorum during public hearings.

**Brent Mason** (1646 North Oakridge Park Drive) said he represented 114 home owners whose homes surrounded the park property and who would receive the greatest impact by having the park near them. He thanked the City Council for the acquisition of the property for the park. Mr. Mason enumerated several additional features the citizens would like in the park, including an enlarged basketball court, directional lighting on a timer, limited night lighting for security only, enough flow in the creek so there would be not standing water, a berm next to the frontage road to protect the park from traffic, a soft base for the tot lot, a timer for the water park so that it would not be available during night hours, a cushioned base for the trail, a medium sized bowery including a grill, and a wall where plaques could be displayed honoring Farmington's early settlers.

With no other comments, **Mayor Connors** *CLOSED* the public hearing and asked the Council for their response.

**Mr. Forbush** suggested that the Leisure Services Director and the landscape architect include the suggested features into the plans for the park and present it to the Planning Commission.

**Mayor Connors** asked if there would be further public hearing, to which Mr. Petersen stated the Planning Commission would conduct public hearings in relationship to the Heritage Park consideration.

**Bob Hasenyager** asked specifics about the basketball court. Basketball is a very popular sport in the area and he commented on the need for more public courts. Night lighting would extend the use of the court. He also suggested that the floor of the court not be cement for safety reasons. Mr. Hasenyager suggested moving the court away from the homes so that they would not be disturbed by players in the late evening hours.

**John Swain** (architect) stated the issue had been discussed. The court had been minimalized on purpose to keep the park from being overrun by basketball use at the expense of the rest of the uses.

**Mr. Hasenyager** stated he would hate not to improve the court on the grounds that it was popular.

**Mr. Swain** felt that it may become so popular that there would be a problem with out-of-area users to the exclusion of Farmington citizens. It could become an attractive nuisance.

**Mr. Forbush** said there were financial considerations and choices to make. There was only so much budgeted for the park and it may not be possible to afford all the features requested.

At the end of the day, City Council members will have to choose what will be added or deleted once total projects costs are refined.

**Mayor Connors** expressed gratitude for the work by Council members, City staff, and citizens thus far. Issues would be researched, especially impact on the neighborhood.

**PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF INPUT INTO THE PLACEMENT OF THE PROPOSED COMMUNITY CENTER AT THE MAIN CITY PARK (Agenda Item #5)**

**Mayor Connors** reviewed reasons the City Council was considering locating the new recreation center on south Main Street at the northeast corner of the Main Park. The location takes advantage of two existing parking lots. Use of the facility will be mostly in the evenings and on weekends. Taking advantage of the existing parking lots would save taxpayers' money in additional land and construction costs for parking lots that would otherwise be required at the City Hall location. The Rose Garden site afford future expansion capability which the City Hall site does not. The City Hall site would be very crowded with the addition of the center. The Main Park is already a destination point for public recreation and other indoor activities. Locating the

community center at the Main Park would be consistent with the City's Master Plan.

**Mr. Forbush** declared a potential conflict of interest since his property is near the park and he is a close neighbor and friend with those in attendance. He believed he should not be involved in any decision or negotiation. He asked to be excused from the rostrum and discussion of the agenda item. He also requested that any further negotiation with neighbors be handled by other staff or City Council Members. Mayor Connors concurred. Mr. Forbush then left the rostrum.

**Susan Holmes** wanted the record to reflect that no funds from the recently appropriated bond would be used to purchase property.

**Mayor Connors** opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

**Scott Bass** (166 South Main) had several concerns about placement of the recreation center in the Rose Park vicinity. He had lived in the area his entire life. His property had been impacted by City projects many times. It is now no longer the quiet place he and his family intended for his property. His family had tried to be good neighbors even with the negative impacts they had experienced. The construction of the City Pool so close to his home reduced his property value. He appreciated the City and its effort previously to mitigate the property value loss. He saw the community center as another negative impact to his property. He wondered why this neighborhood had to continually be the target of City projects. Mr. Bass reported that during Festival Days he had a truck and a boat parking on his front lawn. Parking would be a problem if the community center is located at the Main Park. There would also be a loss of several large trees, including three large pine trees planted by his grandfather.

**Paul Hess** (10 South Main) echoed several concerns presented by Mr. Bass. He said living next to government facilities was not too bad because they usually go home at night. However, users of the community center would be there especially at night. There would be safety issues and a devaluation of property. Also, the original plan presented with the bond election was not being followed.

**Rich Rigby** (44 South Main) recently purchased property in the area and believed that building the community center in the Main Park would detract from the reasons he made the purchase. He had concerns about traffic, noise and after hour uses. He felt the facility would encourage youth to linger after dark and perhaps cause problems.

**David Hale** commented that he felt the major problems that needed to be addressed were privacy, noise, and possible crime.

**Max Forbush** rejoined those sitting on the rostrum and informed the Council there were time constraints pertaining to decisions which needed to be considered. The plan is to combine all elements funded by the bond issuance in one bid proposal. It was the City's desire to get construction started in April. In order to proceed with a timely bid process is important to finalize the community center location and to make other pertinent decisions as soon as possible.

[Larry Haugen arrived at 8:05 P.M.]

A discussion of issues ensued, including the following points:

- ↯ Locating the community center at the Main Park would actually be less costly because of the availability of parking already in existence at the Park.
- ↯ The cost of the building itself would be the same, whether located at the Main Park or near the City Offices.
- ↯ Mitigation of impact on the neighbors is very important.
- ↯ If the center is constructed at the Main Park it would be close to already existing community recreational facilities.
- ↯ Mr. Johnson mentioned he would like to have more facts about parking and other issues. The impact on the neighbors will exist no matter where the building is located.
- ↯ The non-resident parking problem in front of homes on Main Street should be addressed.
- ↯ There may be interior properties associated with the recreation programs that could foster criminal activities if not carefully monitored.
- ↯ It may be well to have the Police Chief review the situation and give input regarding both locations.
- ↯ All residents need to be contacted and problems need to be mitigated no matter where the center is located.

**Mayor Connors** suggested a sub committee be organized to review all facts and bring back a recommendation to the full Council. He felt two members of the City Council, a member or two from the Planning Commission and staff could be assigned.

**Susan Holmes** stated that because she had been working with the project since its inception, she may be of help. She wanted to make sure that the citizens were treated fairly and offered to serve on the committee.

**David Hale** expressed similar feelings. Other names were considered for the committee including Viola Kinney, Leisure Services Director, Larry Jensen from the Planning Commission and Rick Anderson, a downtown resident.

**Mayor Connors** requested that Ms. Holmes act as chairman of the committee and stated the committee would be asked to review location, impact, and mitigation.

**PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE VACATING A PORTION OF 100 EAST ADJACENT TO JON STREADBECK PROPERTY BETWEEN 200 AND 300 NORTH (Agenda Item #6)**

**David Petersen** reviewed the agenda item. The Streadbecks were primarily requesting a street vacation to avoid demolishing an existing accessory building as they make plans to build their single-family home. The Streadbecks desired some assurance from the City that as they proceed forward with their building plans, they can fit their home in the building envelope for the lot or a future expanded lot.

**Mayor Connors** opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

**John Streadbeck** (258 North Main) stated his desire to preserve the existing accessory building and committed to building the home so that the front would be even with, or set behind, the house to the north.

With no further comments, **Mayor Connors** *CLOSED* the public hearing.

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* that the City Council adopt Ordinance No. 2002-47, an ordinance vacating a certain portion of the public right-of-way on the east side of 100 East Street located at 258 North 100 East within Farmington City State of Utah. **Bob Hasenyager** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF JOHN STEPHEN WHITE'S FLAG LOT PROPOSAL (Agenda Item #7)**

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the agenda item. Mr. White's met the criteria stated in ordinances covering flag lot approval. The family owns two homes on the property. One is an historic home, which the White's would like to preserve. The property will not allow traditional lot design because of unusual configuration and the existence of the historic home. The approval of the flag lot would not be for economic benefit. There are no privacy issues regarding this flag lot. There is no curb, gutter or sidewalk on the White frontage, and this should possibly be a condition of approval. As the property develops, a road will be located east of the proposed home on the flag lot and the home on this lot is being designed in such a way that access can be achieved off of the upper road, making it the primary access.

