EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

April 14, 2020, 5:30 p.m.
Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers
1650 East Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, Utah 84005

5:30 P.M. – Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Work Session

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Matthew Everett, Christopher Pengra, Erin Wells, Rich Wood, and Brett Wright.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Community Development Director; Michael Hadley, Planning Manager; Jessa Porter, Planner; Fionnuala Kofoed, City Recorder; and Elizabeth Fewkes, Recording Secretary.

City Recorder Fionnuala Kofoed explained the procedural adjustments due to the electronic meeting and the proposed interim adjustments to practices relating to the Planning Commission Work Sessions and Policy Meetings.

Public meetings will be held electronically in accordance with Executive Order 2020-1 Suspending the Enforcement of Provisions of Utah Code 52-4-202 and 52-4-207 due to Infectious Disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus issued by Governor Herbert on March 18, 2020.

Commissioner Wood called the work session to order at 5:30 p.m.

1. Discussion Items

1.A. Commercial Regional Zone – Discussion Item

Commissioner Wood thanked the Planning Commission for their efforts in the previous meeting and staff for their efforts during the crisis to facilitate the continuance of City meetings and the fulfillment of Planning Commission responsibilities.

The Planning Commission reviewed Commissioner Wood's Google Doc with suggestions for the creation and of land use designations for Commercial Regional and Office Professional zones. The Commission discussed and amended land usage for public parks, plazas, trails, and open space; grocery stores; tobacco specialty business; pawn shops; check cashing and deferred deposit lenders; and outdoor storage/parking of recreational vehicles, trailers, boats, and similar vehicles.

Commissioner Wood stated the following Planning Commission work session meeting would include zone designations recommendations for the City's General Plan Future Land Use Map. Mr. Mumford explained the land uses are not limited to the zone designation within the General Plan; the Future Land Use Map only denotes the location where the zone is most appropriate.

Commissioner Wood suggested removing the Commercial Development Standards from the General Plan category table and instead include the information as Code verbiage in Eagle Mountain Municipal Code Chapter 17.35 to reduce spacing restrictions and increase clarity.

Commissioner Wood stated he reviewed the land uses of other cities and most have an Office Professional zone and requested the Commission's feedback on the creation and inclusion of the Office Professional zone. Discussion ensued and the Planning Commission determined to recommend the implementation of the Office Professional zone.

1.B. Business Park Zone – Discussion Item

Commissioner Wood expressed concern with lack of use directives in the current Business Park Zone and explained his zoning districts and land use designation suggestions.

Discussion ensued regarding heavy manufacturing and industrial uses and the Commission concluded to further research and discuss concerns and allowance at a future date.

Commissioner Wood requested the Commercial Regional and Office Professional Commercial zones return to the next work and policy sessions and the Business Park zone for work session only.

Commissioner Pengra said the applicant with an Airpark Zone application sent an email to staff requesting to pull his rezone application. Commissioner Wood suggested the removal of the Airpark Zone designation due to the lack of need for the zone after the withdrawal of the application and its exclusion from the General Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

6:30 P.M. – Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Policy Session

Commissioner Wood called the meeting order at 6:32 p.m. and announced the meeting was being held remotely via Lifesize.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

City Recorder Fionnuala Kofoed led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

MOTION: ***Commissioner Wright moved to approve the March 10, 2020 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, and***

Christopher Pengra. Those voting nay: None. The motion carried with a vote of 4:0. Commissioner Wells abstained as she was no in attendance at the March 10, 2020 meeting.

5. Status Report

Community Development Director Steve Mumford said a status report from the previous City Council meeting has been sent via email and informed the Planning Commission the City Council had approved an ordinance amending Municipal Code Chapter 17.35 Commercial Zone, and the Ranches Golf Course and Event Barn Site, with the requirement the applicant provide a detailed putting green plan due to the green counting in place of the fee-in-lieu as an open space amenity for housing units.

6. Action and Advisory Items

Commissioner Wood explained statements of policy and how the public comment portion of the remote meeting would be conducted and commenting options.

6.A. Development Code Amendment – Retaining Walls in PUEs – Public Hearing

Mr. Mumford presented the item and said it is often difficult for property owners to lose five feet of their property to place a retaining wall outside of a public utility easement, especially on smaller lots. While it is important for the City to obtain public utility easements on the backs and sides of lots in case utilities are needed in those areas, the City does not often use them for more than the occasional drainage system. The City Attorney recommended that the Municipal Code be amended to allow the City Engineer the ability to approve retaining walls within public utility easements when he determines that it will not unreasonably interfere with the easement.

