

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

November 14, 2024

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, November 14, 2024 at 7:00 pm in the Kaysville City Hall located at 23 East Center Street.

Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Chair Mike Packer, Commissioners Katie Ellis, Wilf Sommerkorn, and Rachel Lott

Planning Commissioners Absent: Commissioners Erin Young, Megan Sevy, and Paul Allred

Staff Present: Melinda Greenwood and Mindi Edstrom

Public Attendees: Jennifer Borup, Lauri Cragun, Megan Snell, Laurene Starkey, Tyler Tholen, Cooper Rich, Elle Braun, Tyler Nelson, John Peden, Russ Condie, Brad Gobbs, Cannon Neslen, Damon Day, Brandon Strebel, Braydon Perkins, Kelsey McFarland, Jill Dredge, and Jessica Carlisle

1- WELCOME AND MEETING ORDER

Chair Packer welcomed all in attendance to the Kaysville City Planning Commission meeting.

2- DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of conflicts of interest from the Commissioners.

3- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR ANIMALS AT 1892 LAKE RIDGE DRIVE

Melinda Greenwood introduced the Conditional Use Permit application for keeping farm animals at a residential property located at 1892 Lake Ridge Drive. Ms. Greenwood explained that under Utah State law, conditional uses are considered permitted uses but may require conditions to mitigate impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. The city's zoning code governs these conditions, with limits on what can be applied. In practice, additional conditions are rarely necessary as most requirements are already outlined in the zoning code.

Ms. Greenwood said that the applicant, Kyle Orison, was unavailable, but his wife, Angie Orison, was in attendance at the meeting to represent the application. The property is a single-family dwelling situated on a lot that is slightly over half an acre in size. The proposal involves keeping farm animals, specifically horses, on the property on an occasional basis. The lot size would permit no more than two horses. The Orisons own a ranch in southern Utah and intend to bring horses to the residence as needed while traveling.

Ms. Greenwood recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit based on the provisions of the city's zoning code, particularly Chapter 17-24, which governs farm animals. The code includes measures to mitigate potential negative impacts on neighbors, such as requiring that structures for animals be kept at least 50 feet from any neighboring residential building and mandating controls for noise, dust, and odor. A condition of approval was noted: the property

must be fully fenced before any farm animals are allowed. While the property is partially fenced, gates or additional fencing would need to be installed to meet this requirement.

Ms. Greenwood indicated that the applicant had communicated the intent to have horses with their neighbors and had not encountered any objections. Staff confirmed they had not received concerns from the public regarding this application.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked if the permit is primarily for horses and if there were plans to enclose them.

Ms. Greenwood said that the applicant did submit a drawing that showed an area in the backyard to keep the horses. It was her assumption that is where they plan to keep the horses.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked if that would be 50 feet away from any adjacent structures and thought by looking at the layout from the houses on the adjacent lots, they look to be 50 feet away making it a pretty small area.

Chair Packer sought clarification on the distinction between "structures" and "enclosed areas" as defined in the city code.

Commissioner Sommerkorn said that the code mandates that structures for the care of animals must be at least 50 feet away from neighboring buildings predominantly used for residential purposes. However, it also allows animals to be kept within an "enclosed area," which is not subject to the same 50-foot requirement.

Ms. Greenwood confirmed that an enclosed area, such as an open-air corral or fenced area, does not qualify as a "structure" under the code's definition. Structures are defined as anything constructed at a fixed location with an impervious material, typically requiring a building permit.

Commissioners debated potential impacts on neighboring properties if animals were housed close to property lines, including concerns about odor, dust, and noise.

Chair Packer invited Angie Orison to approach the Commissioners for any questions they might have.

Ms. Orison said that they intend to keep only one horse on the property, though possibly two on rare occasions. They explained that the horse would primarily stay at a ranch in southern Utah or at a friend's property in Morgan, with the property in Kaysville serving as a temporary location for occasional use rather than year-round housing.

The applicant emphasized that no structure would be built for the horse, and they were already planning to finish fencing the property to comply with city requirements. This clarification

addressed concerns about the potential impacts on neighbors and reinforced that the use of the property would be infrequent and temporary.

