

JOINT FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 14, 2002

CALL TO ORDER

Present: Mayor David M. Connors, Council Members David Hale, Bob Hasenyager, Larry W. Haugen, Susan T. Holmes, Planning Commission Chairman Linda Hoffman and Commissioners Kent Forsgren, Bart Hill, Cory Ritz, Larry Jensen, Cindy Roybal, and Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, City Recorder Margy Lomax, and Deputy Recorder Jeane Chipman. City Council Member Edward J. Johnson was excused. Also present for discussion of the first discussion item were Davis County Commissioners Cragun, Page, and McConkie and Sheriff Bud Cox.

Mayor Connors called the meeting to order at 6:20 P.M. A traffic jam on I-15 and consequently Farmington's Main Street delayed the beginning of the meeting. **Bart Hill** offered the invocation. **Mayor Connors** led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC HEARING: DAVIS COUNTY REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO EXPAND THE COUNTY JAIL LOCATED AT 800 WEST STATE STREET IN A BP ZONE (C-2-02)

Background Information:

On October 9, 1997, the Planning Commission reviewed an application from Davis County (Application #C-8-97) for a work center located at 800 West Clark Lane adjacent to the Davis County Justice Complex and the Farmington Bay Youth Center. The Planning Commission was given two suggested alternative motions by staff. The first motion recommended that the application for the work center be denied based upon criteria outlined in the General Plan. The second motion suggested that the application be tabled pending complete site plan review, demonstration of need, and submittal of further information required by Section 11-7-107 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The County's application was tabled in order to allow the County opportunity to review other possible locations near the Justice Complex site. (See enclosed letter dated October 14, 1997, and Planning Commission staff report dated October 9, 1997.) The applicant again appeared before the Planning Commission on October 23, 1997, and was given approval to construct the work center subject to standards outlined in Chapter 7 of the Zoning Ordinance. (See letter to Joe Rhoads, dated October 28, 1997.)

The Planning Commission's decision was appealed by the City Council. Prior to the appeal hearing, which was set for December 3, 1997, Mayor Bell, Max Forbush, County officials, and Mike Mazuran, the City Attorney, drafted an agreement indicating that the City Council would approve the conditional use permit for the County to build the work center on

Clark Lane and that, among other things, the County agreed to bed eliminations involving their entire facility. (See enclosed Inter-local Agreement 97-384.) The City Council thereafter approved a motion to rescind their appeal of the conditional use application contingent on the conditions of the agreement to be signed by the Davis County Commissioners. (See enclosed City Council meeting minutes. December 3, 1997.)

The 1997 Inter-local Agreement allows for an additional expansion of approximately 192 beds. Officials from the County met with the City Council on February 27, 2002, to discuss the County's expansion plans beyond the 192 bed limit. They also led members of the City Council and Planning Commission on a field trip of the jail facility on March 6, 2002. The County is now requesting that the City amend the Inter-local Agreement for an additional 200 beds so the overall site could receive an expansion of approximately 400 beds. Please review the enclosed Section 11-8-015 "Conditional Use Standards" in consideration of this request.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Mayor Connors welcomed everyone in attendance and introduced the agenda item. The implications of amending the Inter-local agreement signed in 1997 capping the number of beds in the County Justice Complex was far reaching. The Mayor stated City officials were anxious to gather a broad range of citizen input prior to making any decisions. The City officials were also sensitive to the time restraints placed on the County in regards to completing an expansion of the jail facilities. Over three hundred notices were mailed by the City to west Farmington and west State Street residents informing them of the public hearing being held. There was also coverage in the City newsletter and in the local newspaper.

David Petersen discussed the site plan as proposed by the County. He stated the Planning Commission would be considering a conditional use approval for the project. The Inter-local Agreement amendment is the jurisdiction of the City Council.

Mayor Connors invited Sheriff Bud Cox to address the City Council and the Planning Commission.

