

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 13, 2003

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Kent Forsgren, Bart Hill, Cindy Roybal, Jim Talbot, Jordan White, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Commissioners Cory Ritz and Sid Young were excused.

Chairman Forsgren called the meeting to order at 7:10 P.M. **David Petersen** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Bart Hill *MOVED* that the minutes of the February 27, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting be approved. **Jordan White** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

PUBLIC HEARING: GLENDA AND RANDY RIGBY REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR SCHEMATIC PLAN APPROVAL FOR THE MILLER MEADOWS SUBDIVISION (Agenda Item #2)

Background Information

The applicant is proposing an excellent example of a conservation subdivision containing four large conservancy lots. Enclosed in the Planning Commission packet is a copy of Chapter 12 of the Zoning Ordinance. This chapter and how it relates to the proposed Miller Meadows Subdivision will be presented at the Planning Commission meeting. This will hopefully serve as a good refresher course for new and old members of the commission.

The wetlands illustrated on the schematic plan have not been officially delineated, but it is very likely that the wetlands are indeed located as shown on the plan. The developer is only proposing to cross the wetlands in one spot and will likely do so with box culvert thus not impacting the wetland area. If no wetland areas are impacted, the developer may not have to obtain a 404 Permit from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The Legacy Highway is proposed east of the site. UDOT is planning for a long, linear trail running adjacent to the Legacy Highway corridor.

As part of the last bond election held by the Davis County School District, 50 acres adjacent to the south boundary of the subdivision has been purchased as the site for the future Farmington High School. A pedestrian connection between one of the lots on the south boundary of the subdivision to the new school site may reduce the temptation for future high school

students residing in the development to drive their cars or their parents' cars to school.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen briefly explained the principles of Farmington's conservation ordinance. The theory is to save some open space before all land is used for development. The question is what will be done with the open space once it is designated as such. One option is to declare a portion or portions of the development as conservancy lots wherein large parcels are set aside for non-development in perpetuity. One residence can be constructed on such a conservancy lot but no future development can take place.

The Rigby property located at 600 South 650 West is in an AE zone adjacent to the Legacy Highway corridor. The schematic plan calls for 82 lots with 30 percent of the parcel as open space. Because of the bonus earned by ordinance, the developer could have 91 lots, but the Rigbys want to maintain the rural feel of the area. The Rigbys have proposed 4 conservancy lots. Possible wetlands have not yet been reviewed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Petersen suggested two connection paths from the subdivision, one leading to the Legacy Highway trail and the other to the high school property.

Public Hearing

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Keith Russell (representative of the developer and Ensign Engineering) said the potential wetlands had been delineated and the Army Corps of Engineers was in the process of deciding whether or not to designate the wetlands as such. The developer was designing the subdivision around the possible wetlands so that they could move forward without waiting for the Corps. The schematic plan does not use all the lots allowed by ordinance. The Rigbys want to keep the open feel. Every lot in the design is over 10,000 square feet, and most are over 12,000. Phase I will be the area adjacent to the high school property. Phase II will be dictated by the 1000 foot dead end street limitation. The area impacted by the possible wetlands will be developed later.

Paul Chase (1163 North Alice Lane) said he was a member of the Farmington Trails Committee. He complimented the developer for their conservation design. He liked the suggested access to the Legacy Trail and to the high school property but asked if the trail would be a right-of-way strip or fee dedicated property. He also asked about fencing and liability issues.

Mr. Petersen responded that the paths would likely be owned, constructed, and maintained by the City.

Mr. Chase felt it would be better to have the City own the strip so that land owners would not be held liable for any problems.

Debbie Wilcock (726 South 650 West) said she owned the property adjacent and to the south and west of the parcel under consideration. She reported that the tributary run off coming from the north through the entire area culminated on her property before it drained under the railroad track through a 10 inch pipe. She had great concerns about the increase of impervious ground that would be created by the subdivision and said it could cause greater flooding on her property if drainage were not properly addressed. Ms. Wilcock felt the 10 inch pipe was inadequate for the runoff.