Commissioner Sommerkon made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit Kyle Orison located at 1892 Lake Ridge Drive subject to the provisions that are noted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellis and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Chair Packer - Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn - Yay
Commissioner Lott – Yay
Commissioner Ellis- Yay

4- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A MAJOR B HOME OCCUPATION FOR ROCKSTAR CONCRETE AND CONSTRUCTION LOCATED AT 245 CHRISTINE WAY FOR CHRISTINE ALLUIS

Mindi Edstrom introduced the Conditional Use Permit noting the business's compliance with state licensing through DOPL and the Department of Commerce for construction, excavation, and demolition. She continued saying that there would be no business equipment or materials stored at the residence, except for a truck. They have an enclosed trailer used for recreational vehicles which will be stored behind a fence on the property. All other equipment, including an excavator, will be stored off-site at storage units in Kaysville and Farmington and that the business complies with the city's home occupation regulations, including ensuring no more than 5% of the lot area is used for the business (approximately 675 square feet).

Ms. Edstrom emphasized that there should be no exterior storage of material or supplies, off-street parking must be provided for any vehicles or trailers associated with the business and only one vehicle or trailer exceeding 22 feet in length is permitted.

Ms. Edstrom said that home occupations are designed to operate without a noticeable impact on the residential appearance of the neighborhood. She said that staff received two calls expressing concerns from neighbors regarding the potential and existing equipment overflow and the use of street parking.

Ms. Edstrom said staff recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit, subject to compliance with the conditions outlined in city code and invited the Commissioners to suggest additional conditions as necessary and that the applicant was present and available for questions from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked if staff if there was equipment at the home already.

Ms. Edstrom said the application for a Conditional Use Permit arose from a code enforcement issue. Initially, the property had equipment and items, including a tractor and an excavator, stored on-site in violation of city code.

City staff have worked with the homeowners to address these code enforcement violations, ensuring the property will be brought into compliance. The effort aimed to resolve the outstanding issues and establish clear guidelines for the operation of the business as a home occupation.

The Conditional Use Permit process provides an avenue to ensure compliance while addressing neighborhood concerns and maintaining the residential character of the area. The applicant has made adjustments to align with city regulations, including relocating equipment off-site.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked if the property was now compliant.

Ms. Greenwood said that staff is working collaboratively with the applicants to address these concerns and bring the property into compliance. Progress has been made since the initial violations were identified in September, with significant improvements noted after discussions with the applicants in October. Efforts include the rental of a storage unit to relocate business-related items and the commitment to resolve remaining issues.

Ms. Greenwood said the sidewalk adjacent to the property requires replacement. However, given the approaching winter and the time required to secure a contractor and permits, staff recommended deferring this repair until spring, pending confirmation from public works.

Ms. Greenwood said that the Conditional Use Permit is recommended for approval, staff clarified that any future violations, such as unauthorized equipment storage or parking issues, would be addressed through standard code enforcement procedures. Additionally, the Conditional Use Permit could be revoked, if necessary, which would also result in the revocation of the associated business license.

Ms. Greenwood commended the applicants' cooperative approach and noted confidence in their continued progress toward full compliance. The recommendation to approve the Conditional Use Permit aligns with city policy while allowing the applicants to operate their business legally from their property.

Ms. Christine Alluis, the applicant, clarified that items previously on their property, which could be assumed to be related to their business, were connected to personal projects, including the installation of an underground pool and other backyard renovations. This contributed to the presence of materials and equipment on-site. To address these concerns and ensure compliance with city regulations, the applicants have rented three storage units to relocate all business-related items off the property and taken steps to separate personal and business activities, ensuring the property remains in compliance with home occupation standards.