Commissioner Wood opened the public hearing at 6:42 p.m. No comments were submitted to the City Recorder's Office phone line at 801.789.6611 or online via the City website at https://eaglemountaincity.com/city-recorder/city-meetings-portal/#meetingdocs, and no public was in attendance to make comment. As there were no comments, Commissioner Wood closed the hearing.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Wells moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the amendment to Eagle Mountain Municipal Code Section 15.80.050 Retaining Walls in PUEs. Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, Christopher Pengra, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.***

6.B. McDonald's – Site Plan & Conditional Use Permit – Public Hearing

Planning Manager Michael Hadley presented the item. This proposed project is for a McDonald's fast food restaurant. This application is for a site plan located in the Porter's Crossing Town Center Lot 3 and is approximately 0.974 acres in size. Porter's Crossing Town

Center was approved by the City Council on May 3, 2011, along with a master site plan; the preliminary plat was approved in April 2011.

Mr. Hadley suggested the Planning Commission consider if the building materials and elevations and the 6-foot-6-inch monument sign, that exceeds the height maximum of five feet, meet the intent of Municipal Code. He stated the monument sign would be located in the southwest corner of the lot.

Mr. Hadley stated staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of the site plan to the City Council with the conditions that the applicant adds rock building materials to the building, the monument sign complies with City requirements, and any additional conditions that the Planning Commission deems appropriate.

Commissioner Pengra verified the lighting complies with the dark sky ordinance. Commissioner Wells verified parking lot access points and expressed concern regarding pedestrian traffic passing across the drive-through lane.

Applicant representative Darrin Perkes explained the site plan is for a standard McDonald's site and said the building faces south with customer entrances on the east side and the southwest corner, and an employee entrance is located on the rear of the building. He explained the three drive-through windows are located on the west side of the building and customers parking to the west of the building would cross the drive-through lane to reach the southwest corner entrance. The drive-through lanes will have stop-bar pavement stripping at the second, main pickup window and at the third pick up window, only used when needed for large orders.

Mr. Perkes said it is common to have parking and successful pedestrian crossings on the drive-through side of McDonald's locations. He explained the site plan included the installation of five-foot safety rail fencing at southwest entrance to prevent pedestrians crossing the drive-through lane at the low-visibility point at the corner of the building.

Commissioner Wood suggested the configuration may be safer if the drive-through windows were moved to the south side of the building, facing Pony Express Parkway, and the drive-through entrance moved to the west side of the building to allow for an increase of parking on the east side of the building, facing Porters Crossing, and to wrap the drive-through traffic to the north to prevent drive-through overflow traffic backing up onto Porters Crossing.

Commissioner Everett said the design adequately addressed pedestrian traffic concerns due to the exclusion of an entrance on the drive-through side of the building, the fencing along the southwest corner, and the likelihood of customers parking on the east side of the building closest to the main entrance. He said requesting a redesign would place undue burden on the applicant.

Discussion ensued regarding drive-through pedestrian and vehicular traffic concerns.

Mr. Perkes explained the double-lane drive-through supports eleven vehicles and that the drive-through traffic stripping indicators direct and wrap the traffic back through the parking lot along the east, south, and west sides of the building before it would back up onto the commercial subdivision driveway access at Porters Crossing.

Commissioner Pengra stated an exhibit in the packet included the queue indicator stripping plan for the parking lot and said traffic backup onto Porters Crossing is unlikely due to the multiple parking lot and drive-through access points.

Mr. Perkes said a 180-degree rotation had been considered for the building but was determined to be unfavorable as the drive-through and the menu boards would front on Pony Express Parkway decreasing the aesthetics of the location and reducing the drive-through queue length. The presented design allows for natural wrapping through the McDonald's parking lot.

Mr. Perkes said the sign company had inadvertently been supplied erroneous height dimension requirements and the error was not discovered in time to allow for a redesign before the submission was due. He stated willingness to modify the sign height to comply with Municipal Code requirements and said the landscape plan design is in the process of alterations to include headlight screening berms and shrubbery. Mr. Perkes said he needed to confer with McDonald's corporate representatives to review branding requirements before agreeing to design alteration recommendations to increase façade rockery materials. He said McDonald's attempts to accommodate cities whenever possible and did not foresee issues with the request to increase the stonework on the monument sign.