Sheriff Cox stated that the County Commission and his department were requesting an amendment to the Inter-local Agreement which originally capped the number of beds in the jail facility because of the growth of population in Davis County. With population growth comes growth in crime and thus an increase inmate population. The jail is currently over-crowded. The Sheriff also stated that the County has agreements with other agencies (Utah State and the Federal Government) to house inmates other than County prisoners. According to Sheriff Cox, projections indicate that the County will be built out in the year 2015. The proposal for additional buildings will fill the existing footprint available on the property. If expansion becomes necessary beyond the current proposal, it would have to be a campus or satellite type addition. Sheriff Cox said there were no current plans to make additional expansions beyond what is being proposed. The request would allow the expansion of the housing (as defined by bed numbers), remodel the kitchen and laundry, and build a new visitation facility. Doing so would maximize the security of the facility. If construction is done off site, it would raise the cost and security

breach potential. Having the facility on the same site saves tax payer dollars and time and would prove much more convenient for County officials.

Commissioner McConkie stated the jail project was one of the two most important issues facing the County currently. One is the jail and the other is Legacy Highway. The proposal will be a savings to tax payers. When the original agreement was signed, the County was sincere about not expanding. There have been changes that have necessitated the request. The County has tried to address all impacts that would negatively effect the City. The County also has an obligation to house criminals as directed by the court system. Mr. McConkie expressed sympathy for the feelings of Farmington citizens who did not want to have a large criminal population in their city. He also expressed appreciation for the cooperation that had been shown by the City in the past and said County officials would try to be more sensitive to inmate security issues.

Mayor Connors opened the meeting to a *PUBLIC HEARING* and invited citizens to comment.

Chris Stange (2513 South 900 West, Syracuse—member of the Davis County Chamber of Commerce) stated she was in favor of the jail's expansion.

Sheldon Killpack (3406 South 875 West, Syracuse—member of the Davis County Chamber of Commerce and marketing director for Lagoon Corporation) stated there are wants and there are needs in government. The request by the County was a need which must be met in the best way possible. Mr. Killpack felt that the expansion proposed for the current location was the best way in which to meet the need for more jail space. It was important to look toward the future and the needs of the County to house criminals in the best way possible.

Maureen Benson (332 South 1100 West, Farmington) stated she was a sheriff deputy who lived in west Farmington. She was opposed to the original construction but realized that it would be the best place for the facility. She said there are criminals who because of over-crowding have been set free. Such people really need to be incarcerated for the safety of the public. It was very important that the jail be allowed to expand so there is room for the criminals who need to be confined.

Tracie McBride (185 South 100 East, Farmington) lives alone in Farmington. She has been encouraged to move elsewhere but loves the City and has felt safe here. She is aware that the County population will increase and that the increase will bring with it an increase in the criminal population. Given a choice between having a larger jail and less criminals in the streets and having the smaller jail and having criminals lose, she would much prefer the larger jail.

Heidi Ritz (903 West 500 South, Farmington) stated she lives in west Farmington. She felt that people, especially in west Farmington, have decided there is no reason to come to give public input because they are not listened to. She stated such people feel that the City has made promises which they have not kept. She realized there was a need for a larger jail facility but it seemed that the County was taking the easy way without consideration of those who live close by. Since there will be a great need for jail beds in the future, there should be an effort to solve

the problem now. The jail should be moved where there would not be an impact on citizens and where there would be more room for even larger expansions. Ms. Ritz stated she had 7 children. Those children are afraid to walk to school over the overpass because it is frequented by released inmates. She cannot always be there to take them to and from school. She stated there is no supervision for the work release inmates and her children are at great risk because they must walk right by the Justice Complex. She asked if the rights of the prisoners were greater than the rights of the residents.

Gary McCloy (261 South 1100 West, Farmington) asked that City officials hold to the agreement that was made in 1997 and not allow the expansion. He suggested that County taxes be increased to fund the jail system and discontinue housing federal prisoners as a source of funding.

Alysa Revell (208 West State Street) asked if the barn would be left standing after the new construction. [Sheriff Cox stated the barn was not within the building footprint.] Ms. Revell stated she had no concern regarding the security of the facility. She did have concern about those who are released. They walk down State Street through the City with no supervision. With double the number of inmates, the number of released people will double. She also felt the County was not justified in housing prisoners who are not County inmates.

Howard Rigtrip (412 South 275 East, Farmington) said he did not want to live next to the jail, or the reservoir, or the fire station, or the burn plant, or other such facilities. However, he did want his garbage collected. He did want fire protection, and he did want water in his home. Those facilities are necessary for the public benefit. It was required of good citizens to provide public amenities. It was the job of government to provide such amenities in the most efficient and most cost effective manner. The City cannot have criminals wandering the streets. Farmington is the County seat where such facilities need to be located.

