

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**
2 **Providence City Office Building**
3 **164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332**
4 **July 10, 2019 6:00 p.m.**

5
6 **Call to Order:** Gary Sonntag, Chair
7 Attendance: Ruth Ann Holloway, Josh Paulsen, Bob Perry, Gary Sonntag
8 Excused: Laura Banda
9 Absent: Rowan Cecil

10
11 **Thank you to Sharon Johnson.** The Planning Commission will recognize Sharon Johnson for her recent service on
12 the Planning Commission.

- 13 • Sharon Johnson resigned from the Planning Commission due to unexpected personal issues. G Sonntag
14 thanked her for her service.

15
16 **Approval of the Minutes:**

17 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for June 26, 2019.

18 **Motion to approve the minutes of June 26, 2019. — B Perry, second — J Paulsen**

19 **Vote:**

20 **Abstained: G Sonntag, R Holloway**

21 **Excused/Absent: L Banda, R Cecil**

- 22 • The commission will wait to approve the minutes because they did not have a quorum of voting
23 members. G Sonntag and R Holloway abstained because they did not attend the meeting in question.

24
25 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues within
26 the City's jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per
27 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 15 minutes.

- 28 • No public comments

29
30 **Public Hearing(s):** None

31
32 **Action Item(s):**

33 **Action Item Note:** Should the Planning Commission not be able to make a decision or take exception to an Action
34 Item(s), then that item will be tabled and revert back to a study category.

35
36 **Item No. 1. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval the final plat for Vineyard
37 Phase 1, a Life Cycle Residential subdivision containing 18 single-family detached homes, 20 townhomes, and 10
38 condominium units, located in the general area of 170 East Spring Creek Parkway.

39 **Motion to approve the final plat: — J Paulsen, second — B Perry**

40 **Vote:**

41 **Yea: R Holloway, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

42 **Nay:**

43 **Abstained:**

44 **Excused/Absent: L Banda, R Cecil**

- 45
46 • Dallas Nicoll of Visionary Homes explained what happened last meeting. The commission was concerned
47 about the preliminary plat restricting the possibility of basements. [The city] has gone back and looked at
48 the minutes from when the preliminary plat was approved. The only mention of basements was that in
49 the geotechnical report, it was recommended that there be no basements unless a land drain is installed.
50 D Nicoll said that Visionary Homes is proposing a land drain.

- 51 • G Sonntag asked if staff had reviewed the geotechnical report. S Bankhead said that the city engineer,
52 Max Pierce, had no problem with the report.
- 53 • G Sonntag asked Chad Wooley, city attorney, whether the code allows the developer to mitigate a Hazard
54 Water Table area in order to put in basements.
- 55 • C Wooley said that he believes that it does allow it. He spoke about Providence City Code 10-5-5. It says:
56 “A conditional use permit shall not be approved until adequate plans and engineering data are delivered
57 to the Land Use Authority showing that no basement or cellar is to be built.” The plain language would
58 suggest that you cannot build a basement in that area. However, 10-5-2 and 10-5-8 speak about the
59 geotechnical report. The geotechnical report can theoretically mitigate any kind of issue according to
60 these sections of the code. We have two code sections that are seemingly in conflict. One section of the
61 code seems to allow for mitigation, and one does not. Both can’t be right. As long as we go with the
62 geotechnical report, C Wooley feels that a judge would agree that we can mitigate the hazard area. When
63 a judge reads two sections that are conflicting, they try to make them fit with each other. He feels that
64 allowing for mitigation is the way that these two sections fit together. He feels that the city has done its
65 due diligence with the geotechnical report, and that our engineer is comfortable with the current plan.
- 66 • J Paulsen asked J Jackson about liability for flooded basements. J Jackson said that the builder will get
67 pulled into any legal issues more than the city will. They as the builder would not want to do anything that
68 would increase their potential liability. J Jackson felt that designating water tables 12 feet or less as
69 sensitive areas is excessively cautious. He regularly builds in areas with water tables of three and four
70 feet. When you get around five feet or less, you definitely need to be cautious, however.
- 71 • J Jackson said that the land drains are a huge insurance for the builder. These land drains are not simply a
72 sump pump in the ground. They are more like a sewer system with manholes, etc. His company uses them
73 all across the Wasatch front.
- 74 • G Sonntag asked about perimeter drains. J Jackson said that each home with a basement will get a
75 perimeter drain. They will gravity feed to Spring Creek. There will not be any pumps in the land drain.
- 76 • G Sonntag asked about the portion of the pedestrian path that will parallel Spring Creek Parkway. The
77 minutes from last meeting said that the sidewalk would be eliminated and there would be a walkway on
78 private property. He asked about free speech rights and maintenance issues. Would it be better to keep
79 the sidewalk separate from the private path? Normally, a subdivision would have to put sidewalk against
80 the street. The minutes said that the pathway would not be built until phase 3 and 4. There will be a lot of
81 pedestrian traffic along there in the first phase. G Sonntag recommends that the two paths be separated.
- 82 • J Jackson said that on Spring Creek Parkway, there will be normal sidewalk. The meandering
83 sidewalk/combined pathway will be along 1000 [East]. The intent was to combine them so that there
84 would be more green space along 1000 East. Residents have expressed a desire to preserve the corridor
85 along 1000 East, and not have houses right along it. He said that there will be a public easement on the
86 pathway, which should allow for free speech.
- 87 • C Wooley said that if the public is allowed to gather in a location, then the HOA would not be able to
88 require people to do anything that they wouldn’t be able to require on a public sidewalk. If you wanted to
89 be more specific, you could put freedom of speech into the easement language.
- 90 • J Paulsen asked that the part of the path that is substituting any sidewalk be built out of concrete for
91 durability. J Jackson said that that would be fine.
- 92 • R Holloway asked about liability on the public right of way if someone is injured.
- 93 • C Wooley said that if it was a normal sidewalk, it would only be the city that is sued. If it is on an
94 easement, the city and the HOA would probably both be sued.
- 95 • After the vote, J Paulsen clarified that he voted “yea” because the developer has the right to proceed with
96 his development under current law. His vote does not mean that he likes the development.