Chairman Forsgren stated that preliminary plat would require a drainage and grading plan for the new subdivision.

Mr. Petersen concurred and said that the City had a fairly detailed drainage plan for the area under consideration. He invited Ms. Wilcock to the City Offices to review the planned drainage system.

When asked, **Mr. Russell** stated there were no plans for equestrian trails through the proposed subdivision at this point. The large lots could be used as horse property.

Mr. Petersen said that the west side of 650 West has been designated as an equestrian trail.

In response to a question, **Mr. Russell** stated the conservancy lots will likely be left in their natural state. The path to the school could be given to the School District. The path to Legacy Highway could be dedicated to the City.

Mr. Petersen said a conservation easement will be placed over the conservancy lots. He reviewed conservation easement restrictions and stated the Planning Commission can review conditions of the easement agreement.

Don Frances (578 South 650 West) complimented the Rigbys on the plan for the subdivision. He felt it was good to have large conservancy lots and to keep the area as a rural atmosphere. He asked about the size of the other lots.

Mr. Petersen stated the conservation ordinance allowed the smaller lot sizes as designed by the Rigbys because of the dedicated open space.

Mr. Frances felt all the lots should be larger and that the open, rural feel of west Farmington should be protected to keep the horse property and the character of the area in tact. A lot of people came to west Farmington because of the rural feeling.

Mr. Petersen reported that when Susan Holmes was a member of the Planning Commission she conducted an unofficial, yet revealing survey of property owners in the west area. Not quite 30 percent of the property owners owned horses or large animals. Many people

had moved there because of the ambiance, not just to own large animals.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing and requested consideration by the Planning Commission.

In discussion of the issues, **Mr. Talbot** commented that most people in the west area had moved there because of the open space and that horse owners usually need more than half an acre for their horses. The conservancy lots seem to provide the open space wanted by the residents.

Motion:

Jordan White moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the schematic plan of the Miller Meadows Subdivision consisting of 82 lots on 49.2 acres located at approximately 600 South 650 West in an AE zone subject to all applicable Farmington City development standards and ordinances and following conditions:

1. The applicant shall prepare an acceptable wetland delineation plan. Said plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Army Corps along with any appropriate permits from the Corps for the project.
2. Developer shall provide pedestrian access to the Legacy Highway Trail. This trail is proposed to run adjacent to the west side of the Legacy Highway located east of the project.
3. A pedestrian way shall be provided to link the subdivision to the high school campus area located south of the proposed development.
4. The trails provided for the connection to the Legacy Highway and to the high school campus shall be fee title dedicated to the City and shall be located in the best location as approved by the City Engineer, possibly between lots 39 and 38 and between 23 and 24.

Cindy Roybal seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Reasons

1. The developers had presented a well thought out conservation plan, including four conservancy lots giving the development an open space feeling.
2. Feelings of residents in west Farmington had been considered.

3. The schematic design followed ordinance requirements.

PUBLIC HEARING: DAVID WEBSTER REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO DEVELOP A FLAG LOT LOCATED AT 717 SOUTH 200 WEST (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information:

Mr. Webster made a similar request for a flag lot to the Planning Commission on April 9, 1998. On April 23, 1998, the Planning Commission approved a motion recommending that the City Council approve the flag lot. However, the City Council reviewed Mr. Webster's proposal on May 6, 1998, and denied his application for a flag lot.

Recently the applicant met with Council Members Bob Hasenyager and Susan Holmes to discuss his flag lot proposal. They suggested that he submit another application similar to the previous proposal. However, they made no promises or commitments that the Planning Commission or the City Council will approve the flag lot.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the background information for the Planning Commission. He mentioned the request had been considered by the Planning Commission and the City Council about 5 years earlier. At that time, the Planning Commission recommended approval but the City Council had denied the request. A water line had been brought to the property from 650 South with participation by Mr. Webster. Recently, Mr. Webster approached two City Council members and discussed the possibility of a flag lot. The Council members suggested submitting the request again. It was noted that the two City Council members made no promises nor commitments to Mr. Webster regarding the application.