Helge Nilsen ((1267 West Burke Lane, Farmington) was concerned with the increase in population and asked if the increase would be inherently dangerous. He was also concerned that the County had to make money off of the federal prisoners and asked if taxes could be increased to make the difference.

Sheriff Cox responded to the statement by saying that the financial gain from housing federal prisoners was not an issue. The County had a ten-year commitment to house federal prisoners. Even without the federal inmates, however, the jail would need to expand.

Mr. Nilsen stated he also felt insecure having to live so close to the facility and asked about those inmates who were allowed outside the facility.

Sheriff Cox explained that those on the work release program were carefully screened and supervised. If they violate conditions of the program they are placed back in security. The Sheriff stated that some prisoners are in orange uniforms and allowed to work outside the facility. If they break any rules given them, they are "blued" which means they lose their privileges and must wear blue uniforms and cannot work outside the facility. The jail has

upgraded their security systems with a new monitoring system and new technology controls. There was a security breach about a year ago when a prisoner took a kitchen worker hostage and escaped the facility. He was caught within the hour and returned to the jail.

Niels Plant (311 South 650 West, Farmington) stated he felt the City should honor the promises it had made in the past. He was tired of the efforts towards incarceration in west Farmington but would rather have more efforts towards recreation. He expressed concern about the trail system and encroachment on open space. The trail system would need a security system to allow citizens safe use in the area of the jail. Mr. Plant also felt that the County would eventually need a larger piece of property for even more expansion and that they should look to the future and move the facility elsewhere. He felt the Fair Park would be compromised and lost at some future date because the facility would need the property for future expansions. Mr. Plant suggested the creek as a permanent boundary beyond which the jail could not expand. He also felt that other communities in Davis County should shoulder the burden of the jail system. He suggested Antelope Island was not a bad idea. People in the area had to drive their cars to feel safe rather than walk. He also had a concern about the prisoners after their release.

Karen Rigby (523 South 650 West) said her family was too close to the school to be bused; therefore, her children had to walk by the Justice Complex. When asked how close her home was to the school, she stated it was 1.5 miles away from the school. The School District's limit was 1.5 miles before they would consider busing. Ms. Rigby said there were numerous "questionable" people walking the streets in the area and asked how the citizens were supposed to know when there had been a security breach. Ms. Rigby reported a situation where an inmate walked away from the facility and got a ride from a neighbor. The neighbor was stopped by a road block and not told what was happening. The road block allowed she and the inmate through the block because the neighbor was not informed about the breakout. Ms. Rigby also reported having ridden her horse near the facility when inmates acted in inappropriate ways.

Dean Thurgood ((730 East 650 North, Bountiful) had recently been a member of the Bountiful Planning Commission. He thanked Farmington officials for acting as the County seat and taking upon them the added responsibility of doing so. He said it was not possible to please everyone. It was evident that the County and the Sheriff's Department needed the added room at the facility. The County and the Sheriff were doing an excellent job and should be supported in their efforts.

Bob Hood (PO Box 1055, Bountiful) felt that none of the complaints stated would change because of the expansion. Complaints by citizens were issues that needed to be addressed whether or not the expansion took place. Mr. Hood was a member of the Sheriff's Council and as such invited citizens to come and give input to that council. Mr. Hood also worked with the Republican Party in the State of Utah where he worked with legislators in regards to jail systems. He stated that every community had been burdened with unfunded mandates and he was working to resolve such issues. An example of such mandates is the increase of inmates demanded of the County. He also stated that if the County does not take progressive action in resolving the overcrowding at the jail, the Federal Government will assume responsibility at which time the County and the City will have no input. Mr. Hood applauded the efforts of the City to gather

public input, however, the County is extremely limited on time and cannot afford much more delay.

Commissioner Michael Cragun (288 South 500 East #G1, Clearfield) felt it was the responsibility of Farmington as the County seat to provide for the County jail system. The two governments had enjoyed a cooperative relationship. Mr. Cragun expressed his appreciation for that cooperation.

With no further comments, **Mayor Connors** *CLOSED* the public hearing. Before turning the meeting back to the Planning Commission there was a brief discussion of procedure. The conditional use request would be heard by the Planning Commission. The Inter-local Agreement amendment would be within the jurisdiction of the City Council.

Chairman Hoffman requested comments from the Planning Commission and invited the City Council members who had not been excused to join in the discussion.

