MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY
APPEALS HEARING OFFICER MEETING

Thursday, March 7, 2024
5:00 p.m.
City Council Workroom
2277 East Bengal Boulevard

ATTENDANCE

Present: Frank Nakamura, Independent Hearing Officer
Michael Johnson, Community Development Director
Maria Devereux, Deputy City Recorder
Samantha DeSeelhorst, Senior City Planner
Adam Ginsberg, Staff Engineer

PUBLIC MEETING

1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements.

1.1 Ex Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.

There were no Ex Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to disclose.

Independent Hearing Officer, Frank Nakamura welcomed those present. Each Staff member was introduced.

2.0 Business Items

2.1 Project AHO-23-002
Consideration and Potential Action on a Request from Gerald Pack for an Expansion of a Non-Conforming Structure located at 2495 East 6710 South.

Senior City Planner, Samantha DeSeelhorst, provided an overview. She explained, the application represents a request to construct an addition to an existing single-family home at 2495 E. 6710 S. The home was built in 1965, and is nonconforming in regard to side setback area, which is common of homes built prior to city incorporation. At its nearest point, the existing home is 6.7' from the west property line and 8.8' from the east property line (15.5' total between both sides). City code requires both side setbacks to add to a minimum of 20', with neither side less than 8'.
The proposed addition would add 125 sq. ft. to the front of the home, and 605 sq. ft. to the rear of the home, as well as raise the structure's roofline. The proposed addition does not extend further into the nonconforming side yards (i.e., closer to property lines) than the home currently does, as it is proposed to follow the existing west wall of the structure (see the table on page 3 for existing and proposed setbacks). Thus, the project does not increase the degree of the home's nonconformity. However, given that additional square footage is proposed along a nonconforming setback, review and approval from the Appeals Hearing Officer is required.

Senior City Planner, Samantha DeSeelhorst, explained the relevant development standards in the underlying R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family) zone, compared with the existing and proposed structure. He noted, the proposed addition complies with the requirement for individual side setbacks (neither side setback can be less than 8'). It is only the combination of side setbacks which remains nonconforming (side setbacks must add to 20'), though this measurement is more conforming than what exists today. The addition will not extend any closer to side property lines than the home currently does, and is in fact farther from side property lines than the existing home is at its nearest point. (Measured from the chimney, the existing home is 6.7' from the west side property line, and the addition is 8.2' from this boundary). Though raised from 17' 4.5" to 25' 2", the building's maximum height is fully compliant with the maximum of 35'. Technically, this increased height creates additional square footage that is nonconforming, but staff finds that this does not create a more significant impact on neighboring properties than any standard residential addition would, as the addition is still 8' away from both side property lines.

Staff recommends approval of the request for an expansion of a nonconforming structure, based on the following findings:

1. The proposal will not negatively affect the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city because the use is the same as what currently exists;
2. The proposal will not create any additional congestion in the streets or roads;
3. The proposal will not create a fire safety issue;
4. The proposal will not affect air flow or block natural light from adjoining properties by conforming with all height regulations;
5. The proposal will have no apparent negative effect on the city's tax base;
6. The proposal will not place any type of unreasonable burden upon neighboring properties;
7. The proposal is in keeping with the intent of the Cottonwood Heights Zoning Ordinance.

Hearing Officer Nakamura moved to approve, Project AHO-24-002, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report dated March 7, 2024.

Mr. Nakamura, Hearing Officer, submitted an Appeals Hearing Officer Finding and Conclusions memo for Project #AHD-24-002.

Gerald Pack (the "Applicant") filed a request for a permit authorizing an addition to a nonconforming structure under section 19.88.070 of the Cottonwood Heights Municipal Code (the "Code").
Under the Code, a duly appointed appeals hearing officer shall review and hear requests for additions to a nonconforming structure and decide whether to authorize a permit for the proposed addition. On March 7, 2024, a hearing was held before Frank Nakamura, a duly appointed appeals hearing officer (the "Hearing Officer"). After considering the information provided by the Applicant with his request, a report prepared by the Cottonwood Heights (City) Planning Staff, an e-mail from a neighbor, and oral testimony presented at the hearing, the Hearing Officer issues the following Findings and Conclusions (The email from the neighbor raises issues that are not within the purview of the Hearing Officer).

Background: Section 19.88.070 of the Code, states:

. . . [A] building or structure noncomplying as to height, area or yard regulations may be added to or enlarged . . . on the lot upon a permit authorized by the appeals hearing officer, provided that the appeals hearing officer, after the hearing, shall find:
1. The addition to, enlargement of . . . the noncomplying building or structure . . . will be in harmony with one or more of the purposes stated in Section 19.02.020 and shall be in keeping with the intent of this title;
2. That the proposed change does not impose any unreasonable burden upon the lands located in the vicinity of the nonconforming use or noncomplying building.
Section 19.02.020 of the Code states:
. . . This title is designed and enacted for the purpose of promoting the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the city, including, among other things, the lessening of congestion in the streets or roads, securing safety from fire and other dangers, providing adequate light and air, classification of land uses and distribution of land development and utilization, protection of the tax base, and securing economy in governmental expenditures, fostering the city's industries and the protection of both urban and non-urban development.

Findings:
Applicant is the owner of a single-family residence located at 2495 East 6710 South. The home was built in 1965. The home is legal nonconforming in regard to side yard setbacks. This is common for homes built before incorporation of the City. City Code requires that the distance of both side setbacks, when combined, total a minimum of 20 feet, with neither side being less than 8 feet. The Applicant' home is 6.7 feet from the west property line and 8.8 feet from the east property line. The combined total of the two setbacks is 15.5 feet.
Applicant requests a permit authorizing the construction of an addition to the nonconforming structure. The proposed addition would add 125 square feet to the front of the home, 605 square feet to the rear of the home, and raise the roofline. The addition, however, would not extend closer to the side property lines. Actually, after the addition, the home would be 8.2 feet, rather than 6.7 feet, from the west property line resulting in a combined total distance of the side setbacks to be 17 feet. The increase in the roofline from 17 feet 4.5 inches to 25 feet 2 inches will remain in compliance with Code requirements. Accordingly, with the addition, only the total combined side setbacks would be legal nonconforming since they total less than 20 feet. Importantly, the addition would not increase the home's existing nonconformity.
The proposed addition to the nonconforming structure is in harmony with the purposes specified in section 19.02.020 of the Code. It does not negatively impact the health, safety, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the City and its residents. It does not increase road or street congestion, it presents no safety concerns from fire and other dangers, it does not impact the adequacy of light and air, and it does not undermine the classification of land uses and distribution of land development and utilization. It does not negatively impact the tax base, has no impact on securing economy in governmental expenditures, fosters the City's industries such as promoting reinvestment and revitalization of older buildings, and does not undermine the protection of urban and non-urban development. There is no evidence that the addition would impose any burden on the surrounding properties. The proposed addition is in keeping with the intent of the Code.

Conclusion:
Per Frank Nakamura, Appeals Hearing Officer, under section 19.88.070 of the Code, the Hearing Officer authorizes a permit to the Applicant to construct an addition to his nonconforming home as he proposed subject to the Applicant obtaining a building permit from the City and meeting all other City requirements.

2.2 Project AHO-23-001.
Consideration and potential action on a request from the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy for six variances to reconstruct water infrastructure throughout the city.

Community Development Director, Michael Johnson, gave an overview of the project. The Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy (MWDSLS) is a special service district that provides wholesale supplemental drinking water to two member cities, Salt Lake City and Sandy City. The residents of those service areas (approximately 400,000 in total) rely on MWDSLS for drinking water. The primary MWDSLS treatment facility is located within Cottonwood Heights at 3430 E. Danish Rd., known as the Little Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant. This facility serves as a hub for the Salt Lake Aqueduct, which is a regional aqueduct pipe measuring 69" in interior diameter, and 84" in outside diameter. Per the applicant's narrative, this pipe carries untreated water from Provo Canyon to the treatment facility, treats the water, and then carries it onto a terminal reservoir near the mouth of Parley's Canyon.

Community Development Director, Michael Johnson, discussed the third item in the Summary of Requests. He explained that the Code typically requires new utilities in proposed subdivisions to use flexible expansion joints within fault or ground shake areas. He noted that this is a unique proposal. The applicant's design in lieu of expansion joints was found to be acceptable. Mr. Johnson clarified that expansion joints are good for subdivisions or private property scale utility lines but do not make as much sense when there is a piece of critical infrastructure this size. Staff recommends approval of this variance.

The fourth item was discussed, which relates to Maximum Seismic Displacement Allowed. Staff Engineer, Adam Ginsberg, explained that for the maximum displacement allowed, the Code has a maximum vertical displacement on the slopes. He stated that it is 15 centimeters. On slopes that experience deformation larger than 15 centimeters, some sort of mitigation is required to allow for the development. These are being placed on the 30% slope, so mitigation such as relocating would not be feasible without changing the entire alignment of the pipeline. The displacement this is referring to is on the slopes during an earthquake event. Going across the slope, the applicant will be required to demonstrate they are restoring the disturbed hillside back to the original factor of safety.

Mr. Johnson stated that the two conditions are similar in nature but focus on the methodology for mitigating the impact of displacement and include a plan for how to restore those unstable slopes if that does occur. Similar to the first request, if disturbing natural slopes, engineering and design need to be provided to show that after the waterway is installed, those slopes will be restored at least to the existing condition before the development occurred.

The fifth item was Off-Site Improvements Within Active Landslide Areas. The applicant stated in their application that they did not feel this was an applicable provision, but in case it was, a variance was requested. A full analysis was conducted. Based on the internal review, Staff concurs with the assertion by the applicant that this provision is not applicable. There are a few hazard areas in the hazard maps that identify landslide areas, but based on the existing conditions, those do not qualify as active landslide areas. Mr. Nakamura asked about the five conditions listed. Mr. Johnson confirmed that those were recommended and there was a similar rationale to what was seen before.

The last item was Utilities in New Subdivisions that Cross a Fault or are Prone to Ground Shifting and Require Flexible Expansion Joints. Mr. Johnson explained that this is similar to the item where a full analysis was done. This is very clearly not relevant to the matter at hand. That being said, the applicant did provide the analysis. The conclusions are very similar to the previous findings.

Mr. Johnson wanted to note a few additional items that are separate from the variance request. Regarding the installation and development work that the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy ("MWDSLS") is about to begin this year, they would be required to obtain public right-of-way permits where necessary as well as development permits for work on private property. Mr. Johnson reported that an Interlocal Agreement was approved earlier this week by the City Council.

Mr. Nakamura asked for additional information about the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Johnson reported that it was approved on Tuesday, March 5, 2024. It was the agreement between the City and MWDSLS, with the understanding that they will be coming through the rights-of-way and roadways.

The applicant, Jeremy Williams, shared supplemental information. He explained that this is a joint project with MWDSLS and the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities. A map was shown, and it was noted that the blue line represents the Little Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant. That is where the MWDSLS main office is and where the main water treatment plant is. The existing Salt Lake Aqueduct was constructed from the late 1930s through the early 1950s. It was constructed roughly 70 to 80 years ago, and it runs south to north. There is the raw water portion that brings it to the Little Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant, and then after it is treated, the finished water portion takes it north to their terminal reservoir by the mouth of Parleys Canyon. There is the existing pipeline and existing corridor that has been there for 70 to 80 years and there is a 10 million gallon finished water reservoir on the Salt Lake Aqueduct at a site that MWDSLS owns. That is shown on the left portion of the map. He explained that this is all existing infrastructure that MWDSLS owns and operates.

The light blue line on the map is the Big Cottonwood Conduit. Mr. Williams clarified that there is the Big Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant that Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities owns and operates at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and there is the Big Cottonwood Conduit that runs from the plant to the same terminal reservoir that was mentioned earlier. That conduit was installed in the 1900s. It is a very old conduit, though he noted that portions of it were replaced in the 1980s. The green line shown represents the Little Cottonwood Conduit. That is also owned by the Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities but is operated by the MWDSLS. It was installed in the 1920s. The combination of the existing pipelines is what provides finished water to the majority of Salt Lake City and the surrounding area. Mr. Willliams explained that these are very important utilities, but this aging infrastructure is susceptible to seismic and other geologic hazards.

Mr. Williams shared information about the Cottonwoods Connection Project. He noted that the Cottonwoods Connector Schedule 1 Pipeline starts from the Big Cottonwood Water Treatment Plant. To the south is the Salt Lake Aqueduct Replacement Pipeline. He clarified that this is the current phase, but there will be a future phase where the Salt Lake Aqueduct Replacement Pipeline will

extend further north. It is important that the pipeline being discussed considers all of the geologic hazards within the area and considers how the existing utilities will function together moving forward.

Once this project is installed, it will facilitate the future repair and replacement of the existing utilities that were previously discussed. Right now, those are all critical lifelines. It takes all of them working in concert to provide peak flows in the summer. If something were to happen to any one of those, there would be a major economic impact on the surrounding area. This pipeline being discussed for installation is critical not just for what it will do but for how it will interact with the existing utilities.

The design team working on this project has experience with similar lifelines in the area. Mr. Williams shared information published by the American Lifelines Alliance. It was a joint venture between the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") and several other agencies. The intention was to establish guidelines for the seismic design of pipelines. It is the definitive document on how to design a pipeline to mitigate geologic hazards. Mr. Williams pointed out a highlighted section and shared information about Doug Honegger. Mr. Honegger provided technical oversight for the development of the paper and is a nationally recognized expert in the design of seismically resilient water pipelines. Mr. Honegger was also retained as a technical advisor for this project.

Mr. Williams discussed the variance requests and how this applies to a large-scale infrastructure project. The City may want to consider amending the Sensitive Lands Evaluation and Development Standards ("SLEDS") Ordinance to facilitate these kinds of projects going forward. He clarified that it is acceptable to request the variances and work with the City in the meantime. Mr. Nakamura asked about rebuilding the treatment plants in the future. He believed this process is critical for the rebuild. Mr. Williams explained that those projects are in the long-term schedule. This helps both of the utilities to develop the framework for how the rebuilds are approached. Mr. Nakamura wanted to know how many miles of pipeline are being discussed. Mr. Williams explained that for the Salt Lake Aqueduct alone, is almost 42 miles long. There is almost 9 miles of finished water aqueduct from Little Cottonwood to the terminal reservoir. The Salt Lake Aqueduct Replacement is just short of 3 miles. It is 7% of the MWDSLS long-term plan to harden that infrastructure and is all part of the process.

Mr. Williams reviewed the analysis that the team performed. The shaded area is an uncertainty zone. The red lines are mapped fault lines, and the dots indicate the direction of movement. He explained that there is a wide uncertainty area and there are multiple fault crossings. This pushed the team to use all of the mitigation strategies that have been implemented. That is the reason for the variance request to move away from the prescriptive requirements of a ball joint that would function for one specific location. Mr. Williams believed the SLEDS Ordinance would be improved by moving away from a prescriptive singular mitigation method and to a range of mitigation methods instead.

The alignment study done by the team was reviewed. Mr. Williams explained that work was done to determine the best route for the Cottonwoods Connector Schedule 1 Pipeline. Knowing that there were fixed points, there needed to be work done to determine the best route. Ultimately, the team landed on the Fort Union Boulevard alignment. The design for this is very involved and technical. The pipeline and the ground have to be modeled with certain inputs applied. The results of the predicted seismic events were applied to the models and then the results were shared. Mr. Williams pointed out the various figures that were created as well as the results from the model analysis

conducted. Modeling was done for fault crossings and slope stability. If there was a ground-shaking event that caused a slope to want to shift, that would put strain on the pipe. As a result, modeling was done to predict how the pipeline would perform and the strain it would undergo. That modeling information informed the design. Mr. Williams explained that the design was extremely helpful in mitigating a number of potential issues related to fault crossings, slope stability, and landslides.

Mr. Nakamura mentioned the conditions suggested by Mr. Johnson. He wanted to know if there is support for those conditions. This was confirmed. Dani Cepernich introduced herself as counsel for the district. She wanted to briefly address the agreement that was entered into with Cottonwood Heights. It was approved by the City Council on Tuesday. However, it is technically not an Interlocal Agreement. It was not entered pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement, but it is an agreement between the two entities. It was entered into in lieu of obtaining road cut permits or other permits for the use of public rights-of-way. This is part of the Special District Act that allows Special Districts to use public rights-of-way without having to obtain a road cut permit or other permit. The agreement fleshed out the conditions on when that will be used. She believes that satisfies the first and third condition. That agreement has been provided to the contractors on the project and was incorporated into their construction contract. They must abide by the agreement with the City. Mr. Williams reported that the terms of that agreement have been incorporated into the contract documents. Additional discussions were had about the conditions suggested by the City.

Mr. Nakamura thanked the City and the applicant for their thorough presentations. By next week, he will submit written findings and conclusions to formalize the decision. Mr. Nakamura found that the applicant has met the burden of showing that all five conditions are met for each variance request. This was outlined clearly in both the Staff Report and the application. In order to ensure reliable water service, pipeline construction is necessary. Additionally, upgrades to existing and aging infrastructure must be handled as well. After extensive study, an alignment has been determined. It is not possible to complete the project without passing through a fault line or within 20 feet of a fault line. The variances requested are warranted for this hardship, as without a variance, it would not be possible to fulfill the statutory responsibility to provide reliable water service. The geotechnical expert and City Engineer found that the project is consistent with the standard practice in accordance with City standards. Accordingly, the variances are granted to the applicant.

Hearing Officer Nakamura moved to approve, with conditions, the variances requested as part of Project AHO-24-001, based on the analysis, recommendations, and findings summarized in the Staff Report and the agreement as approved and executed. The approval is subject to:

1. ***19.72.040.A;***

2. ***19.72.040.H.3;***

3. ***19.72.040.J.1;***

4. ***If applicable, 19.72.040.J.2;***

5. ***19.72.040 Appendix C, Subsection 12.3.a;***

6. ***19.72.040 Appendix B, Subsection 2.6.3.xiv;***

7. ***If applicable, 19.72.040.R.***

Request #1 Conditions:

1. ***Any utility development on areas exceeding 30% slope shall require hillside restoration that, at a minimum, maintains the existing slope stability factor of safety for the pre-disturbance condition of the hillside. A plan shall be submitted that properly demonstrates the proposed engineering and construction methodology, to the satisfaction of the DRC. The plan shall also show specific locations of all such disturbance areas.***

Request #1 Findings:

1. ***The nature of the applicant's proposal is unique in that it constitutes a large, regional-scale critical infrastructure project that traverses a large portion of the city and is not contained neatly within one property or project area. Avoidance of all 30% slope areas in this case is not possible.***

2. ***The alignment options for the project are limited by the necessity of the pipeline to function properly, and the pipe is located within easements and not on fee title land for the full extent of the alignment.***

3. ***The applicant made an apparent attempt to limit the locations where this particular variance is necessary. There are four locations identified that cross areas that exceed 30% slope, and each has been carefully analyzed by the applicant. In one impacted area, the applicant will be replacing an existing retaining wall made of railroad ties with an engineered concrete block wall, improving slope stability.***

4. ***The new pipe follows a similar alignment to the existing pipeline, so the degree of non-conformity with the Sensitive Lands Ordinance is not getting substantially greater.***

5. ***The applicant has statutory authority and right to properly provide the culinary water services, which includes necessary improvements and maintenance of existing infrastructure.***

Request #2 Findings:

1. ***The nature of the applicant's proposal is unique in that it constitutes a large, regional-scale critical infrastructure project that traverses a large portion of the city and is not contained neatly within one property or project area. Avoidance of all fault lines in this case is not possible.***

2. ***The alignment options for the project are limited by the necessity of the pipeline to function properly, and the pipe is located within easements and not on fee title land for the full extent of the alignment.***

3. ***The DRC staff finds that the pipe design follows reasonable industry standards for a large utility line of this nature and is properly designed to withstand tensile stress and impacts of seismic activity to keep the pipe intact and functional during any potential seismic event.***

4. ***During a seismic event, the pipe could lift out of the road and damage other smaller utilities and/or roadways in the city. However, DRC staff finds that this is favorable to the pipe rupturing, and roads/utilities would likely be damaged regardless of the new proposed pipe.***

5. ***The DRC staff has requested that the applicant properly disclose potential hazards and impacts, and the applicant has done this.***

6. ***The applicant has statutory authority and right to properly provide the culinary water services, which includes necessary improvements and maintenance of existing infrastructure.***

Request #3 Findings:

1. ***The correct code reference for this requested variance should be 19.72 Appendix B 2.6.3.xiv (minor correction from provision cited in applicant's narrative).***

2. ***The nature of the applicant's proposal is unique in that it constitutes a large, regional-scale critical infrastructure project that traverses a large portion of the city and is not contained neatly within one property or project area. Avoidance of all fault lines in this case is not possible.***

3. ***The alignment options for the project are limited by the necessity of the pipeline to function properly, and the pipe is located within easements and not on fee title land for the full extent of the alignment.***

4. ***The DRC staff acknowledges that the referenced ordinance provision doesn't properly address major critical infrastructure utility lines such as the one being proposed by the applicant, and the regulations are more applicable to smaller utilities at a property-specific scale or subdivision level.***

5. ***DRC staff requested design specifications that would resolve any concerns regarding the lack of use of flexible expansion joints, and the applicant's design was found to be appropriate and within reasonable standard practice.***

6. ***The applicant has statutory authority and right to properly provide the culinary water services, which includes necessary improvements and maintenance of existing infrastructure.***

Request #4 Conditions:

1. ***Subject to DRC review and approval, the applicant shall submit its methodology for mitigating the impact of potential displacement greater than 15 cm. and provide a plan for how it will restore unstable slopes if disturbed. The applicant shall also demonstrate that cutting into unstable slopes will not worsen the existing conditions of the slopes.***

2. ***Any utility development on areas of 30% slope or greater shall require hillside restoration that, at a minimum, maintains the existing slope stability factor of safety for the pre-disturbance condition of the hillside. A plan shall be submitted that properly demonstrates the proposed engineering and construction methodology, to the satisfaction of the DRC. The plan shall also show specific locations of such areas.***

Request #4 Findings:

1. ***The nature of the applicant's proposal is unique in that it constitutes a large, regional-scale critical infrastructure project that traverses a large portion of the city and is not contained neatly within one property or project area. Avoidance of seismic displacement hazards in this case is not possible.***

2. ***The alignment options for the project are limited by the necessity of the pipeline to function properly, and the pipe is located within easements and not on fee title land for the full extent of the alignment.***

3. ***Upon satisfaction of the recommended conditions of approval above, the DRC finds that disturbance of areas with a risk of seismic displacement greater than 15 cm can be reasonably mitigated through appropriate land disturbance methodology.***

4. ***The applicant has statutory authority and right to properly provide the culinary water services, which includes necessary improvements and maintenance of existing infrastructure.***

Request #5 and Request #6:

1. ***DRC staff has reviewed the requested variance and finds that the code provision is not applicable to the subject application. As such, no variance analysis is required.***

Hearing Officer Nakamura stated that the variances are granted subject to the remaining processes. Written findings and conclusions were to follow.

Mr. Nakamura pointed out that the Staff Report outlines additional City requirements:

- MWDSLS shall obtain a public right-of-way permit for all work in the public right-of-way;

- MWDSLS shall submit development permits for any work on private property that would otherwise require a permit by City Code. This includes, but is not limited to, retaining walls, building permits, demolition permits, land disturbance permits, etc.

It was reiterated that an agreement has been reached between the City and MWDSLS. Mr. Johnson stated that a final signature is still pending, but the agreement has been approved by the City Council. Mr. Nakamura thanked everyone for their civility, thoroughness, and hard work on this item.

3.0 Consent Agenda

3.1 Approval of Minutes from March 7, 2024.

The Appeals Hearing Officer will approve the minutes of the March 7, 2024, meeting after the following process is met. The City Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes to the Recorder. If, after five days there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the hearing officer is in agreement, at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved.

4.0 Adjournment

The Appeals Hearing adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Appeals Hearing held Thursday, March 7, 2024.

Maria Devereux
Deputy City Recorder