97
98 **Study Items(s):**

99 **Item No. 1. General Plan:** The Commission will discuss the public hearing schedule for the proposed general plan.

- 100 • G Sonntag explained that the general plan has been worked on for a long time. He feels that it is not
- 101 perfect, but that it is ready for the city to use.
- 102 • G Sonntag addressed the suggestion from last meeting that the General Plan vote be delayed until the
- 103 next council comes in. He feels that this would delay it unnecessarily.
- 104 • S Bankhead clarified that we have not done a comprehensive rewrite of the General Plan since 2001.
- 105 • G Sonntag recommended that the plan be moved on through the public hearing process and then
- 106 approved. The next council can amend it if they wish.
- 107 • J Paulsen said that assuming that the plan will be approved after the public hearing process negates the
- 108 purpose of having public hearings. If the public dislikes the plan, we should respond to that. He suggested
- 109 that a public hearing be as broad based and as inclusive as possible. Last meeting, the commission felt
- 110 that we should give enough time to publicize the public hearing so that many can attend. It was decided
- 111 that August would be a good time for the hearing.
- 112 • G Sonntag agreed. He would like it to proceed to public hearing. Then we can evaluate the public input.
- 113 However, he is not sure that we need a larger venue. He recommends that we hold it here, even if we
- 114 need two public hearings.
- 115 • G Sonntag said that we need to make sure the hearing goes according to our bylaws. We will want to
- 116 make sure it is limited in time, possibly to an hour. We have already heard about many things, such as the
- 117 Life Cycle Zone. It would be best if the public comments were about the overall general plan.
- 118 • R Holloway said that if we had two meetings, the same people might come to both meetings. Instead, we
- 119 could split the topics into two different meetings.
- 120 • G Sonntag said that we could do two meetings on the entire plan, but we could make sure that those who
- 121 have already spoken do not speak again.
- 122 • J Paulsen said that last meeting, there was a motion made to have the public hearing in August at a venue
- 123 that can accommodate 300-400 people. It was voted on and approved.
- 124 • G Sonntag asked if it was an action item on the agenda. If it wasn't, then there could have been no official
- 125 vote. However, he is fine with that plan if it was the sentiment of the commission.
- 126 • S Bankhead said that it would be best to hold it on July 31st or August 7th. Starting August 12th, Spring
- 127 Creek Middle School has scheduling conflicts.
- 128 • Brent Fresz, Providence City Council member, doubted that those attending the public hearing would fill
- 129 the council room. We have successfully held public hearings on the general plan in this building before.
- 130 Holding it here is cheaper, and we have the support of having our office next door in case we need
- 131 anything.
- 132 • R Holloway asked if we have audio and visual connection to the room downstairs. S Bankhead said that
- 133 we do.
- 134 • J Paulsen said that he would cover the cost for renting the school if that is the issue. If very few people
- 135 show up, then that is our answer that they don't care about the plan and that we can proceed.
- 136 • R Holloway felt that it would be better to err on the side of more people coming. If there is more room
- 137 and parking, more people may come.
- 138 • G Sonntag said that he sustains the decision made at the last meeting to hold it at an alternative venue.
- 139 • S Bankhead said that Spring Creek Middle School has better parking facilities than Providence Elementary
- 140 School.
- 141 • G Sonntag suggested holding the hearing on July 31st.
- 142 • J Paulsen asked about the timing for posting notice for the public hearing.
- 143 • S Bankhead said that it needs to be done at least 10 days in advance in the newspaper. We can put notice
- 144 out on the website and other media earlier than that.
- 145 • J Paulsen asked about putting it in the city newsletter. S Bankhead said that July 31st would not give
- 146 enough time to get it in the newsletter. We would need to do the hearing in August.
- 147 • R Holloway asked if S Bankhead could send the commission other dates that are available. They could
- 148 respond via email and make the decision this week.

- 149
- G Sonntag asked whether the commission can move a study item to an action item. S Bankhead said that normally, they cannot because the public needs to be notified. However, it would be appropriate for the commission to direct her to schedule a public hearing without a motion or an action item.
- 150
- 151
- J Paulsen asked that we consider all available dates (other than weekends) up to the 15th of August at both the middle school and the elementary school.
- 152
- 153
- 154

155 **Item No. 2. Ordinance and Design Standards for Life Cycle Residential Zone, LCR:** The Commission will review and discuss the proposed changes for Title 10 Chapter 4, LCR Zone.

156

- G Sonntag said that we could move forward on the proposed revision, or we could wait if the commission would like to wait.
- 157
- G Sonntag spoke about eliminating the title Life Cycle and calling it a Mixed Residential Housing zone. He also noted the suggestion to change the density from 12 to 10 units per acre. There was also a change to the [lot width] requirements of single-family detached homes. There were also changes in Section A relating to open space and the percentage of single family homes required.
- 158
- G Sonntag asked the commission if they would like to move forward on approving an amendment to the zone.
- 159
- R Holloway said that we should get it done.
- 160
- J Paulsen said that he will not vote for this zone unless there is a stipulation that the developer commit to what type of housing and density they will be building, within a certain margin, at the time of application. J Paulsen said that this would reduce the stress felt by many residents who fear the unknown.
- 161
- G Sonntag asked how the commission feels about changing the name of the zone to Mixed Residential Housing.
- 162
- R Holloway said that it makes a lot of sense to her.
- 163
- G Sonntag brought up the proposed changes to the purpose and intent section.
- 164
- B Perry said that we have worked on that language a lot.
- 165
- R Holloway said that it makes sense. She would approve that language.
- 166
- G Sonntag brought up section A(2). He had suggested replacing the first sentence with: "The reflective pattern would be on a smaller scale in a cluster with buffered borders and open space, allowing a mix of housing on smaller lots capable of supporting a diverse demographic population similar to the city's overall makeup."
- 167
- J Paulsen felt that section D subverts the efforts of the Planning Commission to make a zoning map that is well thought-out. It says that the MHR zone can be located in any existing zone.
- 168
- G Sonntag agreed. He felt that this zone should be treated like any other zone. An applicant would petition for the rezone, and it would go through the normal process [of approval or denial]. Section D seems to suggest that the city should approve it anywhere.
- 169
- J Paulsen suggested that we strike section D altogether. It will still allow developers to apply for a rezone.
- 170
- B Perry suggested striking the language that is red, and changing the first sentence to say that LCR *could* be located throughout Providence.
- 171
- G Sonntag said that we could say the same thing about many zones. We don't need to state it. Also, we don't need the language that says "An MRH is a rezone." All zones are rezones.
- 172
- R Holloway liked the language about adequate acreage. She suggested changing the language to say that "MRH is intended to be located in many areas throughout Providence, providing there is adequate acreage to develop the subdivision and allow a mix of 2 to 4 housing types."
- 173
- G Sonntag said that this would still create the same issue as before. It implies that the zone could be anywhere. If we are going to say it about this zone, we should say it for all the others as well.
- 174
- J Paulsen said that the part about 2-4 housing types is redundant. It is mentioned elsewhere in the zoning ordinance.
- 175
- S Bankhead asked about the section B "Compliance with Standards." That might be a good place to say that the zoning application needs to include the type and number of units.
- 176
- 177
- 178
- 179
- 180
- 181
- 182
- 183
- 184
- 185
- 186
- 187
- 188
- 189
- 190
- 191
- 192
- 193
- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197

- 198 • Don Calderwood, former mayor of Providence, brought up number 4 on the paper containing G Sonntag's
199 suggestions that was handed out. It lists areas where apartments work well. He warned that the language
200 does not specifically say that apartments will not work somewhere else. If we don't tell them they can't,
201 they will.
- 202 • D Calderwood asked if a duplex and a few apartments would work in an LCR zone. S Bankhead said that
203 there needs to be 25% single family.
- 204 • J Paulsen agreed with D Calderwood's point. He felt that residents lose trust in the LCR concept when
205 apartments could be allowed in their area.
- 206 • G Sonntag said that apartments were one of the sore spots with the public. People didn't want
207 apartments. With the new wording, we were trying to give developers some direction as to where
208 apartments would be appropriate.
- 209 • J Paulsen said that we could make apartments a use that is allowed only under certain conditions.
- 210 • G Sonntag suggested removing apartments from the ordinance, and making the developer rezone to a
211 zone that allows apartments if they want apartments.
- 212 • R Holloway said that this would allow the appropriate consideration for apartments as far as traffic, etc.
- 213 • D Calderwood said that the zone is an easier sell to the public if you have terminology that limits where
214 you can put an apartment complex.
- 215 • S Bankhead said that at one time, the city discussed making apartments mandatory in the LCR zone. This
216 caused some heartburn.
- 217 • R Holloway said that taking the word apartments out will make the public more comfortable.
- 218 • Jeff Jackson of Visionary Homes asked if the developer would have to pull out a section of the project and
219 go through the approval process for the apartment section of the development separately.
- 220 • G Sonntag said that that is what we are considering.
- 221 • J Paulsen said that the alternative process is public outcry.
- 222 • S Bankhead suggested that the commission change the language to say that the zone can only include
223 apartments if it is adjacent to another apartment complex or a commercial area. This would save the
224 developer from having to go through two separate processes, and would allow them to have a more fluid
225 design for their overall development.
- 226 • G Sonntag, J Paulsen and B Perry liked the idea. The commission decided to use S Bankhead's suggested
227 language.
- 228 • G Sonntag brought up section E(a)4 which says that the zone allows residential care facilities for 8 persons
229 or less. He has heard that care facilities of this size are not viable.
- 230 • J Paulsen asked if this would include pseudo-independent living arrangements with limited care provided.
- 231 • James Holloway of Providence said that there are some care facilities that do what J Paulsen is describing.
- 232 • R Holloway asked if we have a definition of residential care in our code. S Bankhead said she will have to
233 look.
- 234 • S Bankhead said that certain group homes cannot be prohibited. If it is protected by Fair Housing, we
235 don't need to specify that it is allowed.
- 236 • Kirk Allen, Providence City Council member, said a residential care facility with 8 people would not work.
- 237 • S Bankhead said that we may not be able to limit it to 8 people. If it is a fair housing issue, we do not need
238 to include it in the zoning ordinance. Certain types of group homes that are protected must be allowed in
239 any residential zone, even if they are not mentioned in the zoning ordinance.
- 240 • The commission struck E(a)4.
- 241 • J Jackson said that there are only really three housing types that we are talking about now that we have
242 struck apartments and care facilities out of the ordinance. We need to separate the definitions more so
243 we can get the diversity of housing types that the city is hoping for. A single-family home could come in a
244 variety of types, but the ordinance does not require any variety. He asked if the permitted uses list in
245 Section E is even needed. We could just let the restrictions about percentages of different housing types
246 mentioned later in the ordinance control the types.

- 247 • J Jackson also said that even though the list in E(a) could function to restrict uses such as mobile homes, it
- 248 can't anticipate all future housing types. Would a tiny home qualify as a single family detached home in
- 249 this zone?
- 250 • R Holloway said that tiny homes are a big trend. They are a detached dwelling that is mobile. Some have a
- 251 connection to sewer and some don't. Would this ordinance allow tiny homes?
- 252 • R Holloway asked if our definition of single family homes includes a foundation. S Bankhead said that it
- 253 does. Our code prohibits mobile homes except in a mobile home zone.
- 254 • R Holloway said that some tiny homes are very well-built. They don't have a large impact on the
- 255 surrounding lot. Some are permanent. R Holloway asked if there is a minimum square footage for single-
- 256 family homes in our code. S Bankhead said that there is not. A person could do a tiny home as an
- 257 accessory dwelling unit, but that would require a foundation.
- 258 • G Sonntag said that we may soon need to educate ourselves on tiny homes to make sure our codes can
- 259 tolerate them.
- 260 • R Holloway felt that tiny homes would fit with the purpose and intent of the MRH zone.
- 261 • J Paulsen said that he doesn't like writing our code in such a way that when housing types change, we
- 262 have to change the code. He agrees with J Jackson that we don't need section E.
- 263 • J Jackson said that the idea of the MRH zone is to allow a broad creativity. Listing only three permitted
- 264 types of housing doesn't allow for that much creativity.
- 265 • G Sonntag asked what other types of housing there might be.
- 266 • J Jackson said that there are single family homes, apartments, townhomes, condos, etc. There is a new
- 267 type of home called a mod home. There could be more in the future.
- 268 • S Bankhead suggested that the text of section E be replaced with a reference to Providence City Code 10-6
- 269 Use Regulations. Permitted and conditional uses are described in this chart.
- 270 • G Sonntag asked about section E(b) where it says that Providence city may permit and conditionally
- 271 permit uses.
- 272 • S Bankhead said that section E(b) is referring to uses other than housing types, such as business uses.
- 273 These are regulations having to do with how an owner uses a property, and they are listed in the use chart
- 274 in 10-6. She suggested changing the language to say: "Providence City permits and conditionally permits
- 275 uses in the MHR zone as listed in Providence City Code 10-6: Use Regulations"
- 276 • J Paulsen didn't understand why we reduced the maximum density [from 12 to 10 units per acre]. As long
- 277 as we have a commitment from the developer about the density at the time of the application, he would
- 278 be in favor of a higher maximum density. This can attract developers and allow for the permanent
- 279 preservation of green space.
- 280 • S Bankhead said that the way we traditionally adjust density is by creating separate zones. We could have
- 281 subzones of this zone, such as mixed residential housing high and mixed residential housing low.
- 282 • G Sonntag asked if we could have one zone, but provide a density bonus for being next to commercial. S
- 283 Bankhead said that this can also work.
- 284 • J Jackson said that if developers are situating a project adjacent to a commercial area, the developers will
- 285 go for a multi-family zone, not an LCR zone. He feels that the Life Cycle Zone should be the second tier as
- 286 far as distance from commercial areas. To preserve green space in the core, the city should adjust the
- 287 multi-family high zone to allow more density and require more open space.
- 288 • J Jackson said that he doesn't feel that the city should increase the density of the LCR zone. He feels that
- 289 10-12 units per acre is appropriate.
- 290 • G Sonntag brought up the portion of section H about requiring a phasing plan as part of the application
- 291 that was struck out.
- 292 • J Paulsen liked the idea of the language that was struck, but he would write it differently. S Bankhead said
- 293 that the reason that the mayor said that we could not require the developer to submit a phasing plan with
- 294 the application has to do with vesting. J Paulsen said that his suggestion would be to have the developer
- 295 be vested at a certain density and percent of housing types. If the developer needs to change their plan,
- 296 they can go through the approval process again.

- 297 • S Bankhead said that we will have to talk with Brent Bateman, Utah Property Rights Ombudsman, about
- 298 what we can require from a developer at the application stage. He advised us not to mix the subdivision
- 299 and the zoning processes because of vesting.
- 300 • J Paulsen said that he spoke with B Bateman about variable density. B Bateman didn't look favorably on
- 301 variable density [such as what we currently have in the LCR zone]. J Paulsen said that by having variable
- 302 density in that zone, we may have strayed from best practices with regards to zoning. When a developer
- 303 receives a certain zoning, the public assumes that they will pursue the maximum density allowed. This
- 304 makes the MRH zone a harder idea to sell to the public.
- 305 • G Sonntag said that a few of the sentences in section H convey the meaning that J Paulsen is looking for.
- 306 However, the rest of it makes things too complicated. G Sonntag asked why the language waives the
- 307 requirement that each phase be a stand-alone phase.
- 308 • S Bankhead said that this is because of the requirements that the development have 25% single family
- 309 homes and no more than 50% of any one type of housing. This could be very difficult to comply with in
- 310 each phase. We felt that they may need two phases to meet that requirement.
- 311 • J Paulsen asked why 25% of the single family housing needed to be presented for final plat approval
- 312 before the development moves beyond the second phase.
- 313 • J Jackson said that a developer who is making more money on the multi-family could build that first and
- 314 then not finish the project, or sell the single family lots without building the homes.
- 315 • G Sonntag said that it looks like we will keep the first two sentences and the last two sentences in section
- 316 H. We will eliminate the third sentence.
- 317 • J Paulsen suggested taking out the word "rezone" from the first sentence. He suggested rewording the
- 318 sentence to read: "As part of the application for an LCR development, the applicant shall submit the
- 319 number and housing types that shall be included in the development and the approximate percentages of
- 320 those housing types. The final plat shall not deviate substantially from the application."
- 321 • G Sonntag asked how "substantially" would be defined.
- 322 • S Bankhead said that the city has an inspection called a "substantial completion inspection." She can look
- 323 to see how "substantial" is defined there.
- 324 • J Paulsen will write some language related to this and send it to the commission members.

325

Reports:

326 **Staff Reports:** Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational only.

- 327 • S Bankhead said that City Council approved the annexation petition for the Craig Champlin development
- 328 with a Single Family High Zone.
- 329
- 330 • Don Calderwood, former mayor of Providence, said that he asked the City Council to honor what the
- 331 Planning Commission had decided about the Champlin annexation/zone assignment. Brent Fresz was the
- 332 only one who voted with the commission.
- 333 • J Paulsen clarified that there was no vote taken by the Commission on the Champlin annexation/zone
- 334 assignment. The Commission simply discussed the issue and expressed their thoughts.
- 335 • S Bankhead said that City Council discussed the city manager ordinance. Mayor Drew provided a folder
- 336 with information. S Bankhead will get it scanned and put it on the website. The council has an assignment
- 337 to read through it and get their comments to the mayor.
- 338 • S Bankhead said that the city was awarded the TAP award from the Trust Accountability Program. We
- 339 received a monetary award and a reduction in our workmen's compensation insurance.
- 340 • S Bankhead said that the council awarded the bid for the 500 South Main project. Staker Parson's was
- 341 awarded the bid.
- 342 • G Sonntag asked about the Commission bylaws. S Bankhead said that we will schedule it for the next City
- 343 Council meeting.
- 344 • K Allen spoke about why the City Council approved the Champlin annexation/zone assignment. The
- 345 Council felt that commercial development is changing. It would be hard for commercial to go in where the
- 346 Champlin development is being proposed because it is not right along the highway. The Council felt that

347 the Champlin development going in would provide more customers for commercial development along
348 the highway. Restaurants, doctors, etc could go in there. It would make commercial development there
349 more likely. C Champlin said that with his property in Logan, buyers were only interested in the frontage
350 along the highway. This area will probably be the same.

351
352 **Commission Reports:** Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
353 formal action will be taken.

354
355 **Election of chair and vice chair.** Pursuant to the Planning Commission Bylaws 3.1 as the last item of business at the
356 regular meeting of the Commission in the month of July, the Commission shall elect a Chair and Vice Chair.

357 **Motion to appoint Gary Sonntag as chair: — B Perry, second — J Paulsen**

358 **Vote:**

359 **Yea: R Holloway, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

360 **Nay:**

361 **Abstained:**

362 **Excused/Absent: L Banda, R Cecil**

363

364 **Motion to appoint B Perry as vice chair: — J Paulsen, second — R Holloway**

365 **Vote:**

366 **Yea: R Holloway, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

367 **Nay:**

368 **Abstained:**

369 **Excused/Absent: L Banda, R Cecil**

370

371 **Motion to adjourn: — J Paulsen, second — R Holloway**

372 **Vote:**

373 **Yea: R Holloway, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

374 **Nay:**

375 **Abstained:**

376 **Excused/Absent: L Banda, R Cecil**

377

378 Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:33 PM

379 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley

380 Minutes approved by vote of the commission on August 14, 2019

381

382

383

384 _____
Gary Sonntag, Chair

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder

385

386

387