Larry Jensen expressed appreciation to the Sheriff for the field trip recently taken by the Planning Commission and the City Council. He felt it was very informative and helped educate the City officials about the expansion and the security of the facility. Keeping the inmates within the same facility rather than transporting them from building to building was very wise. The citizens had expressed concern about the inmates who had been released—either for the work release program or who were finished with their sentence and had been set free. The issue seemed to center on transportation. There may be a case for quid pro quo. Farmington officials are very interested in having a commuter rail station in the City. Such a station would also help resolve some of the inmate release problems. Perhaps the Inter-local agreement could include an agreement that the County would support the commuter rail station for the City. Mr. Jensen expressed appreciation for the County's interest in cooperation with the City.

Kent Forsgren stated his concern was not with the inmates inside the facility. His concern was with the inmates when they were released. He also discussed the federal contract for the 120 beds and asked Sheriff Cox how many current beds were being used by federal prisoners.

Sheriff Cox stated 80 beds were currently filled by federal prisoners. The jail was under obligation to house 120 federal prisoners any time the federal officials required them to do so. When asked, the Sheriff stated that the projected inmate increase was based on the growth projection for the County, not federal prisoner increase.

Mr. Forsgren asked if there was or could be a printed action plan that could be given to citizens which addressed their concerns regarding released inmates.

Sheriff Cox stated such a plan could be prepared and distributed.

Sid Young stated that the action plan for citizen notification and information would be a

good idea but that improvements in the release program needed to go beyond citizen notification. Mr. Young felt that security measures for supervision and monitoring needed to be upgraded.

Sheriff Cox responded that security measures would be reviewed and that citizen complaints were taken seriously. The facility officials would cooperate with any suggestion within the law. Citizen safety was very important. He also stated that when the original request was made to build the Justice Complex, the bed cap was placed at the request of Farmington citizens. In retrospect he felt the cap was unwise.

Bart Hill asked if a study had been conducted which revealed a link between the increased population of the facility and increased risk to citizens.

Lieutenant Boucher was unaware of any statistics which indicated an increased risk due to inmate population increase. He responded to questions about the work release program He said inmates are released approximately 1 hour before their work schedule began and expected back to the facility 1 hour after their work day closed. Such inmates could be released any time of the day according to their work schedules. Inmates in orange uniforms released to work outside the facility only had release time during the day.

Cory Ritz said it was obvious the expansion would go forward because of the need of the jail system. He felt the process had been unusual. It was also highly unusual for the County to place the large jail system in the middle of a residential area. Development will soon bring homes adjacent to the jail property. Officials needed to consider carefully the impact such a facility will have on neighborhoods. Input should come from Farmington City itself with a City liaison, not a county-wide liaison. Mr. Ritz also appreciated the field trip to the complex and felt it was very helpful. He had confidence in the security of the inmates inside the facility but was very concerned with the those who were released. His greatest concern was for the children in the neighborhoods and asked if the County officials could influence the School District to provide buses so the children would have no interaction with the inmates. He also felt the practice of housing federal prisoners should be discontinued.

David Hale appreciated the forthrightness of Sheriff Cox. He stated there were other areas of concern regarding City/County relationships that would probably be of benefit to discuss. Such issues included having a commuter rail station in Farmington and encouragement of a campus type jail facility which would not place all the responsibility on Farmington. The County Court house grounds and building needed to be enhanced to help the downtown area. The County library needed to be renovated and parking needed to be improved. Trails along Shepard Creek needed to be addressed. A closer working relationship needed to be created between the two government entities.

Larry Haugen said he and Mayor Connors were probably the only ones left from the City Council that struggled with the original building request. He remembered how hard it was to grant permission for the building and how much resistance there was from the public. He felt that one solution to the over crowding was to have the courts be more efficient in handling their cases. There were too many "pre-trial" inmates being held. A reduction of such inmates would

help over-crowding. He felt the Inter-local agreement should be honored. He also felt that there would be drainage problems created by the expansion and cautioned that proper engineering should be implemented in the design of the expansion which would protect surrounding properties. Because homes would be developed nearby, Mr. Haugen felt there was a big issue regarding children and their close proximity to inmates who had been released for any reason. Mr. Haugen stated that he wanted to keep the current cap, that Farmington was being asked to sacrifice too much for the County, and that the County facility provided no tax revenue which would help with the impact on the City.

