



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

**WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
ELECTRONIC MEETING
NO PHYSICAL MEETING LOCATION
November 17th, 2020**

Mayor
Erik Craythorne
City Council
Gary Petersen, Mayor Pro Tem
Jerry Chatterton
Andy Dawson
R. Kent Henderson
Annette Judd
City Manager
Kyle Laws

Administrative Session
6:00 PM

Minutes for the West Point City Council Administrative Session held via electronic Zoom Meeting in accordance with the signed November 3rd, 2020 Written Determination of the Mayor and Planning Commission Chair of West Point City Concerning Electronic Meeting Anchor Location. Meeting was accessible to attendees by entering Meeting ID #89007090859 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833, on November 17, 2020 at 6:00 pm with Mayor Erik Craythorne presiding.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Erik Craythorne, Council Member Gary Petersen, Council Member Annette Judd, Council Member Andy Dawson, and Council Member Jerry Chatterton

EXCUSED: Council Member Kent Henderson

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director; Paul Rochell, Public Works Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: Kyle Laws, City Manager

VISITORS PRESENT: Visitors able to attend electronically, no sign-in required.

Mayor Craythorne welcomed those in attendance, specifically Lieutenant Jammie Cox, Sgt. Josh Boucher, and Detective David Evans of the Davis County Sheriff's Office. Although scheduled to provide an update to the Council during tonight's General Session, Mayor Craythorne invited them to address the Council at this point so that they could be free to leave the meeting after.

6. General Session - Update from the Davis County Sheriff's Office

Lieutenant Cox stated that the City's regular assigned contact, Lieutenant Boydston, was recently promoted to Captain and so there has been some reorganization in assignments. She introduced Sergeant Joshua Boucher, stating that he will be the new direct liaison for West Point, and they look forward to continuing the good communication and relationship that Lieutenant Boydston had with the City and Kyle Laws (City Manager). Lieutenant Cox also introduced Detective David Evans, who is also assigned to work with the City. The Council expressed their appreciation to each of them for all that they do in serving the City and their community, and thanked them for coming to the meeting to introduce themselves. Lieutenant Cox said that she would send an email with all of their contact information and invited them to reach out with any questions or concerns that they may have.

1. Discussion Regarding the West Point City Council 2021 Meeting Schedule – Ms. Casey Arnold

Ms. Arnold stated that each year, Utah State Law requires that the City adopt an annual meeting schedule. The Council has regularly met on the first and third Tuesday of each month, and the proposed 2021 Meeting Schedule continues that practice. Ms. Arnold noted that the Council Visioning Session usually held each January has not yet been scheduled, due to the current pandemic and uncertainty about health restrictions in regards to gathering restrictions. Ms. Arnold also explained that 2021 is a Municipal Election year, and the meeting that would regularly be held on the first Tuesday in November will be canceled for Election Day. Lastly, Ms. Arnold confirmed that there may be other conflicts with conferences, events, etc., that may arise throughout the year, but those meetings can always be canceled or rescheduled with proper notice as needed.

The Council had no further discussion on the proposed 2021 Meeting Schedule and will consider final approval in tonight's General Session.

2. Discussion Regarding Height Restrictions of Accessory Buildings – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this is a continuing discussion from the last meeting, and gave a brief overview of the issue. The City's current Code limits accessory buildings to one-story, which has become problematic in interpreting, as there is not a clear definition in the Code of what is or is not a "story" – the Code states that a "mezzanine" or a "loft" does not count as a second story, and also that if

an area is in the truss space or attic space, it is considered a “bonus room” and not as a second story. Another concern is that in many situations, a one-story building can actually be taller than a two-story building. There have been some recent applications submitted by residents, and also some code complaints about how neighboring accessory buildings are being used, that have raised the issue and Staff would like the Council’s direction on how and if the language in the Code be amended for clearer application.

To better illustrate what the Code currently does and does not allow, Mr. Davis displayed a picture of an accessory building in the City that is 30 ft. tall, which was approved because it was one-story and met all of the lot size requirements. Mr. Davis then showed the application that was submitted for an accessory building that was much shorter, but was denied because it qualified as having a second-story. In discussing the issues, Mr. Davis stated that Staff believes it may be better to simply keep the current maximum height restrictions, which limit the buildings to the same height as the house on lots sizes up to 15,000 sq. ft. (1/3 acres) and allow a maximum height of 30 ft. on larger lots, and eliminate the one-story restriction.