**Mayor Connors** inquired about the road to the east and wanted assurances that it was intended to be the primary access. If the Council were to consider the flag lot, it would likely be because it would be a temporary situation.

**Mr. Petersen** stated it had been considered by the Planning Commission to leave the stem of the flag lot as a possible emergency entrance for future development. There were 348

feet of curb and gutter that could be added by development of this property, although the White's would like the Council to consider requiring the construction of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk at a later date.

**Mayor Connors** opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING*.

**Hyrum Bates** (architect and representative of the White family) stated he was available for question if so desired by the Council.

With no further comments, **Mayor Connors** *CLOSED* the public hearing.

The Council discussed the issues including the following points:

- ▮ The house would be oriented so that access would be available to both the stem of the flag lot and the future eastern road.
- ▮ The family hoped to gate the stem when the eastern road was constructed.
- ▮ The Planning Commission required the property be plated.

**Susan Holmes** *MOVED* the City Council approve Mr. White's application for a flag lot on property located at approximately 1283 South 200 East, subject to conditions set forth in the Planning Commission letter dated December 6, 2002, noting that Curb, gutter and sidewalk shall be constructed along the full 348.7 feet of the frontage of the property abutting 200 East. **Larry Haugen** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **MINUTE MOTION APPROVING BUSINESS OF CONSENT (Agenda Item #8)**

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* to approve the ratification of Construction Bond Agreements previously signed by Mayor Connors. **Susan Holmes** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **ORDINANCE ENACTING CHAPTER 17 TO ZONING ORDINANCE [ORIGINAL TOWNSITE RESIDENTIAL ZONE (OTR) TEXT] AND AMENDING RELATED ORDINANCES (Agenda Item #9)**

**Mayor Connors** said City staff had not had time to make all changes requested for the Original Townsite Residential zoning ordinance (OTR). However, the moratorium imposed on the area expired on December 12 so it was important to adopt the OTR as a working document at the current meeting.

**Mr. Petersen** reported having talked to the City Attorney, specifically about suggestions made by Alysa Revell. The ideas were good but needed to be compared to State law and other considerations. The Attorney did not have time to respond but will for a later meeting.

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* that the City Council approve Ordinance No. 2002-48, an ordinance enacting Chapter 17 of the Farmington City zoning ordinance titled "Original Townsite Residential Zone (OTR)." and amending subsections 11-2-020(36) and (30) regarding the definition of dwellings, enacting section 11-3-045 regarding "Special Exceptions" and enacting Section 11-28-200 regarding "Secondary Dwelling Units" of the same. **David Hale** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, **Mr. Hasenyager** asked if the effected area were the only one to be considered for the OTR zone.

**Mr. Petersen** stated there will likely be 4 more areas which will be invited to go through the same process.

**Mr. Hasenyager** asked if the original group will review changes if Ms. Revell's comments were added. Director was given to seriously consider these when the ordinance goes through its next phase.

**Mr. Petersen** said any changes would include the public process and citizen input from within the zoning area. He also commented that each area is unique in their needs and opinions. Although, the original OTR could be used as a basis it was likely each group will see things from their own perspective and with their own needs in mind.

A vote on the motion was taken which indicated unanimous approval.

**ORDINANCE REZONING FOUR-BLOCK AREA OF DOWNTOWN FARMINGTON [100 NORTH TO 300 NORTH BETWEEN MAIN AND 200 EAST STREETS (BOTH SIDES OF STREET)]FROM LR TO OTR (Agenda Item #10)**

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* that the City Council adopt Ordinance No. 2002-49, an ordinance amending the Zoning Map to show a change of zone for property adjacent to and between Main Street and 200 East Street from the south side of 100 North Street to the north side of 300 North Street from zone R-2 and LR to Zone OTR. **Ed Johnson** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**Mayor Connors** stated that the action was an important step in preserving the historical nature of the old townsite. He commended the City Council, the Planning Commission, City Staff, and especially the citizens defined.