Sheriff Cox stated that the pre-trial inmates accounted for about 25 percent of the inmate population. He said there was nothing he could do about the issue because if judges ordered the incarceration, then the jails had to take the prisoners. Offices at the jail had requested court action in a more timely manner. He explained that felons who were in prison for 1 or more years were kept at the State Prison in Bluffdale. Criminals who were convicted of misdemeanors and those who had 1 year or less to serve were imprisoned in the County system.

Bob Hasenyager felt strongly that it would be very important to notify citizens of any security breach at the Justice Complex. It was also important that with the possibility of the school redistricting the year after next that the west area of Farmington would be designated as a non-busing area. The safety of the children walking to and from school must be addressed. Plans and procedures by the County to minimize problems and having the County work with the School District for route plans would be vital. The County should also consider not renewing the federal contract which will terminate in the year 2009. Such should possibly be a part of any amended Inter-local Agreement. Another part of an amendment should be language that deters future expansion. Mr. Hasenyager inquired about additional support for Farmington Police in their responsibility to patrol the City.

Sheriff Cox said the County has a very good relationship with the City Police and a tradition of support was enjoyed. Officers from other communities also become involved with the County facility.

Mr. Jensen asked if the released inmates are transported to the bus stop.

Sheriff Cox stated there was not enough man power for such transportation.

Mr. Hasenyager stated the Inter-local Agreement was very important and that it needed to include what is best for both governments with detailed specifics. He asked that the County take into consideration that Farmington bears a disproportionate responsibility in regards to the criminal system and other County activities.

Chairman Hoffman asked for information regarding projected County population. She also stated that it was important to keep promises made to the public. It would be significant to define the limits of any future expansion and to define the limits of Farmington's responsibility. The Chairman then reminded the Planning Commission of the criteria for approving conditional

Larry Jensen *MOVED* that the Planning Commission table the application for conditional use approval until an agreement can be reached between the City and the County regarding the amendment to the Inter-local Agreement and the jail expansion, and to table the application until site plan approval is granted by the Planning Commission. The Commission reserves the right to review the Inter-local Agreement in order to make recommendations to the City Council. **Sid Young** seconded the motion. In discussion of the motion, **Kent Forsgren** suggested amending the motion to include the following:

1. The County should submit a site plan for the expanded jail system.
2. The County should submit a transportation plan.
3. The County should work with the School District regarding a bussing program for children in west Farmington.
4. The County should develop an action plan which addresses citizen notification of security breaches and which includes appointment of a Farmington liaison with the Jail Council and/or the Sheriff's Council.
5. The County should create a complaint hot line for citizens.
6. The County should create a buffer zone between the Justice Complex and residential areas.

Both Mr. Jensen and Mr. Young agreed to the amendments. The vote was unanimous in approval of the motion.

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS ONLY

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Kent Forsgren *MOVED* that the minutes of the February 28, 2002, Planning Commission Meeting be approved. **Larry Jensen** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

WARNER BROTHERS DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL FOR CLARK PROPERTY IN WEST FARMINGTON (Agenda Item #3)

Mr. Petersen stated the agenda item was for discussion only. He said Brad Zarbuck had approached the City Planning Department about receiving permission to increase the density of a proposed subdivision in order to make the project financially feasible.

Chairman Hoffman invited Mr. Zarbuck to address the Commission.

Mr. Zarbuck stated his development company was interested in developing a 29 acre parcel. They would be required to give up 30 percent of the parcel in open space in order to develop 9,000 square feet lots, which he felt would not allow enough lots to make the project financially successful. He asked if there were other options that the Commission would be willing to entertain so that he could increase the density of the project without forfeiting more open space. The mix-use zone under consideration was not yet in effect and was not ready to be considered as an option for Mr. Zarbuck.

The Commission members discussed the issue, including the following points:

1. Citizens, especially in west Farmington, had fought long and hard to insure open space would be protected. Open space was a key element when considering a high density project.
2. The Commission was committed to treating all developers equally and fairly and would not allow one developer to disregard ordinance requirements when all others were compelled to follow the restrictions.
3. Many developers find the City's conservation ordinances beneficial to their projects. They enhance the developments.
4. An off site transfer of open space is a possibility especially if located in an advantageous site for the City. However, such could not be commented on until a firm plan was submitted.
5. The developer was encourage to submit detailed plans to which the Commission could respond. He was reminded that all ordinances must be respected and that the Commission would not accept any plan which does not follow all City ordinances and standards.