Public Hearing

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited Mr. Webster as the applicant to address the Commission.

Mr. Webster (717 South 200 West) stated that at the time of the first request he had felt confident that it would be approved and therefore spent several thousand dollars preparing the property for subdivision. He disconnected his water system from his well and brought Farmington water to his property. He had no FAPID water connections and had to water his property with culinary water at great expense. Recently, he had to invest in reopening his well to water his property because of the expense. If he had had an indication that his original request was going to be denied he would not have made the investments. He stated that if the current request was approved he would agree not to subdivide the property any further. Mr. Webster had an interested buyer for the back half of the property who would likely use it for storage and for horse property. Another possibility would be for him to sell the front (western half) of the property with the house and build another home on the back property for his family. Mr. Webster

said there had been several other flag lots approved since his rejection 5 years ago. He also said that he was considering having his name placed on a list for heart transplant and felt he needed to make some economic decisions prior to that event. Mr. Webster said that of the 8 large lots on the frontage road only two of them could request flag lot consideration because of set back restrictions. He felt he would not be setting a precedence. Regarding traffic impact, his flag lot would not significantly increase trip count. The frontage road is already very busy.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing and turned the meeting over to the Planning Commission members. The members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- ⌞ At the time of the first request, possible developers for the property to the east of Mr. Webster had been asked to consider a possible schematic plan that would allow access to the east side of the property. The developer (Symphony Homes) was hesitant to do so because they did not as yet own the property.
- ⌞ If the stub road coming from the north went straight south it would make the lots on the west of the road too small to comply with ordinance. The road could be swerved or perhaps a knuckle could be designed to allow access to the Webster property. Several scenarios were possible.
- ⌞ All three property owners (the Websters and the adjacent property owners) would have to cooperate in the event that access were to be designed from the east.
- ⌞ The property owner to the south of the Websters had indicated an interest in developing commercial property. However, the area is not zoned for commercial development.
- ⌞ The property does not apparently meet criteria for a flag lot. Some Commission members were hesitant to recommend the application when the City Council had habitually denied flag lots unless there were exceptional reasons to approve them.
- ⌞ Five years ago the City Council had commented that they were concerned about setting precedence.
- ⌞ Mr. Webster asked why there had been so many flag lots approved in the City since his rejection 5 years earlier. He reiterated that not many of the lots on the frontage would be able to apply for flag lot status.

- ▯ There may be other options for development of the property rather than a flag lot.
- ▯ Several Commission members stated they would like to find a way for Mr. Webster to achieve his goal while still observing ordinance standards.

Motion

Jordan White moved that the Planning Commission table the request by Mr. Webster to develop a flag lot located at 717 South 200 West in an AE zone (S-3-03) to allow time for Staff to gather information regarding other flag lot approvals and to research schematic possibilities for the property to the east and to propose alternative development designs for the Webster lot.

Cindy Roybal seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, **Mr. Talbot** commented that he would rather have the request tabled to allow time for research and further preparation rather than recommend approval and have the City Council deny the request because the application does not immediately comply with criteria.

Chairman Forsgren felt that there were possibly other alternatives that would give Mr. Webster a better chance of approval.

Bart Hill stated that he did not want the same thing happen that happened with the last request. He hoped there would be a way to make the request succeed.

Jordan White felt that it would be very difficult to recommend the current request based on criteria set by ordinance.

A vote was taken indicating unanimous approval of the motion.

Reasons for the Motion

1. The motion would allow time to gather sufficient information regarding the request.
2. The request currently does not meet ordinance criteria.
3. The Planning Commission wanted to explore other options.

PUBLIC HEARING: HAMLET HOMES REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO ESTABLISH A TEMPORARY SALES OFFICE IN A MODEL HOME LOCATED AT 1612 WEST CLARK LANE (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information:

The Farmington Ranches Phase III Subdivision contains 123 lots. The applicant currently owns or is building homes on 40 of these lots. Section 11-28-102(h)(1)(iii) states in part:

“A temporary office for the sale and lease of property in a major subdivision or a planned unit development (PUD) may be used until the last lot or unit in the development is sold.”

Notwithstanding this provision, it seems reasonable to set the termination date based upon the sale of the last lot owned by the applicant. It appears that this provision did not envision large subdivisions where more than one builder or company has purchased large groups of lots for resale.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen reviewed background information and stated that Hamlet Homes has removed the sales trailer in anticipation of opening the model home. The model home has been completed and is ready for final inspection and an occupancy permit.

Public Hearing

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a public hearing. He invited Jacob Jensen, the applicant, to address the Planning Commission.

Jacob Jensen (Hamlet Homes) stated the trailer had been removed, the model home was complete, and final inspection of the model home was pending Planning Commission approval.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing.

Motion

After a brief discussion, **Jim Talbot** moved that the Planning Commission approve Hamlet Homes conditional use and site plan approval to establish a temporary office in a model home located at 1612 West Clark Lane subject to compliance with all applicable ordinances, requirements, and development standards and the following conditions:

1. Permanent signs are prohibited. The size and location of signs shall be in compliance with applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance for the zone in which the use will be conducted. All signs shall be removed when the activity ends.
2. No loudspeakers or other amplifying sound devices shall be used in conjunction with the temporary use.

3. Outdoor lighting if used shall be subdued. All lighting shall be designed, located and directed so as to eliminate glare and minimize reflection of light into neighboring properties. Search lights shall not be permitted.
4. The conduct of temporary uses in residential zones shall be limited to the hours between 8:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M.
5. The temporary office in the model home may exist up to and until the last lot of Lots 301-311, 350-365, and 396-398 of the Farmington Ranches Phase III Subdivision are sold.
6. If the office is located in the area of the home intended for a garage, any alternations made to accommodate the office shall be removed and the space shall be converted to function as a garage upon termination of the temporary office.
7. The temporary sales trailer now located on Lot 392 shall be removed from Farmington City within 15 days of the issuance of occupancy for the sales office for the model. Lot 392 shall be immediately restored to its pre-existing condition.

Jordan White seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Reasons

1. The application met with all previous conditions set forth by the Planning Commission.
2. The developer had removed the sales trailer as requested and in a timely manner as previously agreed.
3. The developer had complied with City ordinances.

PUBLIC HEARING: HHI CORPORATION REQUEST FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO AMEND THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW “SMALL AUTO DEALERSHIPS” AS A CONDITIONAL USE IN A BR ZONE (Agenda Item #5)

Background Information:

The intent of the BR zone is to provide an area in the City for a mix of professional and government offices limited commercial uses and residential land use. The City’s General Plan states:

“The City should work with Davis County, the School District and other property owners

to develop a downtown master plan. The plan should include public open space and should promote Farmington's historic heritage through establishing architectural standards and a consistent landscaping theme.”

A Downtown Master Plan was adopted by the City as an element of the General Plan in 1996. The Downtown Master Plan identifies 12 design principles. The Planning Commission should consider whether or not a small auto dealership is consistent with these principles. A retail analysis outlined in the Downtown Master Plan shows the following possible retail establishments that could be supported in downtown Farmington. These establishments were analyzed as being the best possibilities to bring Farmington residents into downtown without greatly increasing traffic.

- ¬ Lunch time eating places including bakery, delicatessen, health food, candy and nuts, ice cream parlor, yogurt shop or sandwich shop.
- ¬ Dinner restaurants.
- ¬ Barber/beauty shops
- ¬ Video rental store.
- ¬ Dry cleaners
- ¬ Stationery store
- ¬ Flower shop
- ¬ Insurance office
- ¬ Real estate
- ¬ Optometrist
- ¬ Medical and dental
- ¬ Legal
- ¬ Accountant

Other ideas for local business generated through interviews with local business and government planning officials include: bed and breakfast, copy store, museum, western wear, bakery and a theater. The downtown Master Plan contains a market analysis. Recommendations in this analysis reflect the need for more eating places anticipated personal services and smaller

scale professional office growth in the downtown area and concern for traffic conditions and the preservation of downtown historic Farmington.