**RESOLUTION AMENDING FARMINGTON DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TO INCLUDE NEW STREET CROSS SECTION ALTERNATIVE (Agenda Item #11)**

Packet material indicated the agenda item was follow-up business from a previous Council meeting when staff presented a conceptual change to the development standards in areas where there was not sufficient elevation and change of terrain to adequately use standard curb and gutter approach to drainage.

**Mr. Petersen** stated the Planning Commission recommended the alternative and had suggested minor changes. The bottom of the swale needed to be constructed of appropriate material and responsibility for maintenance had to be clearly defined.

A brief discussion of wetland designation and construction material ensued.

**Susan Holmes** *MOVED* to adopt Resolution 2002-50, a resolution adopting amended development standards providing an exhibit illustrating an additional local street cross-section standard for Farmington City, subject to the following conditions:

- The bottom of the swale shall be of appropriate materials which are easy to mow or maintain and which conform to engineering requirements, if any, for proper drainage.
- If this cross-section is ever implemented maintenance responsibilities must be clearly identified.

**David Hale** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEM/REDRAFT OF SIGN ORDINANCE (Agenda Item #12)**

**Mr. Petersen** briefly reviewed sign ordinance requirements in the City. The ordinance does not allow signs by quasi-public uses.

**Mayor Connors** stated changing the ordinance should probably only be done after extensive review and in consideration of the implications to the general community. If the interested party

wishes to bring the proposal before the Council, it should be done according to established City procedures.

#### **APPOINTMENT/REAPPOINTMENT OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS/ OTHER CITY APPOINTMENTS (Agenda Item #13)**

**Mayor Connors** detailed the difficulty experienced in chosen the nominees for the Planning Commission. All applicants were highly qualified and capable. There were 12 total applicants, but only 9 were from the geographical areas in need of representation. Those 9 people were interviewed. They were all very talented and excellent applicants. The Mayor hoped those who had not been nominated for the Planning Commission would consider volunteering their services for other areas of City service, e.g., the proposed Conservation Commission. The Mayor stated that the entire nominating committee had given input into the selection. The nominations were Cindy Roybal and Jim Talbot.

**Susan Holmes** *MOVED* that the City Council appoint Cindy Roybal and Jim Talbot to the Planning Commission to serve terms from January 2003 through December 2006. **Larry**

**Haugen** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

By consensus, the City Council directed Mr. Forbush to publicly solicit an invitation to apply for the vacant Planning Commission seat due to Larry Jensen's resignation. The solicitation should be via the Farmington *Newsletter* specially inviting residents from the central part of the City.

**Mayor Connors** nominated Annette Tidwell to serve as a member of the Historic Preservation Commission Board to serve for three years (January 1, 2003, through December 31, 2005).

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* that the City Council appoint Annette Tidwell as indicated. **Ed Johnson** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL TO PURCHASE MARY MYERS' PROPERTY ADJACENT TO THE MAIN PARK (Agenda Item #14)**

**Mayor Connors** reported his recent meeting with the Planning Commission to discuss the proposed purchase of the Mary Myer's property. Case law (Toone vs. Weber County) suggested that before the City moves forward with purchase of real property, it needs a recommendation from the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission recommendation need not be a positive recommendation. However, Mayor Connors felt the City Council and the Planning Commission should be in alliance on as many projects as possible. He also felt that the Planning Commission's negative recommendation (made in the Planning Commission meeting of December 5, 2002) may have been in part because they were not well-informed. He asked that they reconvene when he could be present to answer questions and present all the facts. He had done so, and the Planning Commission reconsidered their original recommendation and now recommended the purchase of the Mary Myers property and the use of the rear of the property as park expansion land. Mayor Connors reported that he committed to the Planning Commission that even though it was not required, any proposal for use of the house would go through the public review process, including a public hearing and Planning Commission review. He anticipated that Ms. Myers would continue to live in the home at least through the summer.

**Susan Holmes** stated the purchase of the land fits the Master Plan for the downtown area.

**David Hale** said relocation of the community center would be impacted by the purchase.

**Mayor Connors** stated the purchase of the Myers property was unrelated to the location of the community center.

A discuss ensued, including the following points:

- ▮ Mr. Forbush stated the purchase of the Myers property would impact the location of the community center only because of budgetary reasons. Explaining further he said that if the center is located on the same block as the City Offices,

additional land for parking would have to be purchased and improved. Purchasing both the Mary Myers' property and purchasing and improving other property is a financial push for the City.

- ▮ The issue of the Myers property purchase and the location of the community center were unrelated, in that the decision of where to locate the center had not been made and would not be made in connection with the purchase.
- ▮ Discussing the purchase of real property in open public forum was uncomfortable for some Council members. There could be the possibility that a second bidder may raise the cost of the land and make it harder for the City to acquire it. Some Council Members pointed out the Myers family had made decisions in good faith with the understanding the City was seriously interested in the purchase to back out now would not be wise.

**Mr. Forbush** discussed a letter from the Myers family outlining their proposal for purchase of the property.

**Mayor Connors** stated the City was in need of the Myers' property and therefore should move ahead with the purchase regardless of the location of the recreation center. Mr. Forbush was instructed to find a way to purchase the other property should that be required.

**Susan Holmes** *MOVED* that the City Council authorize staff to have the City attorneys prepare a purchase agreement to purchase the Myers' property and to authorize the landscape architects to incorporate the back part of Myers' property to be used for location of a picnic bowery subject to acceptance of appraisal estimates by both parties, the Myers' approval of construction commencement early in the spring of 2003, and agreement by the Myers that they shall pay for title insurance. Other tenets of the Myers letter dated December 2, 2002, shall be deemed acceptable. **David Hale** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **AWARD OF BRASS COMB RESTORATION PROJECT TO HOME-TECH, INC.** **(Agenda Item #15)**

**Mr. Forbush** stated the budget allowed to renovate the Brass Comb Building was not sufficient for the entire project. The architect for the project had met with Home-Tech and studied how much of the project could be accomplished with the funds available. The building could be made salable if the contractors were to accomplish specific tasks. Mr. Forbush detailed those projects and recommended approval.

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* to authorize the City Manager to move forward with the project by securing an agreement to accommodate contract work by Home-Tech, Inc. **Susan Holmes** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

#### **MISCELLANEOUS**

**Flood Plain Issues in South Farmington**

Mr. Johnson raised an issue regarding residents of the City who had requested the City look into having their property removed from flood plain designation. A LOMR (letter of map revision) would be required. After discussion, the City Council felt that citizens wishing such action should proceed as private citizens, without the involvement of City resources. Mr. Forbush said he would discuss the matter with the petitioners.

**Davis Art and Humanities Council**

Ms. Holmes discussed issues involving a memo from the Davis Arts and Humanities Council. Farmington had not been included in the write up for the first grant referred to in the report enclosed in the packet. She felt that the action proposed by the Davis Arts and Humanities Council would be divisive to the County. She suggested a letter be drafted for consideration of the Council and signature of the Mayor to clarify Farmington's position regarding their opposition to the moratorium recommended of building any new art centers.

**Review of January Newsletter**

The Council briefly discussed the draft copy of the *January Newsletter*.

**Proposed joint meeting with Dan Lofgren**

The City Council by consensus suggested that the project proposed by Dan Lofgren could be reviewed according to established City procedures. However, if Mr. Lofgren would like to ask for a review by the Council's Development Committee, that would also be appropriate. Otherwise, it could be included on the Council's agenda in January as a discussion item.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Larry Haugen** *MOVED* that the meeting adjourn at 10:10 P.M. **David Hale** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

---

Margy Lomax, City Recorder  
Farmington City