Mr. Davis stated that during the Planning Commission’s discussion of this issue, a concern was raised about accessory buildings that are used as accessory apartments, feeling neighboring residents may find it a nuisance to have a window on a two-story apartment close to their property line. To help alleviate this concern, the Planning Commission proposed requiring an additional setback for accessory buildings with accessory apartments that are on the second level, however Mr. Davis stated that there are some other options the Council may want to consider. One possible option would be to just prohibit accessory apartments altogether, but that would require amending the City’s Affordable Housing Plan because accessory apartments are used to help meet the State’s requirements. Another option would be to limit accessory apartments to the first floor only.

Mayor Craythorne expressed his concern regarding accessory apartments in general that when the conditional use permit is first applied for (which is required for all accessory apartments), it is granted if the person intending to be living in the apartment meets the requirements of the Code (family member, elderly, clergy, etc.), but when that person moves out, it is hard to police who future renters are. If second-story accessory apartments are allowed, he worries it will just open up more opportunities for rentals in the City that are not in compliance.

Council Member Petersen expressed his opinion that there should be a clearer separation between a ‘shed’ and an accessory building – a ‘shed’ is not likely to be a structure that could be used for an accessory apartment like a large shop or other larger outbuilding could be. He suggested that the City have both an accessory building ordinance and a separate shed-like structure ordinance.

In regards to the height and number of stories allowed, Council Member Dawson stated that he is in favor of keeping the current height restrictions and removing the one-story limit, but also feels that 30 ft. high buildings should have larger setbacks to keep them farther back from the house and neighboring properties. Council Member Petersen agreed with removing the one-story limit, but feels that 30 ft. tall buildings in residential neighborhoods is too much. He suggested that the minimum lot size to have a 30 ft. height maximum be increased. Council Member Chatterton agreed, feeling that a minimum lot size of .5 acres would be more appropriate for 30 ft. high accessory buildings. Council Member Dawson suggested that instead of setting a minimum lot size limit that allows all the way up to a 30 ft. height maximum, a formula be used (similar to how animal points are determined) for more of a step-based height allowance based on property size. Council Member Petersen agreed with that, knowing that there are properties throughout the City that are just under .5 acres and feeling that it would still be appropriate for them to have accessory buildings that are taller than the existing house.

Council Member Petersen also wanted to add another suggestion in regards to accessory apartments that in addition to the conditional use permit, the City require some sort of license that has to be applied for and granted to each new renter to better ensure that the rental restrictions are being complied with.

Mayor Craythorne felt that it would be a good option to remove the one-story limit to avoid bonus rooms and loft areas being used or intended as living spaces. If a second-story is allowed, it is more likely that residents wanting to have a living space will build actual rooms that meet the required building codes, fire restrictions, etc. Additionally, the use of bonus rooms as actual apartments will police itself because of how uncomfortable these areas are to live in (extremely hot in the summer, cold in the winter, etc.). Mr. Davis agreed, adding that it would be really difficult to convert a shed into an accessory apartment and suggested that instead of a separate shed ordinance, language could be added that simply says shed can’t be converted into accessory apartments. He confirmed for the Council that when a building permit is applied for by a resident, an accessory apartment is normally part of the plans for the building, rather than an accessory apartment being added or converted into after the building is constructed.

Council Member Dawson inquired as to whether accessory buildings with accessory apartments are required to pay additional impact fees. Mr. Davis stated that if they connect to the existing utilities of the house, there are no additional impact fees. As a Board Member of the North Davis Sewer District, Council Member Dawson stated that there have been issues with this in other cities because the people living in these accessory apartments are adding additional use and impact to the system – it is comparable to having a flag lot with a separate house. Mr. Davis stated that the way the Code is written, impact fees are only paid on new connections. It would be an option for the Council to change that code as well if they felt that accessory apartments should pay for their additional impact on the systems.

Council Member Judd inquired as to whether there are restrictions on basements in accessory buildings. Mr. Davis stated that there is no language in the code that restricts basements, but he is not aware of any building permit applications being submitted for an accessory building with a basement. Council Member Judd stated that it may be something to be addressed, whether now or in the future, for residents that might get “creative.” Council Member Chatterton also suggested that it be clarified in the Code that the height is measured from the existing grade adjacent to the building so that there aren’t issues between the applicant and the City in how the height is determined.

The Council ultimately felt that it would be appropriate to increase the minimum lot size required for a 30 ft. accessory building height from 15,000 sq. ft. to 20,000 sq. ft., which is not quite a 1/2-acre, but is more than the current 1/3-acre lot size requirement, and to remove the one-story restriction. The Council also wanted to add that accessory buildings cannot be converted into or have an accessory apartment added once built – an accessory apartment has to be included in the original building permit.

Further discussion and final approval of the amended code will be held in a future meeting after a public hearing is held.

3. Discussion Regarding Setback Requirements in the R-4 Zone – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that the Council has also discussed this item extensively in past meetings, and this is a continuation of that discussion. As a brief overview, Mr. Davis stated that the R-4 zone, which allows townhouses or patio home type projects, typically have smaller setbacks than single family homes. The Council recently approved a change to the setback requirements, allowing a 20 ft. setback to the front face of the building and a 25 ft. setback to the garage. However, the Council wanted to continue the discussion on whether the 25 ft. setback to the garage would apply to all roads, or should vary based on the type of road.

There are two different townhome projects in the City, Yalecrest and Sandy Point, that have been used as examples throughout the discussion because they each contain varying types of roads. In the Yalecrest Townhomes, there are private alleys, private lanes, and public streets throughout the project. The alley at the back of the units has a 25 ft. road width (20 ft. of asphalt and 5 ft. of curb and gutter with no sidewalks) and the driveways are about 8 ft. – 9 ft. The fronts of the buildings face a public street with a standard 60 ft. road width. The private lanes are the same width of the alleys, but are very short and access only about eight units per lane. In the Sandy Point Townhouses, there is also a standard 60 ft. public street as you come into the project, with private lanes that each access between 10 to 15 units, and are the same 25 ft. road width (including curb and gutter but no sidewalk) as in the Yalecrest project. The Bluffview townhouse project that will soon be submitted for final approval contains a mix of road types as well.

Staff feels that the required setback could vary by road type, but that the Code needs to contain a clearer definition for each type of road. The proposed definitions, with some additional changes recommended by the Planning Commission, are as follows:

Alley: A private roadway that provides access to the rear of residential or commercial buildings with a minimum of 20’ of asphalt with curb and gutter on each side. ~~Alleys can be a through street or a dead end, but dead end alleys~~ shall not provide access to more than 15 lots or units. Units or lots that have rear access from an alley shall also have frontage on a public road or a private road.

Private Lane: A private roadway that provides access to the front of residential or commercial buildings with a minimum width of 20’ of asphalt with curb and gutter on each side. ~~Private lanes can be a through street or a dead end, but dead end lanes~~ shall not provide access to more than 15 units or lots.

Private Road: A private roadway with a minimum of 50’ right-of-way that includes curb, gutter, and sidewalk on both sides and meets the requirements found in the public works standard drawings. Dead ends are allowed but must be provided with a dedicated turnaround at the end and shall be no longer than 600’ in length.

Public Road: A public roadway with a minimum of 60’ right-of-way that meets the requirements found in the public works standard drawings.

Based upon these definitions the following front setbacks are proposed in the R-4 zone:

Road Type	Setback to Building	Setback to Garage
Alley	10’ 5’	10’ 5’
Private Lane	20’	20’
Private Road	20’	25’
Public Road	20’	25’

Mr. Davis clarified for Mayor Craythorne that the only difference between an alley and a private lane is that an alley provides access to the rear of the building and also have to have frontage on a public road. Mayor Craythorne inquired as to why there would be a benefit of an alley if they can just have a private lane instead. Mr. Davis stated that the advantage of an alley is that a shorter

setback is required – the alleys in the Yalecrest project have setbacks varying between 8 ft. – 10 ft. The Planning Commission's recommendation is to require 5 ft. setbacks for alleys. Council Member Petersen inquired as to whether the frontage of an alley can be on a private lane, and Mr. Davis stated that under the proposed definitions, the alley frontage has to either be on a public road or a private road that is at least 50 ft. For example, an alley at the back of the units and a private 20 ft. lane in the front would not be allowed. In regards to the proposed reduction from 10 ft. setbacks for alleys to 5 ft. as recommended by the Planning Commission, Mr. Davis stated that a 5 ft. setback is small enough to prohibit it being used as a parking space and just be a short driveway into a garage as intended.

Mr. Davis asked the Council for their direction on whether the proposed definitions and setback requirements are acceptable and also what the limits should be on the number of units a certain road type can access.

Council Members Petersen, Chatterton, and Dawson felt that the access limit of 15 units for private lanes and alleys is appropriate. Council Member Judd raised her concern about having a unit limit and not consider the length of the road; while the traffic impact would be the same, a line of 15 units on one side of a road would have a longer road length, which would have more of an impact on garbage collection, plowing, parking, etc., than if the units were on both sides of a shorter road. She also wondered what the residents actually living in the existing townhouse projects felt about the roads in their neighborhood and what their comfort level is with each road-type.

In regards to a limit of the number of units accessed by a private road, which requires a 50 ft. road width, Council Member Petersen asked if there is currently a restriction in the code on the length of a private road. Mr. Davis stated that there is no restriction on the length of the road if there is access on both ends, but if the road comes to a dead-end, it cannot be longer than 600 ft. Council Member Petersen stated that he would be in favor of having some restriction on the number of units accessed by a private road in order to avoid the entire project having roads that are only 50 ft. wide. He suggested 30 units as the maximum that can be served by a private road. Mr. Davis stated that in talking with Layton City about their road-type restrictions, they expressed that they wished they had a limit on the maximum number of units simply because of the maintenance issues long private roads can create. In addition, Mr. Davis added that he is also concerned about the traffic impact that 50 ft. road widths can handle. He feels that it may be best to limit both the length of and number of units accessed by private road. Mr. Davis confirmed for the Council that the Code does not currently have standards on the construction of private lanes or alleys; luckily, all of these types of roads that have been built have been done under the same standards as required with private and public roads. The Council felt that language clarifying that all road types must be built to City standards should also be added.

Due to time restrictions, the Council wished to continue this discussion at the next meeting.

4. Other Items

No other items were discussed.

The Administrative Session adjourned.



WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
ELECTRONIC MEETING
NO PHYSICAL MEETING LOCATION
November 17th, 2020

Mayor
Erik Craythorne
City Council
Gary Petersen, Mayor Pro Tem
Jerry Chatterton
Andy Dawson
R. Kent Henderson
Annette Judd
City Manager
Kyle Laws

General Session
7:00 PM

Minutes for the General Session of the West Point City Council held via electronic Zoom Meeting in accordance with the signed November 3, 2020 Written Determination of the Mayor and Planning Commission Chair of West Point City Concerning Electronic Meeting Anchor Location. Meeting was accessible to attendees by entering Meeting ID #89007090859 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833, on November 17, 2020 at 7:00 pm with Mayor Erik Craythorne presiding.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Erik Craythorne, Council Member Gary Petersen, Council Member Annette Judd, Council Member Andy Dawson, and Council Member Jerry Chatterton

EXCUSED: Council Member Kent Henderson

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director; Paul Rochell, Public Workers Director; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: Kyle Laws, City Manager

VISITORS PRESENT: Visitors able to attend electronically, no sign-in required.

1. **Call to Order** – Mayor Craythorne welcomed those attending the electronic meeting.
2. **Prayer** – Given by Mayor Erik Craythorne
3. **Communications and Disclosures from City Council and Mayor**

Council Member Chatterton – None

Council Member Dawson – Provided an update on the North Davis Sewer District, stating that the District is currently working on its preliminary budget for the upcoming year.

Council Member Petersen – None

Council Member Judd – None

Mayor Craythorne – In regards to the current pandemic situation, the Davis County Health Department held their regular weekly meeting with all the County Mayors and County Commissioners the previous day, wherein they provided an update on the number of cases in the County and on the availability of a vaccine. As is the case with most of the Counties throughout the State, West Point's positive case numbers are high and continue to increase – there have been 323 positive cases in the City throughout the pandemic, and there are 54 current active cases. The DCHD also stated that there are four hospitals in Utah that currently have the vaccine on-site, ready for distribution once approval is given. The first batch of the vaccine will be given to health care workers and the second batch will hopefully be distributed to long-term care facilities. The Mayor expressed his appreciation to all the health care workers and other personnel that are working hard for our community. He stated that he was surprised and optimistic to discover that the vaccine had already been issued into Utah hospitals.

4. Communications from Staff

Mr. Davis stated that the City Hall Lighting Ceremony has been canceled due to the current health guidelines and restrictions on social gathering. Ms. Arnold added that the Child Remembrance Ceremony at the Angel of Hope statue scheduled each year for

December 6th has been canceled as well. However, the public has been invited to honor the day with their household groups at the cemetery, where luminaries will still be placed on all headstones of all the children in the cemetery and white flowers will be available for people to place upon the Angel of Hope in remembrance of their loved ones. The Mayor stated that at this point, the annual Christmas Party is still scheduled for December 11th at Warehouse 22 in Syracuse. Additionally, the Cemetery Luminary scheduled for December 18th will still be held, but the luminaries will be placed by City Staff rather than volunteers.

Mr. Davis also informed the Council that the two new positions approved in this year's budget have been filled. The new Public Works Inspector is Anthony Stone, who already worked for the City in the Public Works Department. A new Community Development Director has also been hired, and will be introduced later in the meeting.

Mayor Craythorne also wished to give the Council an update on the 800 N Road Reconstruction Project. A few years ago, Clinton and West Point Cities received some funding for the project, allowing the section down to 2500 W to be completed. He stated that this completed portion of the project looks fantastic, and thanked Clinton City for being the lead on the project. To hopefully fund the portion from 2500 W to 3000 W, West Point and Clinton jointly applied for 3rd Quarter Sales Tax money, from which the County receives about \$17 - \$18 million to distribute for road projects in cities throughout Davis County. The Mayor stated that the funding request was approved and \$2.2 million was awarded by the County to finish the remaining section. Bryce Wilcox from Clinton City has said that some of the project will begin in the spring of 2021, but they will likely wait until the end of the school year to complete the section of the project by Lakeside Elementary.

5. Citizen Comment

Emailed Comment

Michael Eastman – 630 N 5000 W: "I would like to address the winter parking ordinance. The code currently states just no on-street parking. There is no difference is three curb & gutter or not. As I think we could all agree, a person can park in their driveway up to but not over the sidewalk. I went and measured and from the inner side of the sidewalk to the asphalt is about 10 feet. That was in a couple of places in town. What I would like to propose is the ordinance to be changed to stated that where there is no curb and gutter that we could still park on the street as long as we were still 10 feet away from the asphalt. I hope this can happen."

Joelle Caruso – 457 N 3650 W: Ms. Caruso would like to comment on the Council's discussion during the Administrative Session regarding setbacks in the R-4 zone. As the Mayor suggested that the Council do in the last meeting, she visited the Yalecrest and Sandy Point projects to better visualize the different road types and road widths. In some areas in the Sandy Point development, the alleys were at the front of the house and on some streets, she was unable to turn around without having to go into someone's driveway. She stated that there were also still cars parked in the short driveways. Additionally, she witnessed a UPS driver that had to park his truck at the end of the street, on a 50 ft. road, and walk back and forth to the houses and his truck to make his deliveries. Cars also had to drive around his truck parked in the street to be able to get to their own driveways. This is an issue that she doesn't feel has been considered in the Council's discussion. She added that the Yalecrest project did not seem to have the same problems as she saw in Sandy Point, because the roads had a little more space and nobody was parked in the driveway space to their garage.

6. Update from the Davis County Sherriff's Office

This item was held at the beginning of tonight's Administrative Session.

7. Consideration of Approval of the Minutes from the October 20th, 2020 West Point City Council Meeting

Council Member Dawson motioned to approve the Minutes from the October 20, 2020 West Point City Council Meeting
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

8. Consideration of Approval of Ordinance No. 11-17-2020A, Setting the 2021 Meeting Schedule for the West Point City Council – Ms. Casey Arnold

Ms. Arnold stated that the City Council must set its Meeting Schedule each year via ordinance. The Council has historically met on the first and third Tuesday of each month, and the proposed 2021 Meeting Schedule follows that same schedule. Staff recommends approval.

The Council had no further comments or discussion.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Ordinance No. 11-17-2020A

Council Member Petersen seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed

9. Consideration of Approval of Ordinance no. 11-17-2020B, Amending the Table of Land Use Regulations in WPCC Section 17.75.030 to Allow Open Storage for Recreational Vehicle, Boat and Trailer in the R-I/P Zone – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that Tim Gooch owns property on 1800 N and about 3900 W. His property is zoned C-C along the frontage of 1800 N and R-I-P in the rear portion. Mr. Gooch has submitted plans for storage units on the front part of the property and the concept also includes open RV storage on the industrial portion of the property. However, Staff discovered that RV storage is not actually listed as an allowed use in the industrial zone, although it has always been considered as an appropriate use for that zone. Staff proposes that open storage for recreational vehicles, boats, and trailers be added to the table of allowed uses as Item Number 23. Staff recommends approval of this amendment to the Code.

Mayor Craythorne opened the item for public hearing.

a. Public Hearing

No comments.

Council Member Petersen motioned to close the public hearing

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed

The Council had no further discussion on the proposed ordinance.

b. Action

Council Member Petersen motioned to approve Ordinance No. 11-17-2020B

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

Roll Call:

Council Member Petersen – Aye

Council Member Judd – Aye

Council Member Dawson – Aye

Council Member Chatterton – Aye

Council Member Henderson – Absent

The Council unanimously agreed

10. Consideration of Approval to Remove the Bartholomew Lane Subdivision Phase 3 from Warranty – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this subdivision is located at 1600 N 3600 W and was placed on warranty on June 2, 2015. They have been on warranty longer than the one-year requirement because the landscaping of the detention pond still needed to be completed. Mr. Davis stated that they have now finished that landscaping with sod, landscape rock and the outlet of the pond and they also reinstalled the sprinkler system and it is all in very good order. Staff recommends removing Phase 3 from warranty.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve

Council Member Dawson seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed

11. Consideration of Approval of Bryn MacDonald as Community Development Director – Mayor Erik Craythorne

Mayor Craythorne stated that when this position opened, he and Mr. Laws had discussions over the quality of the applicants that may apply and if we would be able to find the right applicant that was a good fit for the City. During the interview process, the Mayor stated that Mr. Laws kept him updated on the progress and kept referencing one particular applicant that the panel really liked. Mr. Davis added that there was a great pool of qualified candidates that applied, but Mrs. MacDonald rose to the top from the beginning – each interview and interaction with her has been a great and pleasant experience. Before being offered the position at the end of the recruitment process, the Mayor stated he was able to visit with her and could see why she was the chosen the applicant. He stated that he is very excited and appreciative to welcome her to the City as the new Community Development Director. He invited Mrs. MacDonald to introduce herself to the Council.

Mrs. MacDonald stated that she is very excited to be working for West Point and that the Staff she has been able to work with and meet so far has been “awesome.” She has worked for Herriman City for close to 15 years, which has seen a huge amount of growth during her time there; when she started in 2006, the population was about 10,000 and is now at around 60,000. She looks forward to working with the City as it prepares for and goes through this period of growth in development. She stated that she is originally from Oregon and attended BYU. She and her husband have three kids and they are planning to move into or close to West Point. She again stated her excitement for the opportunity to work for West Point and other City Staff.

Mayor Craythorne stated that he has really enjoyed the opportunity to get to know Mrs. MacDonald and think that she is going to be a perfect fit for the City and brings invaluable experience to the position. The Council expressed their excitement to have Mrs. MacDonald join the City and look forward to working with her and benefitting from the professional experience that she has.

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve Bryn MacDonald as Community Development Director
Council Member Dawson seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

12. Motion to Adjourn the General Session

Council Member Petersen motioned to adjourn the General Session
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed


ERIK R. CRAYTHORNE, MAYOR

January 5th, 2021


CASEY ARNOLD, CITY RECORDER

January 5th, 2021