These recommendations do not discuss the use proposed by H.H.I. Corporation. Written text regarding auto sales and other auto related uses are not discussed in the plan. However, the Downtown Master Plan does contain alternative vision plans for the core area. In some of these plans the Farmington Towing and windshield repair sites are replaced by a new restaurant and retail uses.

A detailed review of other City ordinances, including Bountiful, Layton, Draper, Murray, and Orem was conducted regarding auto sale uses. None of these cities identified "small auto sales" as a possible use.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mr. Petersen showed an overhead map indicating the locations of HHI properties in the downtown area. He reviewed the background information and stated the General Plan does not give specific guidance regarding auto sales endeavors. Neither does the Downtown Master Plan include any specific statements about auto sales. The Downtown Master Plan does, however, discuss elevations and suggested uses for the downtown area. Mr. Petersen reviewed suggested conditions if the Planning Commission decided to approve the request. When asked about notification for the public hearing, Mr. Petersen stated that zone text changes do not require public notification. However, if the Planning Commission directed the City Planner to notify surrounding property owners, he would do so.

Public Hearing

Chairman Forsgren opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Don Hokanson (422 North 1200 East, owner of HHI) stated his objective was to be able to legally sell a few vehicles. He indicated there would be both cars and pick up trucks for sale. He said traffic patterns in the area would not be negatively impacted. The cars would be kept in the rear of the property. Licensing for the auto sales business would require that there be a business office. He wanted to meet the requirements of the City for the office and for a business sign. He said he did enough fleet business that approval of his request would assist him in his regular business. The quantity of the sales would not change. Mr. Hokanson stated that when he first purchased the property it was zoned as commercial but since had been rezoned as BR. He said the BR zone was not good for his business and felt the zone designation should be revisited.

Paul Chase (1163 North Alice Lane) asked where access to the rear of his property would be located. He also asked questions regarding the BR zone. He stated as a citizen he was concerned about the applicant being considered without the input of nearby neighbors. He thought they should be informed if there was to be an entirely different use approved. The Trail Committee was working on establishing a downtown scenic trail way. The auto sales did not fit

with such a trail.

Mr. Petersen stated that the BR zone allows businesses and residential uses to exist together in the downtown area.

Mr. Hokanson reported that access to his rear property was through the rear property of the bank. He discussed the RDA and felt it was hampering decisions for his property since he did not know what the RDA would be doing with the property. He felt he could not sell his property because of the RDA and that he did not know when he could because there was no fixed time table for redevelopment. He felt it would be a nice idea to bring in small shops in the downtown area and to have a grocery store there, but he did not know how realistic such plans were. He felt there had been numerous studies of the area and that the RDA plans needed to be looked at again.

Mr. Petersen stated he thought it would help the Planning Commission to know how the neighbors felt if there were notification of a public hearing. He took the opportunity to explain the basics of the RDA program. The Farmington RDA does not go into neighborhoods, tear down all the buildings, and reconstruct planned developments. The RDA is a program wherein tax increments from increased values is reinvested in the project area through infrastructure and other betterments. Improvements on property are market driven. Mr. Hokanson can do anything he would like to do with his property and make any improvements he wishes to make at any time as long as City ordinances are observed.

Public Hearing Closed

Chairman Forsgren, seeing no forthcoming comments, closed the public hearing and requested consideration by the Planning Commission. Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- ▭ Approval of the request would likely not impact what was already being done. It would make a difference in the Hokanson business tax structure and allow him to sign the sales activities.
- ▭ Placement of the sign would have to be discussed. All City sign ordinance requirements would have to be followed.
- ▭ Precedence would likely be set and allow other auto sales businesses to be established along Main Street and nearby areas.
- ▭ It would be a good idea to gain input from neighbors.
- ▭ The downtown area is very sensitive and the historic nature needs to be protected.

Motion

Bart Hill moved that the Planning Commission table the applicant's request for a recommendation to the City Council to amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow "small auto dealerships" as a conditional use in the BR zone to allow time for neighbors within 300 feet to be notified of a future public hearing. Cindy Roybal seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, **Jim Talbot** recommended the motion be amended to include property owners within 500 feet of the property under consideration and that a letter of explanation accompany the notification. Mr. Hill and Ms. Roybal concurred.

Further discussion ensued, including the following points:

- ▮ The zone text change would amount to changing a zone for the benefit of one individual. Commission members were hesitant to do so and asked if there were other options.
- ▮ Mr. Petersen stated it may be possible to have the applicant request a special exception or a temporary use permit. The temporary use permit would have to be time specific and would have to be resubmitted periodically.

A vote was taken. The motion passed 4 to 1. Mr. White opposed the motion because he wanted to have the other options researched before considering the text change.

Mr. Petersen stated he could work with the City Attorney to determine if a special exception or a temporary use was viable. He could present the options to Mr. Hokanson to see if either of these options were acceptable to him.

Motion

Jordan White moved that the Planning Commission direct the City Planner to research options of either a temporary use or a special exception and that he review options with the City Attorney and discuss them with the applicant. He was directed to then return to the Planning Commission in two weeks with a report. The Planning Commission at that time would review the options. If neither the temporary use nor the special exception or other alternatives were viable, the City Planner would be asked to move forward with notification of a future public hearing to consider the zone text change. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, Commission members wanted to clarify that the City Planner would review temporary use permit or special exception options with the City Attorney to make sure they were viable and that the information would be reviewed with the applicant and brought back to the Planning Commission for their consideration at the next meeting. At that time, the Planning Commission would consider information gathered. If no resolution could be found through the special exception or the temporary use permit, the Planning Commission could have the option to call for notification of nearby property owners and to set a public hearing to consider the text change.

A vote was taken indicating a unanimous vote in favor of the motion.

Reasons for the Motion

1. The motion allowed time for consideration of options other than zone text changes for one property owner.
2. Precedence and neighborhood impact was being considered.
3. The applicant would be allowed the choice of other options to achieve his goal.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS

City Council Report

Mr. Petersen reported the City Council meeting held March 5, 2003, as follows:

- ⌞ The City Council approved the final plat request for Farmington Ranches, Phase IV.
- ⌞ The request to amend Farmington Ranches Development Agreement to accommodate the proposed Buffalo Horse Ranch was not ready. A site plan had to be designed and reviewed by the Planning Commission before the Development Agreement could be considered by the City Council.
- ⌞ Dr. White had expressed concern because he had been required to pay for extending asphalt in the UDOT's Shepard Lane right-of-way. Because the extension was a requirement by UDOT, the City was unable to address the problem.
- ⌞ Mr. Petersen reported the City had hired a consultant to help with possible EDA and RDA proposals for commercial sites around the new interchange.
- ⌞ Mr. Petersen invited Planning Commission members to a public forum regarding economic development to be held Wednesday, March 27, from 6:30 to 8:00 P.M. He stated he would send the members an agenda for the meeting.

Point of View/Hillside Access Problems

Mr. Forsgren raised an issue of concern in the Point of View Subdivision. An access path had been provided through a small park area owned by the City for pedestrians to get to the hillside property owned by the Forest Service. He said that nearby neighbors were upset by the use of motorcycles through the pathway and had become violent.

Mr. Petersen stated the property was owned by the City and if there is abuse the City can determine what to do. Motorcycles could cause some problems in the foothills because of scaring and erosion. However, the nearby neighbors should not be taking matters into their own hands.

Mr. Forsgren suggested that the Planning Commission draft a recommendation to the City Council for consideration of restricted use of the pathway.

Mr. Talbot suggested that minutes of past meetings wherein the access had been discussed should be reviewed. If restrictions already existed, they should be enforced.

Mr. Petersen said he would research the facts. He also suggested that a meeting be arranged between the citizens in question and the Mayor to resolve the issue. The City could help educate the neighbors about proper uses of the access.

ADJOURNMENT

Jim Talbot moved to adjourn at 9:40 P.M.

Kent Forsgren, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission