

1 **2.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS**
2

3 Nancy Hardy detailed an article in *The Salt Lake Tribune* focusing on the Mountain Accord and
4 reporting that it is a consensus effort and a good plan. When polled in 2012, 92% of Utahans’
5 stated they would like to see the Wasatch protected from additional development and
6 recreational access preserved.
7

8 Richard Nelson gave his address as 7854 South Honeycomb Road. He has lived at this address
9 for 25 years and is greatly concerned about the degradation of his neighborhood. Officer Lovato
10 has been present on many occasions and is not getting much attraction in their area. The traffic
11 problems are severe and are due to the duplexes in the area.
12

13 Commissioner Guymon asked Mr. Nelson to comment when the item comes up again on the
14 agenda. The benefit was that staff can then contribute to the conversation. City Planner, Mike
15 Johnson, pointed out that this is an on-street parking issue and not specific to any one property.
16 Mr. Nelson wished to bring it to the attention of the City. Parking is his primary concern and
17 because of the rental situation, they are not owner occupied units. As a result, one of the
18 duplexes is owned by a business owner and the garages are used to store his business inventory,
19 which eliminates parking. The other duplex garages are also full and are not being utilized for
20 parking.
21

22 (18:11:31) Josh Romney gave his address as 3575 Honeycomb and stated that this issue goes
23 beyond the parking issue. He expressed concern with the safety of residents. With the increased
24 traffic, the total number of cars is continually increasing. Cars turning off of Bengal Boulevard
25 are also turning into the neighborhood. The cars in the neighborhood have obscured visibility
26 along that particular street which is creating a safety hazard.
27

28 Kevin Lavin gave his address as 7865 South Honeycomb Road where he has lived for one year.
29 With two small children, they can only to play on the opposite side of the street because the
30 farther up they go, the worse the parking problem gets. Keeping children contained in the
31 neighborhood is difficult and he expressed concern for their safety. The installation of speed
32 bumps was the least that should be done to mitigate the problem.
33

34 Mr. Johnson pointed out that there is an application or petition for traffic calming available
35 through the City website or from staff. Doing so will initiate the process for petitioning some
36 sort of traffic calming or safety mitigation on that street. Because this is a public street, there are
37 certain rights to park along it if it is not posted otherwise. The posting of signs would also be
38 another option.
39

40 (18:18:00) City Attorney, Shane Topham, suggested that the residents explain the situation to the
41 City Council. This is outside the purview of the Planning Commission but the responsibility of
42 the City Council. They can redirect Public Works to look at traffic calming in conjunction with
43 the City Engineer. Mr. Topham recommended this be presented at a future Business Meeting in
44 order to voice their concerns. He explained that the Planning Commission does not have the
45 ability to direct City departments, but can pass information to staff.

1
2 There were no additional citizen comments.

3
4 **3.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5
6 **3.1 (Project #SUB-16-002) Public Comment on a Request from Hamlet**
7 **Development for a Two-Lot Subdivision that Affects Lot 304 of the**
8 **Honeywood Hills 3 Subdivision, Located at 7824 South Honeycomb Road.**
9

10 (18:21:45) Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and stated that the proposal is for a lot split
11 located at 7824 South Honeycomb Road. There is currently an undeveloped lot and any time a
12 lot is subdivided or modified, Planning Commission approval is required. It is the applicant's
13 intent to build a two-family building where each side would have individual ownership and be
14 split directly down the center of the property.

15
16 Michael Brodsky, from Hamlet Homes, gave his address as 308 East 4500 South and stated they
17 are proposing two for sale homes. They measure approximately 2,800 square feet per side, come
18 with an oversized two car garage, and two-car parking in the driveway. He anticipated selling
19 each home for around \$400,000. The finishing details were described. Mr. Brodsky stated that
20 the intent is for the homes to be sold and generally owner occupied. Hamlet Homes is a builder
21 of residential homes and he emphasized that they do not do rentals. A permitted use was
22 requested. The lot subdivision would allow them to have two fee simple lots, also known as a
23 zero lot line configuration.

24
25 Chair Guymon raised a question regarding the recording of any covenants to address the
26 maintenance responsibilities regarding the dividing wall. Mr. Brodsky stated that there is no
27 association for them to be able to record the covenant with. He has, however, prepared language
28 detailing the responsibilities and obligations of those who share the party wall. This is a
29 permitted use and was contemplated with the R-2-8 Zoning. The lots would measure 5,200
30 square feet and 4,800 square feet.

31
32 (18:29:56) Chair Guymon opened the public hearing.

33
34 Marsha Collin gave her address as 7858 Honeycomb Circle and expressed concern with the
35 parking situation. She compared the proposal with others previously built and because of their
36 large size, many have several unrelated people occupying them. This could ultimately lead to
37 eight additional cars on the already problematic parking. Mr. Johnson pointed out that restricted
38 covenants are potentially privately enforceable, but the City would refer to the zoning ordinance
39 and proceed with any regulations to it. The subdivision does not relate to the zoning of a
40 property and parcel specific zone. Restrictive covenants would need to be acted on by land
41 owners as a group to enforce them.

42
43 Mr. Topham stated that restrictive covenants would need to be acted upon and enforced by the
44 landowners as a group. Depending on what the restrictions state, they would typically provide a
45 cause of action for a homeowner's association or individual. It is a contract among the

1 landowners that is imposed by the developer who records the restricted covenants against the
2 subdivision before lots are sold.

3
4 Mr. Brodsky reported that part of the due diligence on a parcel of property is to pull a title report
5 and identify restrictive covenants recorded against them. There are currently none on the subject
6 properties.

7
8 (18:36:58) There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

9
10 **3.2 (Project #SP-16-001) Public Comment on a Request from Rick**
11 **Campbell/Willow Creek Pet Center for a Program for Signs Located at 2055**
12 **East Creek Road.**

13
14 (18:37:00) Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and reported that this is an application for a
15 program for signs located at 2055 East Creek Road. The property is zoned R-R-143, one-acre
16 low density residential. There is a conditional use on the property allowing for the operation of a
17 veterinary hospital. The intent of a nearby residential zone is to allow for low impact, smaller
18 scale commercial uses that adequately buffer busy streets from adjacent residential areas. The
19 sign ordinance was detailed. The applicant is seeking to take advantage of a provision that
20 allows them to go outside of the underlying sign ordinance by proposing to convert either the
21 existing ornament signs to LED display signs or construct monument signs in the same place,
22 also with an LED display. Both sign proposals were received by staff.

23
24 Next reviewed were the standards for approval that state that the Planning Commission may
25 approve a program for signs if the signs visually represented in the program are:

- 26
27 1. Consistent with the purposes of this chapter;
28
29 2. Compatible with the theme, visual quality, and overall character of the surrounding
30 area or an Area of Special Character, if the signs included in the Program for Signs
31 are located in such an area; and
32
33 3. Appropriately related in size, shape, materials, lettering, color, illumination, and
34 character to the function and architectural character of the building or premises on
35 which they will be displayed, and are compatible with existing adjacent activities.
36 After staff's review, they found that it is not compatible with the existing character of
37 the area based on the low density nature of the land uses and recommended denial.

38
39 (18:42:58) The applicant, Dr. Rick Campbell, stated he has owned and operated Willow Creek
40 Pet Center for the last 33 years and has counseled Salt Lake County Animal Control and the
41 Humane Society on animal control issues. The Cottonwood Heights Police Department has
42 approached him regarding being the City's Animal Control Center. The proposed signage would
43 help their center find owners for the lost animals. He believed that if microchipping was part of
44 the licensing program, there would be little or no need for animal control. With the use of an
45 electronic sign, all of their services could be listed and residents would be made aware of the

1 options available. Animal control costs could potentially be reduced by 90%. He pointed out
2 that both Brighton High School and Platinum Car Wash currently have electronic signage.

3
4 Chair Guymon opened the public hearing.

5
6 (18:50:06) Connie Barry gave her address as 8077 South Spectrum Cove and stated that her
7 home overlooks the west side of Willow Creek Pet Center. She expressed concern with the
8 electronic signage polluting her home and opposed the request.

9
10 A question was raised regarding restrictions being placed on times the signage is illuminated.
11 Mr. Johnson confirmed that conditions could be placed on any approval granted.

12
13 Brian Briscoe, from Young Electric Sign Company, pointed out that Dr. Campbell's main
14 concern was for the neighbors. The possibility of rotating the northbound signage to help
15 mitigate any disturbance was also explored. He explained that there are ways to control the
16 lumens output, which can be digitally controlled. With the use of photo cells, they are able to
17 automatically turn down by half of their daytime use. He added that they have the capability to
18 eliminate a lot of the neighbors' concerns.

19
20 Joyce Shell, who lives on the corner of Creek Road and Highland Drive, raised a question as to
21 the number of cars that frequent the intersection. She believed it was a very beautiful
22 neighborhood area that has a serious traffic issue that is destroying the residential nature of the
23 street. She believed that over time the noise will spread and she asked how the proposed
24 signage, if approved, will impact the other three corners.

25
26 Chair Guymon clarified that each application is considered on its own merit and two of the other
27 corners are within the Sandy City boundary.

28
29 (18:59:08) Lynne Kraus gave her address as 2407 East 7745 South and stated that she agrees
30 with the staff recommendation. She appreciated Dr. Campbell's willingness to help and educate
31 City residents, but believes the proposed signage is out of character for the surrounding areas.
32 She suggested he use the newsletter to inform and educate the public.

33
34 There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

35 36 **4.0 ACTION ITEMS**

37 38 **4.1 (Project #SUB-16-002) Action on a Request from Hamlet Development for a** 39 **Two-Lot Subdivision that Affects Lot 304 of the Honeywood Hills** 40 **3 Subdivision, Located at 7824 South Honeycomb Road.**

41
42 (19:00:28) *Commissioner Orr moved to postpone the above item to a later date to allow the*
43 *Planning Commission time to review it in more detail. The motion failed for lack of a second.*
44

1 *Commissioner Jones moved to approve Project #SUB-16-002, action on a request by Hamlet*
2 *Development, for approval of a subdivision plat amendment of Lot 304 of the Honeywood*
3 *Hills 3 Subdivision located at 7824 S Honeycomb Road, subject to the following:*

4
5 **Conditions:**

- 6
7 1. *The applicant shall work with staff to address all technical corrections on the*
8 *preliminary plat, in compliance with all applicable City ordinance regulations.*
9
10 2. *The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits prior to constructing any new*
11 *structure on the proposed lots.*

12
13 **Findings:**

- 14
15 1. *The proposed subdivision meets the applicable provisions of the Cottonwood Heights*
16 *subdivision ordinance and the Cottonwood Heights zoning ordinance.*
17
18 2. *Proper notice was given in accordance with local and state requirements.*
19
20 3. *A public hearing was held in accordance with local and state requirements.*

21
22 *Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion.*

23
24 In response to a question raised, Mr. Johnson stated that the applicant could have constructed a
25 two-family dwelling and applied for ownership after the fact which guarantees that each side will
26 be owned privately.

27
28 *Commissioner Bevan amended his second and emphasized the need for a party wall*
29 *agreement.*

30
31 Commissioner Peters was of the opinion that the subdivision is a benefit to the community as it
32 provides an opportunity for a two-dwelling property to be sold, rather than rented.

33
34 Chair Guymon and Commissioner Griffin recused themselves due to a conflict of interest.

35
36 *Vote on motion: Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Commissioner Jones-Aye, Commissioner Orr-Aye,*
37 *Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Commissioner Peters-Aye. The motion passed unanimously with*
38 *two abstentions. Alternate Joseph Demma did not participate in the vote.*

39
40 **4.2 (Project #HOC-16-001) Action on a Request from Jonathan and Dana**
41 **Middlemiss for a Conditional Use Permit to Operate a Home Preschool at**
42 **3571 East Summer Hill Drive.**

43
44 (19:06:40) Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and stated that after the hearing the public
45 comment portion was closed at the last meeting, they received additional written comments.

1 They were not passed on to the Commission because the public comment period was closed,
2 however, they were available for review.

3
4 In response to a Commission Member's question regarding Section 19.76.040, Land Use,
5 Mr. Johnson stated that home daycare or preschool uses meets the definition of a home
6 occupation. It is more specifically regulated within the chapter, but is a type of home
7 occupation, which is how it has been interpreted and applied to cases like this in the past.
8 Although there are three separate sections, they are all treated as home occupations.

9
10 (19:10:35) *Commissioner Peters moved to recommend approval of #HOC-16-001, a request*
11 *from Jonathan and Dana Middlemiss for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a home*
12 *preschool at 3571 East Summer Hill Drive subject to the following:*

13
14 **Conditions:**

- 15
16 1. *There shall be a maximum of 12 children on the premises at any time, including the*
17 *caregiver's own children under the age of six and not yet in full-day school*
18 *(19.76.040.E.1).*
- 19
20 2. *There shall be no more than one employee present at any one time who does not*
21 *reside in the dwelling (19.76.040.E.2).*
- 22
23 3. *The home preschool caregiver shall comply with all applicable licensing*
24 *requirements under Title 5 ("Business Licensing") of the Cottonwood Heights*
25 *Municipal Code (19.76.404.E.3).*
- 26
27 4. *The use shall comply with all applicable noise regulations (19.76.040.E.4).*
- 28
29 5. *The play yard shall not be located in the front yard and only shall be used between*
30 *8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. (19.76.040.E.5).*
- 31
32 6. *The lot shall contain one available onsite parking space not required for use of the*
33 *dwelling for any employee not residing in the dwelling (19.76.040.E.6).*
- 34
35 7. *No signs shall be allowed on the dwelling or lot except a nameplate sign*
36 *(19.76.040.E.7).*
- 37
38 8. *The use shall comply with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations*
39 *(19.76.00.E.8) including but not limited to all applicable requirements of the Utah*
40 *Department of Health's Bureau of Child Development.*
- 41
42 9. *The applicant and all employees shall provide a copy of all licenses and permits*
43 *required by the State of Utah.*
- 44
45 10. *The applicant shall adhere to the hours and days of operation as described in the*
46 *written narrative submitted as part of the project application.*

- 1
2 **1. The applicant shall adhere to the drop off and pickup times and methods as**
3 **described in the written narrative submitted as part of the project application.**
4

5 **Findings:**
6

- 7 **11. The proposed home preschool conforms to applicable home occupation and home**
8 **preschool requirements, as found in the Cottonwood Heights Zoning Ordinance**
9 **(Title 19) and Business License Ordinance (Title 5).**
10

- 11 **12. The proposed home preschool is clearly secondary and incidental to the primary use**
12 **of the property as a single-family residence.**
13

- 14 **13. The proposed conditions of approval act to mitigate any perceived negative impacts**
15 **created by the applicant's proposal.**
16

17 **Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.**
18

19 (19:11:17) Commissioner Bevan considered this to be a good idea. He stated that the applicant
20 has a history and knows how to operate such a business.
21

22 Commissioner Ryser pointed out that the traffic issue is a legitimate concern. Having had
23 experience with this type of business, there will be staggered drop off and pick up times and
24 moving efficiently helps mitigate potential concerns.
25

26 Commissioner Jones stated that he has two similar businesses near his home and has yet to see a
27 problem.
28

29 Commissioner Griffin believed it to be a good accommodation for the City that will ensure the
30 safety of children by keeping them inside the neighborhood.
31

32 Commissioner Orr detailed General Plan Section 1.5 under Guided Principles, which states that
33 the community wishes to protect low-density residential neighborhoods from incompatible uses.
34 Section 19.26.030 of the R-1-8 Zone allows home occupations as a conditional use. He defined
35 home occupations and stated that Section 19.31.020 for R-2-8 provides home occupations as a
36 permitted use and daycares and preschools as conditional uses. It was his opinion that if daycare
37 and preschools are to be conditional uses in the R-1-8 zone, the Code would specify that. He
38 believed this was not a conditional use, is incompatible with the neighborhood, and will change
39 the nature of it.
40

41 (19:17:01) **Vote on motion: Commissioner Griffin-Aye, Commissioner Peters-Aye,**
42 **Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Commissioner Orr-Nay, Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Commissioner**
43 **Jones-Aye, Commissioner Guymon-Nay. The motion passed with a 5-to-2 vote. Alternate**
44 **Joseph Demma did not participate in the vote.**
45

1 **4.3 (Project #ZMA-15-003) Action on a Request from Grant Kesler for a**
2 **General Plan Amendment, Zone Map Amendment and Development**
3 **Agreement on Approximately 15 Acres of Land Located at 9361 South North**
4 **Little Cottonwood Canyon Road.**

5
6 (19:18:04) Senior Planner, Glen Goins, reported that at the close of the last meeting, a written
7 comment section was left open for one week to allow time for the Granite Community Council to
8 formalize their comment and submit a response. It has been received along with approximately
9 130 other comments in opposition to the proposal. There is a necessary protection of open space,
10 a precedent that is set as well as protection in a F-20 zone. The Granite Community Council's
11 response echoed the same sentiment brought up at the last hearing in addition to an amended
12 submittal received within the allotted time. A number of comments have been submitted since
13 the meeting but they are not included because they were received after the cutoff date. The
14 objections are based on the existing zone and private property rights and together, both would
15 qualify for just a single home in the zone. In response to a question raised, Mr. Goins reported
16 that he has not received any information that would alter staff's recommendation to approve the
17 requested zone map change. He reported that the application is consistent with the Granite
18 Community General Plan.

19
20 Chair Guymon pointed out that they are not acting on a development agreement. One of the
21 items associated with the development agreement would impose either a conservation easement
22 or a conservation deed prohibiting development on slopes of 30% grade or greater. It would also
23 prohibit the City from granting density bonuses or clustering density as a result of the open
24 space.

25
26 Mr. Goins explained that as a result of the development agreement that was drafted and agreed
27 upon, no PUD can be applied for. This agreement would tie the land not necessarily the owner.

28
29 (19:25:38) *Commissioner Griffin moved to forward a positive recommendation for Project*
30 *#ZMA-15-003 request from Grant Kesler for a General Plan Amendment, Zone Map*
31 *Amendment, and Development Agreement on approximately 15 acres of land located at 9361*
32 *South North Little Cottonwood Canyon Road based on the following:*

33
34 ***Findings:***

- 35
36 ***1. The zone map/change is consistent with the Granite Community General Plan; and***
37
38 ***2. The required public hearing has been held.***

39
40 ***Commissioner Peters seconded the motion.***

41
42 A comment was made that the applicants have been very forthcoming and worked very hard to
43 comply with staff's requests.

44
45 Chair Guymon stated that the primary reason the Commission recommended denial was because
46 the application was received in such a way that the open space and slope areas could be counted,

1 resulting in additional density. The applicant took that into account and returned with a proposal
2 voluntarily agreeing to restrictions where open space would not be counted toward additional
3 density.

4
5 Commissioner Orr reviewed Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of the General Plan and stated that each zone in
6 the City has requirements that keep uses consistent with the zone and in harmony with the
7 General Plan. Each has benefits to the community. He was of the belief that the applicant needs
8 to show that the benefits to the community and residents outweigh the benefits of the existing
9 zone. The applicant has yet to demonstrate that or that the application is consistent with the
10 General Plan or amending the General Plan. The FR-20 zone has the legitimate public objectives
11 of protecting the foothills and canyon areas and their natural and scenic resources.

12
13 Mr. Topham suggested that a positive recommendation be coupled with a suggestion or
14 requirement that the rezone be done in conjunction with the Development Agreement.

15
16 *Chair Guymon amended the motion to forward a positive recommendation including the*
17 *requirement that as part of the ultimate approval, there would be a final approved*
18 *Development Agreement preserving the open space as discussed. Commissioner Peters*
19 *seconded the motion.*

20
21 Commissioner Peters was of the opinion the view scape will be enhanced by a handful of homes
22 on the property and will preserve the view shed.

23
24 *Vote on motion: Commissioner Griffin-Aye, Commissioner Peters-Aye, Commissioner Bevan-*
25 *Aye, Commissioner Orr-Nay, Commissioner Ryser-Nay, Commissioner Jones-Nay,*
26 *Commissioner Guymon-Aye. The motion passed 4-to-3. Alternate Joseph Demma did not*
27 *participate in the vote.*

28
29 **4.4 (Project #ZMA-15-004) Action on a Request from Rola V, LLC for a General**
30 **Plan Amendment, Zone Map Amendment, and Development Agreement on**
31 **Approximately 11.54 Acres of Land Located at 3801 East North Little**
32 **Cottonwood Canyon Road.**

33
34 Mr. Goins stated that the above matter is similar to the one preceding it.

35
36 *Commissioner Griffin moved to forward a positive recommendation for Project #ZMA-15-004*
37 *on a request from Rola V, LLC, for a General Plan Amendment, Zone Map Amendment, and*
38 *Development Agreement on approximately 11.54 acres of land located at 3801 East North*
39 *Little Cottonwood Canyon Road based on the following findings and as modified by the*
40 *conditions and the development agreement as discussed.*

41
42 ***Findings:***

- 43
44 ***1. The zone map/change is consistent with the Granite Community General Plan; and***
45
46 ***2. The required public hearing has been held.***

1
2 *Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion.*

3
4 Chair Guymon asked if all would agree that prior comments apply with equal force. All of the
5 Commission Members present agreed to incorporate by reference their comments on the prior
6 application.

7
8 *Vote on motion: Commissioner Griffin-Aye, Commissioner Peters-Aye, Commissioner Bevan-*
9 *Aye, Commissioner Orr-Nay, Commissioner Ryser-Nay, Commissioner Jones-Nay,*
10 *Commissioner Guymon-Aye. The motion passed 4-to-3. Alternate Joseph Demma did not*
11 *participate in the vote.*

12
13 **4.5 (Project #ZTA-15-003) Action on a City-initiated text amendment to Chapter**
14 **19.36 (Mixed Use Zone) of the Cottonwood Heights Municipal Code.**

15
16 (19:38:43) Mr. Goins reported that he had no verbiage substitute, but received comments from a
17 Planning Commission Member concerning height. He welcomed further suggestions.

18
19 (19:39:31) *Commissioner Jones moved to forward a negative recommendation on Project*
20 *#ZTA-15-003 Action on a City-Initiated Text Amendment to Chapter 19.36 (Mixed Use Zone)*
21 *of the Cottonwood Heights Municipal Code. Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion.*

22
23 Commissioner Jones stated that the Commission discussed previously that they would be in
24 agreement if the language remained at 35 feet. If the applicant wishes to go 10 feet, they would
25 need to come before the Commission and request a variance. Leaving the Code as-is provides an
26 opportunity to hear from the developer and the citizens. The difference between a 35-foot and
27 45-foot building is extreme. He agreed to the old language. Commissioner Griffin expressed
28 concern that the details need to be further reviewed as well.

29
30 Commissioner Ryser was of the opinion that the Commission sets the standard so that citizens
31 understand that it can increase to 45 feet but are given an opportunity to express their opinions
32 prior to approval.

33
34 In response to a question raised, Mr. Topham suggested the item be continued to allow the
35 Planning Commission to further evaluate and review the language.

36
37 Commissioner Jones withdrew his motion.

38
39 (19:45:58) *Commissioner Bevan moved to continue the above item to the June 1, 2016*
40 *Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion. Vote on motion:*
41 *Commissioner Griffin-Aye, Commissioner Peters-Aye, Commissioner Bevan-Aye,*
42 *Commissioner Orr-Aye, Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Commissioner Jones-Aye, Commissioner*
43 *Guymon-Aye. The motion passed with unanimously. Alternate Joseph Demma did not*
44 *participate in the vote.*

45
46 **4.6 Approval of Minutes of April 6, 2016.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

(19:47:39) Commissioner Peters moved to approve the minutes of April 6, 2016, with the changes noted. Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Alternate Joseph Demma did not participate in the vote.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

1
2 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
3 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, April 20, 2016.*
4

5
6
7 
8
9

10
11 Teri Forbes
12 T Forbes Group
13 Minutes Secretary
14

15
16 Minutes approved: June 1st, 2016