AGENDA AMENDMENT

Cory Ritz *MOVED* that the Planning Commission consider additional agenda items regarding miscellaneous business presented by Jeffrey T. Holman and by Dr. R. J. White. **Kent Forsgren** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

REQUEST BY JEFFREY T. HOLMAN REGARDING CREATING A RENTAL APARTMENT IN A R ZONE (Agenda Item #3b)

Chairman Hoffman invited Jeffrey Holman to address the Commission.

Mr. Holman asked the Commission about their opinions regarding options to allow for a basement apartment in his residence. The home is in a single family residential zone (R) which does not allow for two-family residences. He said he thought there was two options available to

him: (1) to initiate a text amendment to the ordinance to delete the exclusion of “R” zoning from two-family residences, or (2) to initiate rezoning of the subdivision from “R” to another zone designation that would allow for two-family dwellings.

The Commission discussed the issue including the following points:

1. Either option would create a precedence for all R zones in the City. Such an action would be detrimental to most R zone neighborhoods and would likely not be acceptable to the citizens.
2. Taking such action would create several non-conforming lots within the area.
3. There is no hardship in connection with the request.
4. Either a text amendment or a rezone would require a public hearing. Neighborhood response may likely be negative.
5. The Commission members were in opposition to change zoning or text in response to a single situation.
6. The consensus of the Commission was in opposition to the request.

REQUEST BY DR. WHITE TO CONSIDER RELOCATION OF HIS VETERINARY OFFICE (Agenda Item #3c)

Mr. Petersen explained that Dr. White has been required to move from his existing veterinary office location due to the new frontage road being constructed by UDOT. He has located a parcel of land east of his current location which is zoned A. A veterinary office is a conditional use in an A zone. There is also an adjacent triangle shaped piece of land that would need to be rezoned if the project were approved. Dr. White must move out of his office by May in order to allow UDOT to construct the frontage road. Therefore, time is very short. Dr. White has asked for consideration and quick action.

The Commission discussed the issue and by consensus felt that the move would create a good transitional use and buffer between the commercial uses in the area and the residences. They asked that there be sensitivity to the residences in the area. They suggested that a site plan and a rezone request be prepared to be considered during their next meeting. It was the general consensus of the Planning Commission that Dr. White could move forward with his plan.

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE–WORK SESSION (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information:

On February 14, 2002, the Planning Commission held a work session to review and discuss a proposed overhaul or major amendment to the General Plan. The makeup and format of

the existing General Plan and a few issues related thereto were also discussed. The Commission reviewed the process and the timing involved in the last major overhaul of the plan between 1991 and 1993. The Planning Commission identified five neighborhood study areas (see enclosed map) and established a goal to complete a recommendation to amend the General Plan to the City Council by the end of the year. Possible goals for this study session include:

1. Review enclosed timeline for changes and recommendations.
2. Should the City conduct another survey similar to the survey sent to citizens last time (10 years ago)?
3. What are the major issues regarding the City as a whole and the major issues regarding each neighborhood study area individually? (Note: current population and populations projects for the City and each neighborhood will be provided at the meeting.)

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

In discussion of the agenda item the Planning Commission felt the time line was acceptable. They also felt the map which designated the 5 general areas of the City was good. They discussed conducting a survey of the City as was done 10 years ago and felt that neighborhood meetings should be held first to help inform the public about the issues.

Mr. Petersen distributed information regarding general demographic characteristics of Farmington. The statistics were discussed. Commission members asked that the next meeting's agenda include "issue identification" as one of the first items.

MISCELLANEOUS, CITY COUNCIL REPORT (Agenda Item #5)

Mr. Petersen invited the Planning Commission to the City Council meeting to be held March 20th. Discussion would include a proposed "conservation housing overlay." An area in the City has been chosen as a "test case" to determine effectiveness. He reported that the City Council approved the annexation and Phase 3 regarding Farmington Ranches.

Kent Forsgren asked about the procedure in handling citizen complaints. He had received several complaints about recent problems with erosion control, drainage and flooding problems.

Mr. Petersen suggested that the complaints be submitted to the City Council.

ADJOURNMENT

Kent Forsgren *MOVED* to adjourn at 9:40 P.M.

Farmington City Planning Commission

March 14, 2002

Linda Hoffman, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission