

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 10, 2005

PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

Present: Vice-Chairman Cindy Roybal, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Annie Hedberg, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff,, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Chairman Cory Ritz was excused.

Vice-Chairman Roybal began discussion at 6:30 P.M. The following items were discussed:

- **Agenda Item #6, the Rice request for a recommendation to the City Council to vacate the southern end of Davis Creek Drive.** The applicant and the Planning Commission discussed options for development of the property. Todd Rice, the applicant, stated that due to the expense of road improvements he was requesting the City vacate the right-of-way. He did want to leave open the option of subdividing the property in the future. In trade for the vacation he would donate the trail near the dike. Commission members were concerned with maintenance of the 50 foot easement if it was vacated. They also discussed options for access and potential subdivision. The existing neighbors had issues regarding the access and maintenance of the property. Commission members discussed having the applicant laying asphalt on a 20-foot width of the right of way for an access and vacating the rest of the existing easement to adjacent property owners. The Fire Chief had reviewed the plans and had required a turn-around space for access by emergency vehicles.
- The architect for the Russon Brothers Mortuary being constructed in northern Farmington was present. He asked the Planning Commission members to consider allowing the use of fake Farmington rock on the facade of the mortuary. The expense of the real stone was almost twice the cost of the fake facade material. Some members felt that because the mortuary was at one of the gateways to the City, because the City itself had to comply with the real-rock mandate, and because the building would need to stand for many, many years, it would be best to have the real stone used. It was mentioned, however, that the Centerville City Hall had been constructed with fake rock. The appearance of that building was not displeasing .

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Vice-Chairman Cindy Roybal, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Annie Hedberg, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff,, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Chairman Cory Ritz was excused.

Vice-Chairman Roybal called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. **Jim Talbot** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the March 2, 2005. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING: DAN COOK REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR A 2 ACRE SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 2 LOTS AND 1 PARCEL LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1300 WEST 475 SOUTH IN AN AE ZONE (S-2-05) (Agenda Item #2)

Background Information

Mr. Cook was proposing to develop 2 lots on 2 acres within the “Special Improvement District” area on 475 South Street in west Farmington. It was possible for the applicant to accomplish his objective by doing a simple lot split whereby each lot would be 1 acre in size. However, Mr. Cook was proposing to create 2 half acre lots fronting 475 South with an unbuildable or open space parcel located to the rear of the lots. In order to accomplish this, his proposal must be considered as a conservation subdivision and a deed restriction could be placed on the property limiting development to only 2 dwelling units.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen introduced the agenda item. He stated that the applicant’s proposal for a conservation parcel would provide him with reduced taxes.

Public Hearing

Vice-Chairman Roybal opened the meeting to a public hearing. She invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Cook (applicant) wanted to keep the back parcel (the proposed conservation parcel on the north side of the property) as horse property. No other property had been set apart for open space in the area. Mr. Cook stated he wanted to sell lot A to raise money to pay the S.I.D. assessment. He wanted to build on lot B. He also wanted to keep the conservation parcel as a run-off detention basin. Because of road improvements a drainage system to the south of the property had been eliminated. That had caused water flow problems. With the conservation parcel acting as a detention basin, the water drainage problem could be resolved. Mr. Cook felt his motivation was not to maximize his profit from the property by reducing the tax rate. The

building lots on the south end of the property would each be ½ acre, which would be larger than some of the surrounding properties.

Mr. Poff raised the question about the drainage design in the area.

Mr. Petersen said he would investigate the S.I.D. plans to determine if drainage conditions were being observed.

Mr. Cook stated he had no problem with having a restrictive covenant limiting him from building anything on the open space parcel in the future.

Mr. Talbot questioned whether or not property to the west was affected by the drainage and if water would go from the detention basin to the adjacent properties.

Mr. Cook stated that because of the topography of the area, he would have to dig out the parcel so that it would detain drainage.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further discussion, **Vice-Chairman Roybal** closed the public hearing.

Motion

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council grant schematic plan approval for a subdivision on property located at approximately 1300 West 475 South subject to a deed restriction acceptable to the City restricting any residential development of the open space parcel in perpetuity. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

1. The applicant complied with City ordinance requirements and the General Plan for the area.
2. The lot size was similar to surrounding properties.
3. Open space will be provided in the subdivision.
4. The open space parcel would provide a retention basin which would help resolve drainage problems in the area.

PUBLIC HEARING: SYMPHONY HOMES REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE FARMINGTON CITY GENERAL LAND USE PLAN BY RE-DESIGNATING PROPERTY WEST OF THE 4218 CONTOUR LINE BUT EAST OF I-15 BETWEEN THE FRONTAGE ROAD AND 200 EAST AND NORTH OF LUND LANE FROM "DEVELOPMENT RESTRICTIONS VERY LOW DENSITY AND/OR AGRICULTURE OPEN SPACE" TO "LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL" (MP-1-05) (Agenda Item #3)

Mr. Petersen reported that the applicant had withdrawn the application.

LARRY ALSUP AND CINDY MORROW/CONSIDERATION OF A MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT AN ATTACHED GARAGE LOCATED AT 139 EAST 400 NORTH IN AN OTR ZONE (C-8-04) (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information

The Planning Commission considered this agenda item on February 23, 2005, and voted to table action for the reasons set forth in the draft minutes included with the packet for the March 10, 2004, Planning Commission meeting and also set forth in the letter dated to Larry Alsup from David Petersen dated February 25, 2005. Thus far, no new information has been submitted by the applicants. However, Larry Alsup and Cindy Morrow met with the Farmington Historic Preservation Commission on February 23, 2005. The results of this meeting from the Historic Preservation Commission are provided in a letter dated February 25, 2005.

As part of the remedy to resolve or mitigate negative impacts related to the demolition of the structure in the southwest corner of the property, the Planning Commission may consider requiring that the applicants grant a conservation easement to the Utah Heritage Foundation (or some other nonprofit group acceptable to the City) to preserve in perpetuity the two remaining structures on the property adjacent to 400 North Street. Such an easement will prevent the demolition of these structures in the future.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen showed the site plan as redesigned by the applicant. Regarding the building plans, the applicant had been working with the City's Building Inspector. The building plans should be approved by City Staff on or near March 15th. The City will need to have the plans for the porch extension. The recommendation from the Historic Commission was included in the packet. Other than the southwest corner, the rest of the site plan was likely ready for approval.

Mr. Montgomery asked the members of the Historical Preservation Commission who were present what their opinion was regarding having the demolished structure replaced.

John Anderson (member of the Historic Preservation Commission) reported that in discussion with the Preservation Commission, in general they felt the landscaping suggested by the applicant may be insufficient. The trees may be too small to give the desired mitigation. The Commission had discussed replacing the building with another historic building from another location. Mr. Anderson referred to the Committee's letter in the packet. With the Hinman house (the demolished structure) removed, the site plan, including the fence constructed by the applicant, did not comply with the ordinance for the zone. The Commission wanted to find a reasonable resolution. It would be nice to have another historic home in place of the demolished Hinman home. The Historical Preservation Commission was very concerned with the precedence that may be set if the applicant was allowed to destroy a home of historic nature without due reparation. Mr. Anderson stated that the Commission members were aware of situations where historic homes could be saved by moving them to other locations and suggested the applicant may provide reparation by moving such a home to their lot. There was a home in the mouth of the Weber Canyon that needed to be moved. A grant was available to help with the costs of the move.