Commissioner Wood opened the public hearing at 7:30 p.m. No comments were submitted to the City Recorder's Office phone line at 801.789.6611 or online via the City website at https://eaglemountaincity.com/city-recorder/city-meetings-portal/#meetingdocs, and no public was in attendance to make comment. As there were no comments, Commissioner Wood closed the hearing.

Commissioner Everett suggested requesting the applicant remove the drive-through painting indicators on the east parking lot access to make the access an exit only. He expressed appreciation of the applicant's willingness to adhere to Code requirements.

Commissioner Pengra stated that McDonald's has experience in construction, layout, and traffic flow and did not have concerns with the site plan.

Commissioner Wright said the drive-through design addressed pedestrian safety issues. He agreed with traffic flow concerns and said indicating the east parking lot access as an exit only through signage would help to direct traffic to wrap through the parking lot. He agreed it was appropriate to request design alterations to meet design aesthetics of other businesses in the area.

Commissioner Wells expressed concerns the drive-through traffic wrapping through the parking lot would increase pedestrian hazards and cause parking obstructions. She acknowledged the experience McDonald's has in facility layout and was not aware of a better solution to address her concerns.

Discussion ensued regarding drive-through and traffic concerns.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Everett moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the McDonald's site plan with the following conditions:***

1. ***The applicant shall add rock masonry details to the building;***
2. ***The monument sign shall comply with City height requirements and the applicant shall add rock masonry details similar to other signage in the area; and***
3. ***The east parking lot access drive-through stripping indicators shall be removed.***

Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, Christopher Pengra, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Everett moved to approve the McDonald's conditional use permit. Commissioner Wood seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, Christopher Pengra, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.***

6.C. Parkway Crossroads – Recorded Plat Amendment - Action Item

Mr. Hadley presented the item. Parkway Crossroads is a mixed-use commercial project located at the southeast corner of Ranches Parkway and Pony Express Parkway. This is an application for a recorded plat amendment for the Parkway Crossroads development, vacating the existing lots 3 & 4 and creating two new lots for new development. The new Parkway Crossroads site plan was approved by the City Council on January 21, 2020. Staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the Parkway Crossroads recorded plat amendment with no conditions of approval. Mr. Hadley presented the recorded plat to clarify the item.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Pengra moved to recommend approval to the City Council of the Parkway Crossroads Recorded Plat Amendment. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Brett Wright, Rich Wood, Christopher Pengra, and Erin Wells. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.***

Commissioner Wood recessed the meeting at 7:50 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

6.D. Overland Village 2 Concept Plan

Commissioner Wood explained that due to the Master Development Agreement the concept plan included an action item.

Mr. Mumford presented the item and cited the Overland Master Development Agreement (Section 6.4) that requires the review and approval of a village concept plan for each village prior to approving other development applications within the village. It states, "Master Developer shall present to the Planning Commission and City Council a Village Concept Plan, and a traffic study based on the Village Concept Plan, before submitting any Development Application for any such Village. Each Village Concept Plan shall generally illustrate the various types of housing, where density of Residential Dwelling Units within each Village will be located, the location and size of parks and trail improvements, the location of roads and infrastructure improvements, and any potential locations for schools, churches, or other civic or community uses."

Mr. Mumford explained the Overland Master Development Plan (MDP) designates Village 2 with a minimum unit count of 540 units/lots and a maximum count of 743. The proposed Village 2 concept plan includes the maximum number of units/lots, 743, and includes a mix of lot sizes and housing types. The lots range in size from the smallest, at about 5,200 square feet, to the largest, at about 11,200 square feet. An approximate percentage breakdown of the lot sizes is as follows: 33% Townhomes, 22% Cottage at 5,200 square feet, 15% Collection at 6,000 square feet, 4% Garden at 6,500 square feet, 14% Collection at 8,000 square feet, 10% Estate at 10,000 to 11,000 square feet, and 2% Homesteads at 11,000+ square feet.