Commissioner Lott made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit located at 245 Christine Way for Rock Star Concrete and Construction for Christine Alluis. Commissioner Sommerkorn seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Ellis - Yay
Chair Packer - Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn - Yay
Commissioner Lott – Yay

5- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A MAJOR B HOME OCCUPATION FOR CRUNCH TIME CONSTRUCTION, LOCATED AT 1398 NORTH MOUNTAIN ROAD FOR JONATHEN PEDEN

Mindi Edstrom introduced the Conditional Use Permit for Johnathen Peden, located at 1398 North Mountain Road. Mr. Peden is the owner of Crunch Time Construction, a new business in Kaysville. Ms. Edstrom said that the only equipment stored at the home will be his truck and 16-foot trailer, all other equipment and supplies will be taken directly to construction sites, there will be no employees or customers at the residence and that Mr. Peden is a licensed General Contractor verified with DOPL. Ms. Edstrom recommended approval of the Conditional Use Permit for Mr. Peden and Crunch Time Construction with any conditions Planning Commission may find necessary.

Chair Packer opened the meeting up to questions from the Commissioners, and there were no questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Ellis made the motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the property at 1398 North Mountain Road for Crunch Time Construction based on the findings from staff. Commissioner Lott seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Ellis - Yay
Chair Packer - Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn - Yay
Commissioner Lott - Yay

6- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE SALE OF BEER AT THE BOONDOCKS FULL- SERVICE RESTAURANT LOCATED AT 525 SOUTH SUNSET DRIVE

Melinda Greenwood introduced the next two items on the agenda which are for Boondocks located at 525 South Sunset Drive in a General Commercial zone. The applicant is requesting two Conditional Use Permits, one for beer consumption on premises and one for liquor consumption. Both uses are allowed as conditional uses under the city's zoning code. She said that while the city issues the Conditional Use Permits, the State regulates the sale and consumption of alcohol. The applicant meets state requirements for these permits, including checking proximity to community locations like schools and churches.

Ms. Greenwood continued saying that the role of the Planning Commission is not to approve or deny the sale of alcohol but to ensure the Conditional Use Permit meets zoning requirements and address any reasonable conditions to mitigate negative impacts.

Ms. Greenwood said staff recommends approval with no additional conditions, as there are no

substantial negative impacts identified.

Commissioner Sommerkorn emphasized that conditional uses in the city's zoning code are generally treated as permitted uses by state law and court rulings. The city does not have much discretion in approving these uses once they are outlined in the code. The only situation in which the city could deny a conditional use permit is if there are significant, detrimental impacts on the community or neighborhood that cannot be mitigated. However, "mitigating" these impacts does not mean eliminating them completely; it means reducing or addressing them as much as possible. Therefore, the Planning Commission's role is limited to reviewing the proposed use against the city's code and ensuring any potential impacts are appropriately addressed, possibly by adding reasonable conditions, but the general approval is expected unless substantial issues arise.

Ms. Greenwood explained that any conditions placed on a conditional use permit must be codified within the city's zoning code. Ms. Greenwood noted that the city already has adequate infrastructure in place, such as access for public safety, services, and water supply, and that these won't change. The traffic flow for vehicles and pedestrians has been in place for the past 11 years, and the site already has established drive approaches. Given this, staff did not feel that there were any additional conditions necessary for this specific use.

Chair Packer clarified that the discussion is about a Conditional Use Permit for the sale of beer, which is a permitted use at this site. He emphasized that this is not a liquor license, which is regulated by the state. The Planning Commission's role is limited to approving or denying the Conditional Use Permit, but they do not have the authority to approve a liquor license. The process for obtaining a liquor license is separate and controlled by state regulations, not by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Greenwood provided further context, explaining the complexities of land use regulations, which involve various layers of law, including federal, state, and local codes. She clarified that the City Council previously approved the sale of on-premise beer and alcohol as a conditional use in certain zones, such as a General Commercial zone.

She also highlighted that the Conditional Use Permit approval process is administrative, meaning that once the use is allowed under zoning, the Commission's role is to apply conditions if necessary, but the decision to approve or deny the use is already established in the zoning code. She stressed that the business license for alcohol consumption is a separate process regulated by the state, which conducts its own checks for proximity to sensitive locations like churches or schools. The state would ensure compliance with its distance requirements, and there are no proximity issues in this case.

Thus, the Planning Commission is only involved in approving the Conditional Use Permit for the site, while the state handles the liquor license.