Mr. Montgomery remarked that whenever applicants come before the Planning Commission for approvals of projects, there is a trust established where the City assumes the applicant will do what they said they would. In the current case, a wall had been constructed which was not compliant with ordinance, an old home of historic significance had been demolished without permit, and the location of the garage had been changed and was non-compliant with the ordinance. The large, expensive home had been built, and it would be unreasonable to have it torn down. The home would need to remain the way it was. The garage had been brought into compliance with the extension of the porch. The view of the large, newly constructed, non-historic home distracted from the historic nature of the area. That view would have been obstructed by the old home. Because of past history, Mr. Montgomery felt he was not convinced the Planning Commission had a level of trust that the applicant would fully mitigate the view with landscaping. The Historic Preservation Commission was working to preserve the historic nature of the original town site and enforce the requirements of the OTR zone. If the Planning Commission chose to ignore the Historic Commission's recommendation, they would be ignoring what the Preservation Commission had been asked to do. Mr. Montgomery felt the applicant should be required to build or replace another structure on the southwest corner of the property or establish an escrow to have a home built in the future. It may be necessary for the applicant to forgo other proposed amenities on the property in order to accomplish this.

Kevin Poff stated his preference that there be a structure on the location rather than landscaping.

Vice-Chairman Roybal invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Cindy Morrow (applicant) stated she thought the Planning Commission had given her direction to have a landscaping plan prepared and that it would be satisfactory. She had brought the plans to present to the Planning Commission. The landscaping as planned would screen more than the original home would have screened.

John Anderson stated the Historic Commission had reviewed the landscaping plans and still recommended the building replacement.

Keith Klundt stated that with the old home gone, it would be hard to replace the original look and feel one for one. In reality, the original home was an old, unsightly and unsafe building that did not qualify for registration as an historic building. Mr. Klundt was not concerned about precedence because he felt future developers would have to acknowledge an effort by the City to impose a penalty for non-compliance with the site plan.

Mr. Talbot had not been able to attend previous meetings wherein the issues had been discussed. He asked for clarification of the main concerns of the Planning Commission. Was it not the garage location that was of most concern and had not that issue been resolved? In discussion of the question, some Commission members remarked that they were equally concerned with all three non-compliant situations: the wall, the garage, and the demolition of the old home, not only because of the loss of the home but because it left the large, non-historic home exposed. Mr. Talbot stated it was his understanding that the City and the Historical Preservation Commission had been approached regarding the old home and asked if they wanted to have the home. The answer had been that the City entities were not interested.

Mr. Petersen stated that neither the City nor the Preservation Commission had funds or means of any kind to remove such a building. However, the Preservation Commission was very interested in preserving the building

Mr. Anderson referred to the Preservation Commission's letter in that the demolition of the Hinman house rendered the new house's setback radically out of compliance with the OTR zone. The recommendation of the Preservation Commission included three options. If option #2 was chosen and a new residential structure was built on the same location it should be done in a manner that would replicate the distinctive features of the original home including size, design, layout, and building materials. The other two options involved moving the primary residence to comply with the zoning setbacks (an unreasonable solution at this point) or moving a similarly sized threatened historic structure to the location of the original Hinman house. Mr. Anderson stated that the Historic Preservation Commission wanted to be reasonable and help provide feasible resolutions to the problem.

Mr. Klundt remarked that any building required for the southwest corner of the property needed to be of value both to the City and to the property owners.

Mr. Poff did not want the Planning Commission to take actions that would send the message to future developers that it would be acceptable to the City to break the rules, such as demolishing structures without permit, and nothing would be done.

Rick Anderson (member of the Historic Preservation Commission) stated the strongly worded letter in the packet may not reflect the feelings of the entire Commission. The Commission wanted to find a reasonable solution to the problem. Because the original site plan included the old home, the original site plan was in compliance with the OTR. With the home gone, the site plan was out of compliance. The easiest way to rectify the situation was to replace the Hinman home with an acceptable structure. The structure could be a functional building of any nature that complied with City ordinances.

Motion

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission table consideration of the agenda item for two weeks (until the Planning Commission meeting planned for March 24, 2005) to allow the applicant time to investigate alternatives regarding mitigation of the demolished Hinman home. Those alternatives may include, but are not limited to, 1) the cost and possibility of moving a similarly sized threatened historic structure to the location of the original Hinman house, including a specific structure available for relocation mentioned previously in the meeting, 2) the cost and possibility of constructing a structure at the same location similar in size and appearance to the old structure which existed previously. The new structure must comply with City ordinances regarding construction and use, and 3) the potential of establishing a bond or escrow account with the City for the future construction of an acceptable structure on the old house site. The applicant would, in the mean time, be permitted to continue construction of their new home on the site. If the applicant does not comply with the conditions as set forth in the motion, the conditional use permit may be revoked or a stop work order may be issued. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by a 5 to 0 vote. Mr. Talbot abstained.

Findings

- The motion presented a reasonable solution to the problem created by the applicant.
- The motion was sensitive to the Historic Preservation Commission recommendation regarding the preservation of the historic nature of the original townsite and the OTR.

- The motion gave the applicant time to find a resolution to the situation in a way that does not cause a severe impact to the applicant.
- The motion did not include landscaping as an option for the mitigation of the demolished Hinman house.
- The Planning Commission found that the applicant could grant a conservation easement to the Utah Heritage Foundation (or some other nonprofit group acceptable to the City) to preserve in perpetuity the two remaining structures on the property adjacent to 400 North Street. Such an easement would prevent the demolition of these structures in the future.

PUBLIC HEARING: FARMINGTON CITY REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND SECTIONS 11-11-060(C), 11-11-060 AND 11-11-070, 11-13-050 AND 11-13-060, 11-28-070, 11-32-106(1)(A), 11-32-106(2)(A), AND 11-30-105(1) REGARDING ACCESSORY BUILDINGS, DRIVEWAY WIDTHS AND LOCATIONS, AND DRAINAGE AND EROSION CONTROL PLANS (ZT-1-05)(Agenda Item #5)

Background Information

Over the past 4 or 5 years, inadequacies in the zoning ordinances have been noted by City staff. It is now proposed that the City amend the zoning ordinances as set forth in the enclosed draft. (Some of the suggested changes are “housekeeping” items.)

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen listed and discussed the changes proposed. Most were housing keeping items.

Public Hearing

Vice-Chairman Roybal opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Christina Davenport (173 South 1525 West) stated she opposed the amendment to the ordinances regarding the construction of driveways against property lines. She lived next door to the Nemelka family, who were currently building a home and who were constructing a driveway along the boundary line between their two properties. Ms. Davenport felt that City staff had shown favoritism towards the Nemelka’s in changing the ordinance to allow them to build the driveway along the boundary line. She felt there should be the 6-foot setback in order to protect her property from drainage that would be caused by the construction of the driveway. She also

stated the driveway was in reality a road and that the property owner was planning to use it as an access to future development on the back of his property. It was her feeling that another access from the east could accommodate such development. She asked that City staff accommodate the needs of all citizens and not just a few.

Jeff Nemelka stated he was building the homes referred to by Ms. Davenport. In designing the home the garage was designed to have a side entrance, requiring the driveway along the boundary line. It was true that he was thinking of possible development on the back portion of his property for a family member should the need arise in the future. The driveway was about 150 feet. He had brought in a great deal of fill to construct the road. However, drainage would not be a problem for the neighbors because he had graded the road such that drainage would be kept on site.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Vice-Chairman Roybal** closed the public hearing.

Mr. Montgomery commented that it had been noted there were many homes in the City that had similar situations with boundary line driveways and RV parking pads.

Mr. Petersen stated there had been no favoritism shown any one property owner. The construction of the Nemelka driveway was a timing issue. The ordinance had been under review for years. The ordinance impacted the entire City, and the amendment was a change needed to resolve situation in many areas. The Nemelkas had designed their driveway so that the grade would take all drainage towards his property. The proposed amendment would allow the Planning Department discretion on a case by case basis

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission recommend the draft ordinance changes as requested. **John Montgomery** seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The ordinance amendments would clean up issues that have been under review for several years.
- The amendments would provide that many nonconforming situations would now comply with City standards.

- The amendments were mostly housing-keeping in nature.

PUBLIC HEARING: HERALD AND BARBARA RICE REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO VACATE THE SOUTHERN END OF DAVIS CREEK DRIVE (50 EAST)(STR-4-03) (Agenda Item #6)

Background Information

On August 26, 2004, Herald and Barbara Rice received a recommendation from the Planning Commission for schematic plan approval for a lot split of the property located at the south end of Davis Creek Drive. Now the applicants no longer desire to subdivide their property, but want to maintain the ability to create one building lot. The subdivision ordinance does not allow the creation of building lots with frontage only on a street end unless a cul-de-sac or some other acceptable turn-around is constructed and dedicated by the property owner or some other entity. Therefore, the Rice's desire to create a flag lot with a minimum stem width of 30 feet with the remaining 20 feet of the proposed abandoned right-of-way vacated in 10 foot widths to the adjacent property owners.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the proposal of the applicant. He stated that the applicant wished to retain the possibility of subdividing the property in the future. The Fire Chief had reviewed the plans and required a turn around space large enough for access by emergency vehicles.

Public Hearing

Vice-Chairman Roybal opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Todd Rice said there was a prohibitive cost involved with improving the entire width of the current dedicated right-of-way. He wanted to be sensitive to the wishes of his neighbors to maintain a well-landscaped entrance to his property and to uphold the restrictions of their PUD. He would also like to save as much cost as possible while meeting the conditions of the Fire Chief and retaining the possibility of subdividing his property in the future.

Jim Barnett (938 Creekside Court) stated he was in support of the applicant to abandon portions of the current right-of-way to adjoining property owners and to pave a narrow lane as access to his property.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Vice-Chairman Roybal** closed the public hearing.

Mr. Petersen reviewed City ordinances affecting the proposed access improvements.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council vacate a portion of the 50 East street right-of-way 32 feet in width to the applicant from the cul-de-sac south to the beginning of the Rice property and that the applicant improve a 20 foot wide lane for access within said portion of the vacated right-of-way. The remaining portion of the 50 East right-of-way shall be vacated to the adjoining property owners. The motion is subject to all applicable State Laws and Farmington City ordinances and development standards and the following conditions:

1. Easements shall be reserved for any existing utilities that are located in the vacated portion of the street.
2. The applicant shall provide a survey and legal description of the vacated right-of-way for the ordinance authorizing the same.
3. Any building or development of the property shall meet the standards and requirements of the fire code including, but not limited to, drive widths, turn-around areas, pavement widths, fire hydrant placement, possible sprinkling of buildings, and ability to enter Public Safety access easements.
4. The development of the property shall comply with the results, recommendations, and requirements of the Reeve and Associates, Inc., study.
5. An acceptable trail easement and/or land and fee title shall be conveyed to the City traversing north to south along the south and west boundaries of the Rice property inside the east side of the dike (20 feet in width). All trail locations shall be staked and inspected by the City and representatives from the Trail Committee before the alignment is accepted by the same and prior to recordation of the street vacation ordinance. The trail easement and/or land and fee title shall be conveyed or dedicated to the city concurrently with the recordation of the street vacation ordinance.

6. A turn-around or private drive area, providing access to the property shall impact as few trees and native vegetation as possible.
7. The Rice family must obtain a Flood Control Permit from Davis County prior to the City issuing any building permit for the property.
8. The applicant shall grant to Davis County a 20 foot wide right-of-way in a form acceptable to the County from 50 East to the floodway.
9. The applicant shall further grant to Davis County a 40 foot wide flood control easement acceptable to the County adjacent to the dike along the south and west boundaries of the Rice property.
10. Portions of the right-of-way vacated to adjoining property owners shall be maintained in a manner similar to other properties in the area.