Mr. Mumford said the proposed village plan also includes a ten-acre elementary school site, already owned by the Alpine School District. Although this concept plan maximizes the allowed density, it is unlikely that the maximum number of units will ultimately be developed in this village. Increases in lot sizes, reductions in units, minor changes to road and lot configurations, and minor changes to trail locations and park locations are not considered major changes and would not require an amendment to this village concept plan. These changes can be proposed/made at the preliminary plat stage.

Mr. Mumford suggested the Planning Commission consider the Section 6.4 requirements of the Overland MDA. Areas with MDA requirement compliance concerns include: the MDA requires a minimum of a three-acre park to be improved in village two instead of the two two-acre parks in the plan; the proposed 242 units of townhomes may be an inappropriate large number to be located at a two-road intersection and the area has insufficient open space; cul-de-sacs exceeding the maximum length of 250 feet, per the City's connectivity code; the exclusion of potential locations for schools, churches, and other civic and community uses; the exclusion of trails approved in the master trail plan and the need for additional trails to provide better connectivity and recreation throughout the village; the north-south road in the middle of the development connects to the north, potentially bringing traffic from Oquirrh Mountain, Lone Tree, and future development through this project, in front of all of homes that front along this street; and the applicant may consider amending the MDP/MDA to allow for some commercial development at the southeast corner (major intersection) or the northwest portion of the development.

Mr. Mumford stated that staff recommends the following conditions, should the Planning Commission determine to recommend approval to the City Council should the concept plan comply with the Overland MDP and MDA: 1. The north-south road in the middle of the development shall be upgraded to a minor collector road; 2. The park shall be increased to a minimum of three acres, and be moved to a new location (either adjacent to the hilltop park or more centralized in the village); 3. Additional trails shall be added to improve connectivity throughout the village; 4. The cul-de-sacs shall not exceed 250 feet in length; 5. Additional open space shall be added to the townhome area to improve the livability; and 6. Potential church locations shall be shown on the plan or on another exhibit. Mr. Mumford stated plan amendments submitted to staff addressed and met conditions two, four, and six.

Mr. Mumford said the concept plan meets the requirements for lot transitioning at the time of the MDA's creation and explained the MDA restrictions in Section 6.3 limiting multifamily units to villages five and eight indicated apartments and condominiums and does not prohibit townhomes units in the other villages.

Applicant representative Byron Prince with Ivory Development clarified that townhomes were not excluded in the multifamily restrictions defined in the agreement as the townhomes units are not stacked vertically and the underlying ground the unit sits on would be owned by the home owners, and the community areas would be owned by the HOA.

Mr. Prince stated, a few months ago, he had a heated debate with Councilmember Colby Curtis regarding the interpretation of the MDA. He said Councilmember Curtis expressed frustration because the total number of units included on the preliminary plat for Village One exceeded the concept plan by a few units. Mr. Prince said the number of units was still under the maximum number of units allowed per the MDA. Mr. Price recalled that Councilmember Curtis said he was being disingenuous and directed him to present "the worst-case scenario" in future concept plans to show the maximum number of units that may be included in the final preliminary plat. Mr. Prince said, as a result of the discussion, he prepared a "worst-case scenario" concept plan including the maximum density allowed per the MDA, even though the concept plan does not reflect his intended design, his preferred approach, or good planning practices. He said the preliminary plat would depict the actual design plans for Village Two, which contains fewer housing units, and hopefully earn the favor and approval of the City Council.

Mr. Prince explained the actual plan includes the various sizes of single-family lots as presented and would most likely result in a replacement of approximately half of the townhomes with additional single-family units. He explained he arbitrarily increased the townhome units to reach the maximum allowable density.

Commissioner Pengra said he appreciated Mr. Prince accommodating the Councilmember's request and stated his preference to see what is planned over a maximum density proposal.

Commissioner Wells concurred with Commissioner Pengra's preference to review the intended plans and noted the difficulty in evaluating staff's recommendations due to the arbitrary number of townhomes impact on the recommendations.

Mr. Prince explained the MDA limits commercial development to Villages 5 and 8. He expressed willingness to allow commercial development in Village 2, if a business expressed interest and were permitted.

Commissioner Wood expressed hesitation in approving a concept plan that did not reflect the intended or desired plans and suggested the inclusion of a concept plan B of the actual plans.

Mr. Prince said, due to the direction he received from the Council, he preferred to move forward with the presented concept plan but offered to allow the Planning Commission to view the intended concept plan.

Commissioner Everett expressed concern that he did not have time to review the concept plan changes that had been submitted to staff and verified the townhomes would have rear-loading garages.

Mr. Prince explained he had spoken with representatives from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints regarding potential chapel sites and, due to chapel sites located in other villages, a site is not currently needed for Village 2. He reserved an area with favorable topography in the western corner of the village, due to its distance from the school and other church sites, should a church site be needed in the future.

Mr. Mumford displayed the Village 2 initial concept plan, before the changes to meet Councilmember Curtis' request for a maximum density. Mr. Prince explained the lot size designation differences.

Commission Pengra said the Commission and Mr. Prince have both been placed in a difficult position and he was unsure how to move forward. Mr. Prince requested the Planning Commission only consider the submitted concept plan in their decision to prevent complications with the City Council.

Commissioner Wood expressed discomfort in voting on a concept plan that was neither what the applicant intended to build nor what was in the best interest of the City. He suggested including the initial and revised concept plans in the City Council proposal.

Mr. Prince expressed a willingness to include both plans and stated the purpose of a concept plan process is not to define exact density but to provide a general sense of layout and amenities.

Commissioner Wood said the maximum density concept plan complicates a recommendation for approval due to the increase in open space requirements due to the high number of units.

Mr. Prince explained the MDA allowed for a cash donation of $1.71 million to Cory Wride Memorial Park in lieu of open space. The only open space requirement for Village 2 is a three-acre park.

Mr. Prince said traffic issues are difficult to anticipate and the study did not take into account the traffic from future developments to the north. He said he was willing to discuss the potential need of a minor collector road with staff before meeting with the City Council.

Mr. Prince explained the grouping of lot sizes was intended to provide adequate transitioning while maintaining a mix of architecture and housing types without the optics of economic segregation.

Commissioner Wright said, although the Planning Commission does not like and the applicant does not plan to build the presented concept plan, per the terms of the MDA, the applicant would be allowed to build it. He said the Planning Commission should only vet the presented concept plan in accordance with Code requirements, not Commission preference. He agreed with the staff recommendation to increase the size of the main road to a minor collector road to facilitate traffic flow. He suggested the inclusion of additional trails and open space and the placement of the three-acre park in a more accessible location.

Commissioner Pengra said the MDA predates many of the City's current Code requirements and agreed the Planning Commission should make the decision on the application as presented not discussed. He stated he did not believe Councilmember Curtis anticipated the impact of his maximum density concept plan request. He said the role of the Planning Commission is to vet the application against Code to facilitate City Council decisions. He suggested for Commission Wood speak with the Mayor and Councilmembers to indicate the Planning Commission's preferences and concerns.

Commissioner Everett stated the applicant and the Planning Commission have been put in a difficult position. He proposed tabling the application due to significant alterations to the concept plan being submitted hours before the meeting. He expressed frustration to have major changes and insufficient time to adequately review them.

Commissioner Wood also stated opposition to permitting last-minute changes to an application with insufficient time to review the amended plan.

Commissioner Wright stated the desire for a mutually beneficial, respectful relationship between the applicant and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Mumford explained the action item requirements of the MDA and options for tabling or recommending approval to the City Council with the condition of presenting the intended concept plan in addition to the maximum density concept plan requested by Councilmember Curtis.

Mr. Mumford stated the expansion of a north to south road into a minor collector road would require significant concept plan alterations due to the resulting relocation of roads and lots to prevent units fronting on the minor collector road. He presented the Future Land Use and Transportation Corridor Plan that was completed after the Overland MDA and MDP were approved and explained the closure of the Jake Garn Airport and City expansion resulted in the need for an additional minor collector road running north to south through the Overland development, linking Pony Express Parkway and Wride Memorial Highway.

Discussion ensued regarding concerns the allowance of application changes after the submission deadline, uncertainty in drafting conditions where the plan does not reflect the intent of the applicant, and the resulting difficulty in fulfilling their responsibilities as a Planning Commission.

Mr. Prince explained the placement of the park in Village 2 was due to the location of parks within other villages. He agreed to work with staff to adjust the location or size of the park and/or the trails within the City rights-of-way. He said the only changes from the original submission were the addition of a section of trail and the increase in the park size. Mr. Prince stated if the Planning Commission were to table the item in order to have more time to review the changes, he did not intend to make changes to the concept plan.

Commissioner Wells asked Mr. Prince if he would be willing to change the application should Councilmember Curtis rescind his requirement for a maximum density concept plan. Mr. Prince expressed a willingness to change the concept plan to the intended design if desired by both the Planning Commission and City Council. He stated regardless of the concept plan presented, per the MDA, he could legally increase or decrease the number of housing units during the final design phases of the project.

Commissioner Pengra requested clarification regarding Mr. Prince's reasons for adhering to Councilmember Curtis' request for a maximum density concept plan regardless of the Planning Commission's and other Councilmembers directives.

Mr. Prince stated he had not anticipated the Planning Commission's request for the intended concept plan. He expressed frustration with the process, because it makes him appear disingenuous. He stated a second Councilmember agreed with the request for a maximum density concept plan and the intended concept plan had been submitted prior to his discussion with the City Council. He said he intends to adhere to the concept plan with 630 units. However, changes in the market or other factors could causes alterations to the plan.

Commissioner Pengra said he would never accuse Mr. Prince of being disingenuous and the applicant can alter the concept plan regardless of Planning Commission recommendations.

Commission Wells suggested for staff to discuss concept plan alteration recommendations with the applicant and for the Commissioner Wood to discuss the Planning Commission concerns with the City Council prior to the next meeting.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Everett moved to table the Overland Village 2 concept plan until the next scheduled Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Pengra seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Matthew Everett, Rich Wood, Christopher Pengra, and Erin Wells. Those voting nay: Brett Wright. The motion carried with a vote of 4:1.***

7. Discussion Items

8. Next scheduled meeting

Discussing ensued regarding the agenda items for the next Planning Commission meeting on April 28, 2020.

Mr. Mumford asked for clarification regarding application change submissions. He explained he has allowed for minor changes that attempt to address staff recommendations to be sent to the Planning Commission after the deadline and to be discussed during the meeting. He requested direction from the Planning Commission regarding plan changes.

Commissioner Wright stated he voted against tabling the Overland Village 2 concept plan, because the changes were minor and addressed staff recommendations.

Commissioner Everett said he felt the changes were significant, and he had not been aware of the alterations until they were discussed during the meeting. He expressed the desire to have specific guidelines to facilitate consistency in staff decisions to accept or reject late application alterations.

Commissioner Wood said the purpose of the policies and procedures is to prevent subjective judgements on applications to prevent the appearance of favoritism and to provide direction and set expectations.

Commissioner Pengra said the refusal to accept late submissions may slow the application process or put staff in difficult positions. He suggested allowing flexibility to permit changes with the expectation that the Planning Commission would table the item should the alterations be deemed excessive and said the intention of the policy is to prevent the addition of new items not changes to address staff recommendations.

Commissioner Wood suggested discussing an amendment to provide staff direction in the next meeting.

Mr. Mumford said staff allows as much flexibility as possible with the submission timeframe but will refuse new materials submitted significantly after the deadline. He said the purpose in including late submission alterations is partially to ensure the Planning Commission is aware of all the materials and changes given to staff. He stated staff will adhere to policies and procedures as much as possible and send emails with additional materials and alterations as soon as possible then follow the Planning Commission's directives concerning those submissions.

Mr. Mumford and the Planning Commission expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Recorder's Office staff in facilitating and running the remote meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

MOTION: ***Commissioner Pengra moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wells seconded the motion. No vote was called.***

9. Adjournment

Approved by the Planning Commission on April 28, 2020.

Steve Mumford

Steve Mumford, AICP
Community Development Director

Signature: Steve Mumford (Apr 30, 2020)

Email: smumford@emcity.org

4996_001

Final Audit Report 2020-04-30

Created:	2020-04-30
By:	Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAASo6X2vZgeNVw_B2HnSeQXslxZkwTthEr

"4996_001" History

Document created by Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)
2020-04-30 - 2:15:59 PM GMT- IP address: 206.251.40.168

Document emailed to Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org) for signature
2020-04-30 - 2:16:24 PM GMT

Email viewed by Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org)
2020-04-30 - 3:35:34 PM GMT- IP address: 71.195.219.107

Document e-signed by Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org)
Signature Date: 2020-04-30 - 3:36:40 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 71.195.219.107

Signed document emailed to Steve Mumford (smumford@emcity.org) and Shawna Ellis (sellis@emcity.org)
2020-04-30 - 3:36:40 PM GMT