Damon Day, one of the founders of Boondocks, shared the history and context of the company during his presentation. He explained that Boondocks started as a construction company in 1989, building attractions like go-cart tracks and bumper boat ponds across the country. In 1993, they built their first family entertainment center, incorporating both outdoor and indoor attractions, such as arcade games, miniature golf, go-karts, and bumper boats. By 2008, Boondocks introduced bowling to their facilities, becoming the first family entertainment center in the U.S. to integrate bowling, as recognized by Brunswick Bowling.

Mr. Day discussed the evolution of the family entertainment industry, noting the competitive landscape with businesses like Fat Cats and Top Golf, and even Lagoon, which all offer different types of entertainment experiences. He emphasized that Boondocks focuses on creating social, family-oriented experiences rather than individual thrill rides.

After operating for over 35 years, Mr. Day shared that the business has adapted to meet consumer demands for high-quality experiences, including better food offerings and facility upgrades. He said Boondocks will be doing a \$6 million renovation of their Kaysville location, which will include improvements to the bowling center, an XD Dark Ride Theater, and an elevated food experience.

Mr. Day said the request to add alcohol to the offerings is not to promote excessive drinking but to complement the variety of activities Boondocks already provides. He explained that alcohol sales would help maintain a synergistic offering, similar to other family-friendly restaurants like Applebee's or Red Robin. He reassured the commission that after similar expansions at their Colorado locations, and after implementing alcohol at their Draper location, the concerns about negatively impacting the family-friendly environment had been alleviated. Mr. Day mentioned that their active environment (focused on activities like bowling and arcade games) naturally reduces concerns about intoxication or disruptive behavior.

Mr. Day reiterated that 90% of Boondocks' customers in Kaysville come from outside the city, and the business values its relationship with the local community. He introduced Brandon Struble, the Director of Food and Beverage Operations, to address any specific questions related to the alcohol application.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked Brandon Struble how big the restaurant would be that they are putting in.

Mr. Struble said that they are renovating and updating currently to have about 140 seats.

Ms. Greenwood pulled up the slides from Boondocks and Mr. Day explained that the slides are from their Draper facility showing what the remodel will look like in Kaysville City.

Chair Packer opened up the meeting for those in attendance to make a comment.

Russell Condi sought clarification about the alcohol license being requested. He asked if the license was for a full-service restaurant, which would require Boondocks to maintain a ratio of 70% food sales to 30% alcohol sales. Mr. Condi wanted to confirm that patrons would not be allowed to consume alcohol without also purchasing food, which is typical for a full-service restaurant license.

Jennifer Borup, a Kaysville resident living near Boondocks, shared concerns regarding unresolved agreements from when Boondocks first opened. She mentioned that during the original petition process, two agreements were made to address neighborhood concerns. The first was that the parking lot was supposed to be gated after hours to prevent late-night disturbances. However, the gates deteriorated and were not replaced, leading to ongoing issues. The second was the lighting on the side of the building facing her neighborhood was supposed to be turned off after 1 AM. However, the lights remain on, shining into bedroom windows.

Ms. Borup highlighted ongoing issues, particularly noise disturbances from parties in the parking lot after hours, especially on weekends. Despite calls to the Police, response times have been inadequate, with County Sheriff often called in due to limited Kaysville Police coverage.

She expressed disappointment that the city had not documented these previous agreements or held Boondocks accountable, and she believes Boondocks has not been a good neighbor, particularly in failing to reinstate the gates. Ms. Borup also voiced opposition to the alcohol proposal, feeling the facility should not be compared to an Applebee's restaurant, due to the nature of activities at Boondocks, such as driving vehicles, boats, and go-karts. She felt that the neighborhood's concerns were being ignored, and wished to have her grievances formally recorded.

Commissioner Sommerkorn asked Ms. Borup if she was able to research meeting minutes and see if anything had been documented.

Ms. Borup clarified that there was misinformation regarding the timeline of Boondocks' construction. She corrected the claim that it was built in 2013, explaining that construction actually started in 2008 and that meetings with the neighborhood took place before Boondocks opened in November 2009. These meetings, she noted, were not part of the public record because they were held privately — at the Boondocks building and in a neighborhood home.

Ms. Bora also emphasized the difference between Boondock's patrons and churchgoers, citing a recent conversation with the Kaysville City Manager about gating requirements. She pointed out that while churches aren't required to gate their properties, the nature of Boondocks' patrons is different — people staying in the parking lot after hours and partying until 1:00 AM as opposed to the earlier breakups of church activities. She again expressed frustration that these parties persist after employees leave and urged the city to require Boondocks to reinstate the gates as originally agreed. She stated that this was a reasonable request and reiterated how exhausting the situation has become for her neighborhood.

Ms. Greenwood stated that no public meeting ever took place where the discussions about gating and other agreements were documented. After researching records, she confirmed that the Conditional Use Permit for Boondocks was issued before the neighborhood meetings occurred, and notes from those private meetings were not part of any official public record or city regulatory authority.

She also explained that, according to the city's regulations, it would not have been legal for the city to impose a gate condition because such a requirement wasn't part of the standard conditions listed in their code, and there was no provision for that in the 12 conditions associated with the permit. She acknowledged that while the city may have been present during the discussions between Boondocks and the neighbors, the agreement on gates was more of a private agreement between Boondocks and the residents, rather than something officially mandated by the city. Therefore, the city could not force Boondocks to reinstall the gates.

Tyler Thorne expressed concern about Boondocks offering alcohol, suggesting it might change the family-friendly atmosphere that makes the business unique. He questioned whether adding alcohol would attract the intended crowd and suggested that maintaining the focus on activities like go-carts, mini-golf, and arcade games would keep it special. Tyler also voiced worries about the potential consequences of introducing alcohol, particularly the impact on the work environment for younger employees. He urged Boondocks to remain family-oriented and avoid losing what makes the business stand out in the community.

Laurene Starkey raised a concern about a homeless shelter, referred to as a "Code Blue" center, being located near Boondocks. She noted that it was recently voted on by the county and would be in close proximity to the business. Ms. Starkey mentioned the timing of this development alongside Boondocks' proposal to serve alcohol, questioning if the presence of the homeless shelter would create additional challenges.

Commissioner Sommerkorn responded, clarifying that homeless individuals would need to go inside Boondocks to acquire alcohol, and suggested that the issues of alcohol sales and the shelter were separate.

Chair Packer closed the public comments.

Commissioner Sommerkorn raised a question about the Conditional Use Permit standards, specifically referring to section 17-30, which addresses whether a facility or service contributes positively to the community without causing detrimental effects on health, safety, or general welfare. He suggested that, although public hearings are not always required for Conditional Use Permits, they can be valuable because they provide insight into potential concerns, such as the issue of patrons lingering after hours. Commissioner Sommerkorn proposed that requiring a gate to be installed might address the issue of late-night gatherings, questioning whether this could be considered an appropriate condition.

Commissioner Lott acknowledged that while suggesting the installation of gates might show good faith to the neighbors, it's not something the city can enforce. She explained that the gates were originally installed but deteriorated due to frequent impacts, leading to their abandonment. Ms. Lott mentioned that no other businesses were required to have gates, and the issue seemed to stem from maintenance challenges.

Commissioner Sommerkorn also discussed how the parking lot size had been addressed, with the intention of preventing street parking. While the gates' installation would be beneficial for neighborhood safety, Commissioner Lott suggested that it be a recommendation rather than an enforceable condition.

Brad Gibbs expressed his concerns about the noise and dangerous behavior happening near Boondocks every Friday and Saturday night. He lives just 500 steps from the facility, and reported seeing tire screeches and skid marks on Desert Drive, often caused by people doing donuts. He highlighted the risk posed by the area being close to a gymnastics center, dance studio, daycare, and a residential neighborhood, unlike other businesses like Applebee's or Wingers, which are in commercial areas. Gibbs emphasized that even without alcohol being served, the area already has traffic and safety issues that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Ellis expressed hesitation about implementing the suggestion of adding gates or other measures at Boondocks based solely on a few public comments. While she acknowledged the concerns, she was unsure if there was enough evidence to justify such an action, and questioned whether it would be within the city's authority to enforce such a condition. She emphasized the need for more substantial evidence to address the potential impact on the neighborhood.

Ms. Greenwood acknowledged the concerns raised by the neighbors but expressed uncertainty about the city's ability to impose the suggestion of adding gates, citing the lack of clear legal grounds in the current standards. She mentioned that, legally, the city might not have the authority to enforce such a condition, and recommended consulting with legal counsel for further guidance. She also suggested that the issue could be revisited at a future meeting if necessary.

Mary Paul is expressing concerns about Boondocks' changing target market. She pointed out that when Boondocks first came to the community, they marketed themselves as a family-friendly destination, but now, with the proposal to serve alcohol, it seems like they are shifting their focus to attract a much older demographic. She's questioning whether Boondocks has conducted a market analysis to show that this change in their target market is intentional and supported by data. Ms. Paul is concerned that this shift could undermine the family-friendly atmosphere that was initially promised to the neighborhood.

Mr. Damon Day responded to concerns about Boondocks' target market and the potential impact of serving alcohol. He acknowledged that while the addition of alcohol might appeal to an older crowd, it wouldn't fundamentally change the business's character. He explained that

businesses evolve over time to cater to various demographics, and businesses that only target children aren't financially successful. He emphasized that Boondocks strives to create a safe environment for families, children, and adults alike, noting that their alcohol sales would be minimal, far below the percentage typical of bars. He reassured that the focus remains on providing a family-friendly experience, even with the introduction of alcohol.

Ms. Greenwood stepped out to call the City Attorney to inquire the options of requiring Boondocks to have gates at the entrance. Chair Packer suggested moving to agenda item 8 while waiting for a response from the City Attorney. During that time that Commissioner Sommerkorn said that he is in favor of moving ahead without including gates in the motion.

Chair Packer said that he would be uncomfortable applying any condition and that gating and public disturbances are a separate issue.

Ms. Greenwood returned to the meeting and said the City Attorney doesn't believe adding a condition for a gate would be legally defensible.

Commissioner Ellis made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the sale of beer at Boondocks full-service restaurant located at 535 South Deseret Drive based on the findings of staff. Commissioner Sommerkorn seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Ellis - Yay
Chair Packer - Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn - Yay
Commissioner Lott – Yay

7- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE SALE OF LIQUOR AT THE BOONDOCKS FULL- SERVICE RESTAURANT LOCATED AT 525 SOUTH SUNSET DRIVE

Chair Packer asked Ms. Greenwood if staff and Commissioners need to go through item 7 separately.

Ms. Greenwood said the previous discussion was adequate, if the Planning Commission feels comfortable, then she is good to have a motion and a vote.

Commissioner Ellis made a motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the sale of liquor at Boondocks full-service restaurant located at 535 South Deseret Drive based on the findings of staff. Commissioner Sommerkorn seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Ellis - Yay
Chair Packer - Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn - Yay
Commissioner Lott - Yay

8- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 10, 2024 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Sommerkorn made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 14, 2024 Planning Commission meeting and Commissioner Ellis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (4-0).

Commissioner Ellis - Yay
Chair Packer - Yay
Commissioner Sommerkorn - Yay
Commissioner Lott - Yay

9- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood provided updates to the Planning Commission on various initiatives.

Wasatch Front RFP for the Small Area Plan is ready to launch, potentially as early as tomorrow. Nine consulting firms, pre-vetted by Wasatch Front and interested in the project, will be invited to submit proposals. The proposals are expected to be received shortly after Thanksgiving, and the selection process will be jointly handled by the city and Wasatch Front.

The Community Reinvestment Area was presented to the county commissioners during a Tuesday work session. A key concern regarding the use of third-quarter transportation funds has been addressed in the draft interlocal agreement. The agreement now stipulates that any transportation funds received will proportionally reduce the project's funding cap. Pending approval at the next county meeting, Ms. Greenwood is optimistic about its progress.

No Planning Commission meeting will be held on Thanksgiving. The next meeting is scheduled for December 12.

The Planning Commissioner Alternate Interviews are in process, with six interviews that have been conducted and three more planned. Ms. Greenwood emphasized the importance of having a diverse representation on the planning commission, noting the broad range of perspectives among applicants. She concluded by expressing enthusiasm for the quality and scope of the applicants and projects underway.

10- ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Lott motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:46 pm.