Annie Hedberg seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The motion complied with City ordinances and the General Plan for the area.
- The motion accommodates the needs of the property owner and the wishes of the adjacent property owners in the PUD.
- The motion resolved issues with the stub dead end street at the southern end of Davis Creek Drive.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS

Bob Steed building project proposal for the old Brass Comb building on Main Street

Mr. Petersen stated that in a previous action, the Planning Commission had delegated review and approval of design modifications to the City Planner. In review of the designs, it was noted that the building was subject to deed restrictions on the property. The City Council must approve most exterior design modifications after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Steed will need to go before the Historic Preservation Commission also.

Bob Steed (applicant) stated that he had discussed the designs with Alys Revell of the Historic Preservation Commission. It was Ms. Revell's goal to have as many homes in

Farmington as possible qualify for the Utah Historic Register. Mr. Steed had contacted an expert and had him review the plans. The process would be that the construction would have to be finished and then application for registration made. There is no consideration for pre-approval prior to construction completion. There were several problems with having his building qualify for registration. First, the original building he purchased had been added upon, which very likely would disqualify the building. Second, if the building were to be considered for registration, the addition would have to be a separate construction with something like a 3-foot walkway between the buildings. The walkway would cause structural problems with drainage from the roofs. When Mr. Steed purchased the building, he informed the City that he intended to add to the structure. The construction would be done in a quality way. He intended that the construction would meet all City code and that it would help make down town Farmington a better place.

Mr. Petersen cautioned that too many modifications to any building may not necessarily be the best for the project. Those working with historic preservation call it “gilding the lily.”

Ms. Roybal stated that if the building would not have qualified for the historic registrater as it stood, then there was no real reason to stop work on the current design if it meets all other requirements.

Motion

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the design of the Steed project as presented. **Kevin Poff** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- The design preserves the historic nature of the down town area.
- The intention of the developer is to enhance the down town area.
- It was doubtful that the building would qualify for the historic register even before the additions proposed by Mr. Steed.
- It did not appear that the City’s intentions were to have the building on the historic registration, otherwise a deed restriction to that end would have been imposed.

David Frampton’s proposal for a lot split on the Steed Creek Estates Subdivision

Mr. Petersen described the request by Mr. Frampton for a new lot on the Steed Creek Estates Subdivision. Mr. Petersen stated that there had been several sections of the Anderson

property deeded to adjoining property owners without City approval. The parcel changes had been recorded with the County. Mr. Petersen showed the original boundary lines of the subdivision and the proposed property line adjustments which would allow Mr. Frampton a new lot and resolve the property line discrepancies.

Mr. Frampton stated he had grown up in the cul-de-sac and that both his parents and his parents-in-law lived on the circle. He wished to build a home there which would allow him to stay in the neighborhood and help care for the parents. Mr. Frampton stated he had a petition of approval for the project signed by all of the neighbors. The lot would be a half acre in size.

Motion

Kevin Poff moved that the Planning Commission recommend the subdivision amendment and the property line adjustments to the City Council. **Keith Klundt** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

City Council report

Mr. Petersen reported the City Council meeting held March 2, 2005.

David Derrick had built structures across an access road easement. Land remaining would accommodate only a trail. Vehicular access to the area could be provided from a lower cul-de-sac. Staff recommended approval of a resolution to allow Mr. Derrick to relocate his fence and to make trail improvements on the portion of the easement unaffected by the structures. The City Council approved the recommendations of staff.

The City Council accepted a petition for study regarding the annexation of 5 acres of land in the Oakridge neighborhood north of the Oakridge Farms Subdivision and west of 1500 West Street.

The City Council discussed the recent rendition of the new City logo.

ADJOURNMENT

Kevin Poff moved the Planning Commission adjourn at 9:45 P.M.

*Cindy Roybal, Vice-Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission*