



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES WEST POINT CITY HALL July 20th, 2021

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 at West Point City Hall on July 20, 2021 at 6:00 PM with Mayor Erik Craythorne presiding. This meeting was also available via electronic Zoom Meeting and was accessible to attendees by entering Meeting ID #842 9817 8402 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

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

EXCUSED: None

CITY EMPLOYEES PRESENT: Kyle Laws, City Manager; Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager; Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director; Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director; Paul Rochell, Public Works Director; Troy Moyes, City Planner; and Casey Arnold, City Recorder

EXCUSED: None

VISITORS PRESENT: Brian Vincent. No sign-in required for online attendees.

1. Discussion Regarding an Amended Plat for the Community Garden Lot – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this item has been discussed with the Council in previous meetings and is regarding a parcel in the Sandy Meadows Subdivision that is owned by the City. The property is located at 2150 W 470 N and was originally designated as a detention pond for the subdivision. However, that detention pond was no longer needed once the Bison Pointe Subdivision to the west was developed and at that point, the lot was converted into use as a community garden lot. The community garden will no longer be in operation and the City would like to change the use of the parcel into a buildable lot. To do so, the subdivision plat will need to be amended to designate the lot as such. However, when the amended plat was being prepared, the surveyors discovered that the existing fence line is not on the actual property line, and the setback of the house to the west was measured from that fence line rather than from the actual property line. Because the fence has been in place for more than 20 years and that home would technically be non-compliant if the property line were left where it is shown on the plat, the amended plat designates the fence line as the new property line, thereby requiring that the lot with the existing home be recorded as a "new" amended lot, Lot 1, and the City's property will be designated as Lot 2. Mr. Davis noted that the City's property is decreased by about 800 sq. ft. with this property line change, but Utah State Law requires that a fence line that has been in place over a period of years be held as the property line. Although smaller, Lot 2 is still over 10,000 sq. ft., which meets the minimum lot size requirement for this zone.

Staff recommends approval of the amended plat and the Council had no further discussion at this time. Consideration of final approval is on the agenda in tonight's General Session.

****Mayor Craythorne disclosed that he is involved with the following subdivision and recused himself from the discussion.***

Mayor Pro Tem Petersen presided over the meeting for this agenda item. *

2. Discussion Regarding Final Plat Approval of Phase 4 of the Craythorn Homestead Subdivision – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald stated that Phase 4 of this subdivision consists of 17 lots and is located just north of 700 S and 4500 W. The Planning Commission approved Phase 4 at their last meeting, and did not have any concerns in granting that approval. There are no special amenities/improvements required for this development and Staff recommends approval.

The Council had no further discussion on Phase 4 and will consider final approval at the next meeting.

****Mayor Craythorne resumed to preside over the remainder of the meeting. ****

3. Discussion Regarding the Revised Land Use and Development Code – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald stated that the Planning Commission has had several discussions on the proposed revisions of the City's land use and development codes, having now gone through the entire final draft twice. They held a public hearing at their last meeting and there were some citizen comments, although they were mostly in regards to questions and clarifications, with no comments expressing strong opposition. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission did approve the final draft for recommendation of approval to the Council, although it was not a unanimous decision. The dissenting vote was largely in regards to concerns about the process for amending the City's General Plan. Mrs. MacDonald stated that she would go over this issue in-depth during as part of this discussion.

This major code revision removes all sections of the current City Code regarding land use and development and replaces them with a new "Land Use and Development" Code. She explained that it will be much easier for both Staff and developers to have all of the provisions combined into one central section. She explained that many of the changes were made simply to bring the City's Code into compliance with State Code.

Mrs. MacDonald recognized Troy Moyes, the City Planner, who has done extensive work on preparing the 160-page final draft, which was included in its entirety with the Staff Report for this item. The draft is also color-coded, with blue representing State Code changes, red representing policy changes, and green representing text/technical changes.

The proposed changes can be placed in one of four categories and are summarized as follows:

1. **Compliance:** Several proposed changes/additions fall within this category. The current code does have language that is not in line with the current State Code. For example, the Conditional Use chapter allows for the City to "deny" an applicant, whereas State Code states that conditional uses are permitted and should be allowed as long as reasonable conditions are used. The following are specific areas where this category applies:
 - a. Temporary regulations, exactions, and vested rights
 - b. Noticing requirements for zoning amendments
 - c. Appeal authority
 - d. Conditional uses
 - e. Cannabis production and pharmacy
 - f. Manufactured homes
 - g. Nonconforming use and noncomplying structures
2. **Repeal and Replace:** In the process of consolidating standards the following titles were affected and brought into the updated Title 17 Land Use and Development Code:
 - a. Title 2.60 (Planning Commission) – Moved planning commission from Title 2.60 to Title 17
 - b. Title 15 (Building and Construction Standards) – Residential construction (15.15) and commercial development standards (15.20) all moved to Title 17 while the rest stays
 - c. Title 16 (Subdivision) – All moved to Title 17
 - d. Title 18 (Land Use) – All moved to Title 17
3. **Minor Text Changes:** There are over 200 "minor text" changes in the proposed document. Some of those changes include adding "as adopted by the City" to the end of a sentence or adding "Community Development Director or designee" in place of "Zoning Administrator" to be consistent throughout the code and help clarify the text.
4. **Policy Changes:** The changes listed above in the other categories only add clarification and are not major policy changes. There are, however, several proposed policy changes throughout the code, including the following:
 - a. Process for amendments to the Land Use code and/or General Plan (17.00.090)
 - b. Addition of "Zoning Conditions" (17.00.090(I))
 - c. Clarifying standards and approval procedures for Conditional Uses (17.20.030)
 - d. Adding "administrative review/approval" for certain uses in the Table of Land Use Regulations (17.60.050)
 - e. Addition of "Zoning Chapters" (17.60.060) Each zone will be represented by each chapter with individual standards and references to applicable regulations
 - f. Deck and patio encroachment standards (17.70.020 (D))
 - g. New setback standards for Accessory Buildings (17.70.030)
 - h. Subdivision approving bodies (17.130.040)(17.130.050) Planning Commission will see all preliminary plats and will not see final plat. City Council will only see final plats

Mr. Moyes also provided the Council with a chart summarizing the proposed policy/ changes in comparison with the current Code and where the revision is located:

Type	Current	Proposed	Proposed Code Reference
Amendments to the Land Use Code and/or General Plan	Amendments to the Land Use Code or General Plan are initiated by City Council, Planning Commission, or Staff.	Changes can be initiated with an application and supporting documentation by any person seeking an amendment to the code, map, or General Plan. Changes to the General Plan and Zoning Map can be done at the same time.	17.00.090 (page 2)
Zoning Conditions	Not allowed or defined	This will allow the Land Use Authority at the time of rezoning to set conditions on the property. Some of those conditions could be the type of use, density, building square footage, or height of structures. The Zoning Map will have a "ZC" showing those conditions.	17.00.090(J) (page 3)
Appeal Authority	Currently, the Board of Adjustment serves this role.	City Council will appoint a Hearing Officer that will serve for 2 years. That person will be law trained or significant experience with land use law.	17.20.040 (page 37)
Conditional Uses	Conditional Uses have been the "catch-all" for most land use items. The current code language violates State Code (however practice has been in line with State Code) that allows the Land Use Authority the right to deny any application.	This section uses State Code language like: "The applicant shall adequately demonstrate that the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use can be mitigated through the imposition of reasonable conditions based on standards in this chapter."	17.40 (page 44)
Administrative Review (Staff)	Administrative review is done for items like minor home occupations, house plans, commercial licensing, fence permits, smaller accessory buildings, etc.	The proposed changes allow Administrative Review to include daycares, preschools, model homes, accessory buildings up to 1,500 square feet. The Table of Land Use Regulations was also updated to show these changes and clarify other uses.	17.60.050 (page 53-57)
Residential Encroachment Standards	Architectural features like porches, decks, and balconies are allowed to project into the rear yard. No minimum distance is defined to the rear property line.	The proposed changes allow the architectural features to project but not closer than 10' from the rear property line.	17.70.020(D) (page 100)
Accessory Building Setback Standards	Accessory buildings are allowed to a minimum distance of 1' from the property line including the drip line of the roof.	Accessory building setbacks are based on the size of the "wall height" of the structure as defined in the code. A sliding scale was created to push the structure further away based on the height of the wall adjacent to that property line.	17.70.030(A) (page 101)
Subdivision approving bodies	The Preliminary Plan is approved by Planning Commission. Final Plat is approved by Planning Commission and City Council.	Planning Commission will not see Final Plat. Only City Council will see the Final Plat for subdivisions	17.130 (page 140-142)

In regards to amendments to the General Plan, Mrs. MacDonald stated that the City does not currently have a process in place for a developer or property owner to request a change to the General Plan for a project, and only allows for the General Plan to be amended through a rezone request. The proposed process is similar to the zoning request process, wherein it begins with the submittal of an application to the City requesting the amendment. With their request, they would be required to submit supporting documentation like maps, conceptual site plans, project detail, etc. so that the City can consider what is being proposed and how it may or may not be a project they would approve amending the General Plan to allow for. Mrs. MacDonald noted that a change to the General Plan is a legislative decision and the Council can always deny the request, but by including a defined process in City Code, it puts in place a more 'official' route for a developer to bring their proposal before the Planning Commission and City Council and have their request be approved or denied. She added that the Council will likely want there to be "a really good reason" for amending the General Plan and this provides a process for a developer to follow that includes providing enough information about their intentions for a property to make his/her case for why it should be amended. Mrs. MacDonald noted for the Council that the reason the Planning Commission's approval of the proposed code revisions was not unanimous was largely due to a difference of opinion on whether or not there should even be a process that allows for developers and/or property owners to officially request to amend the General Plan.

Mayor Craythorne stated that in some of his discussions regarding this amendment process, the idea of only accepting applications to amend the General Plan during certain times throughout the year was raised, and inquired as to whether the Planning Commission considered including this type of restriction. He stated that some of the surrounding cities have some sort of designated time(s) in their code for when they will accept applications and some that do not. Of those that do not, he is aware that many have had issues of being inundated with applications throughout the year that constantly have to be processed. Mrs. MacDonald stated that the Planning Commission did discuss this idea, but ultimately approved not including specific timeframes for when applications would be accepted and see whether or not it works; if found to be needed, the process could be amended to

include some sort of application period. However, she reminded the City Council that they have the authority to modify the Planning Commission's proposed final draft as they choose. The Council discussed the different options and tentatively settled on restricting the application period to two times per year, most likely in the fall and spring, wherein amendment requests would be accepted. Additionally, the Council wanted to include a one-year waiting period before a new amendment request on the same property(s) can be submitted after being denied. However, Mr. Laws expressed his concern that, because commercial development is usually very time-sensitive, the situation could arise wherein the City would miss out on what could be a great, beneficial commercial opportunity because a business did not want to wait several months for the application period to be open. The Council felt that this was a valid concern and determined that the City Council should have the ability to initiate the General Plan amendment process anytime it chooses, which they may want to do in that type of situation.

Through this discussion, the question arose regarding whether or not the current rezoning process should be modified to prohibit rezone requests that are against the General Plan, which essentially would be an amendment request, as there would now be this separate process the applicant should go through in that situation. Mrs. MacDonald stated that State Law does not require that a city follow its general plan and it is a city's code that designates how closely the general plan is to be followed when considered a rezone request. The Council was in agreement that if a property owner or developer wants a different zone than what is designated on the General Plan, they must go through the amendment process and not the rezone process. The Council felt that as the new amendment process requires more information from the applicant about their intentions for the property, it will better ensure that the end result of the project is in line with what was expected when the zoning designation was approved. Mrs. MacDonald stated that one of the next big projects for the City is updating the General Plan and as those updates are worked through and revisions made, the City will likely have more confidence in the zoning and planning decisions reflected in the General Plan and be able to rely more heavily on it when considering all zoning requests.

Logistically, Mrs. MacDonald noted that an application fee will need to be established and approved by the Council in the City's Fee Schedule for all General Plan amendment applications; this would need to be a significant fee as amending a general plan involves a lot of time from Staff, noticing requirements and costs, etc. Mayor Craythorne asked the Council to consider what an appropriate fee would be for this type of application and share their thoughts during the next discussion of the proposed code changes.

Mrs. MacDonald stated that the Council has had the opportunity to discuss all of the proposed changes in previous meetings; however, they have only had the opportunity to briefly discuss residential encroachment standards, and she would like more feedback from the Council on the proposed revisions. The current language does not have a restriction on how close features like porches, decks, balconies, etc., can be to the rear property line; there are minimum setbacks for the actual home, which is measured from the outer most foundation wall, but these features can essentially go right up to the very back edge of a property. Staff clarified for the Council that the Code defines these structures as those that are 30 in. or higher off of the ground (which would not include features like a cement patio). The Planning Commission has recommended that there be a rear setback minimum from the fence line of at least 10 ft. The Council discussed this proposed restriction and several concerns were raised. One concern was in regards to properties where the fence line may not be on the property line due to an easement or being on a corner lot, and this standard would have a greater restriction on these property owners in being able to use the space they have available in their backyards. Another issue was in regards to what the setback should be for a structure like this that is in the side yard rather than in the backyard, especially as some subdivisions have homes with only 8 ft. side yard setbacks. Lastly, there was a question as to where the 30 in. standard was measured from – whether it is from the top of the floor of the structure or from the bottom. Mrs. MacDonald stated that the Planning Commission had some of these same concerns and although they discussed the issues extensively, were not able to come to a unanimous consensus.

Mayor Craythorne noted that in comparison to many other cities, West Point's Code is "very liberal" when it comes to restrictions on what can and cannot be in a property's backyard (aside from accessory buildings), as many have regulations on the height and width of these types of architectural features in addition to setback requirements. Council Member Petersen stated that this may be an issue to consider further, because as Council Members, part of their responsibility is to protect the privacy of residents in their homes and subdivisions; a tall deck or patio on a home that encroaches up to the fence or property line would likely feel intrusive to those living in the neighboring home. The Council decided to include the proposed 10 ft. setback restriction with this code revision so as not to delay the process, but with the intention to revisit this section in the near future to consider other options and possibly make further modifications.

The Council will hold a public hearing at the next meeting (August 3rd) and if comfortable, consider final approval of the revisions at the following meeting.

4. Other Items

The Administrative Session adjourned.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

West Point City Hall
July 20th, 2021

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 West Point City Council General Session held at West Point City Hall on July 20, 2021 at 7:00 PM with Mayor Erik Craythorne presiding. This meeting was also available via electronic Zoom Meeting and was accessible to attendees by entering Meeting ID #842 9817 8402 at <https://zoom.us/join> or by telephone at (669) 900-6833.

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

EXCUSED: None

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

EXCUSED: None

VISITORS PRESENT: Brian Vincent
No sign-in required for online attendees.

1. **Call to Order** – Mayor Craythorne welcomed those attending the meeting.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Prayer** – Given by Council Member Chatterton
4. **Communications and Disclosures from City Council and Mayor**

Council Member Judd – none

Council Member Petersen – none

Council Member Dawson – The North Davis Sewer District was able to refinance some of their existing bonds with much lower interest rates, which will end up saving over \$2 million in interest fees over the course of the loans. Council Member Dawson stated that this was a great thing the District was able to do.

Council Member Henderson – None

Council Member Chatterton – The Mosquito Abatement District Davis has been hard at work this year, performing their regular abatement tactics and strategies. The State Duck Club in Farmington and Mills Pond in West Bountiful have both had a mosquito pool test positive for West Nile Virus, which is carried by the Culex tarsalis mosquito species. Another species, the Culex dorsalis, has been particularly pesky this year, but are not carriers of the West Nile Virus. The District has had some issues being short-staffed at times due to employees having COVID, such as the pilot coming down with the virus and not being able to do as much plane-spraying this year, and they currently have some job openings. Council Member Chatterton encouraged anyone who may be interested to contact the District for more information.

Mayor Craythorne – None

5. **Communications from Staff**

Mr. Laws stated that the annual summer party for Staff, Council, Planning Commission, and their families is normally held the first part of August, and would like the Council's feedback on whether they would like to hold it this year after it was cancelled in 2020 because of COVID. The Council was in agreeance that the get-together should be held as normal and directed Staff to move forward with planning the event.

Tomorrow, Wednesday the 21st, an Annexation Open House will be held at City Hall. The Parker Place annexation was denied last year due to the proposed property creating an island, and the petitioners have since been meeting with the surrounding landowners to try and get their support for their properties to be included in a new annexation petition in order to be contiguous to the City's boundaries. From this, many of the property owners in that area that have been approached have wanted more information about the possible annexation and how they will be affected. Mr. Laws stated that this will be an informational event where those residents can come and hopefully get some of their questions answered by Staff. He also hopes to be able to explain that an annexation is initiated by property owners, *not* the City, and that the City is not advocating either way.

On Thursday the 22nd of this week, there will also be a Meet the Candidates Night from 6 – 8 PM at City Hall to provide residents with the opportunity to meet and converse with this year's candidates for City Council and Mayor before casting their Primary Election ballots.

Lastly, Mr. Laws reminded the Council that a Special Meeting will be held on August 24th in order to approve the Primary Election Canvass. The meeting will be available for them to attend either in-person at City Hall or via Zoom.

6. Citizen Comment

No comments

7. Consideration of Approval of the Minutes from the June 15th, 2021 West Point City Council Meeting

Council Member Judd motioned to approve the June 15th, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Council Member Henderson seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed

8. Consideration of Approval of the Minutes from the July 6th, 2021 West Point City Council Meeting

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve the July 6th, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Council Member Dawson seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed

9. Consideration of Approval of the Final Plat of the Harvest Fields Subdivision Phases 7 and 8 – Mrs. Bryn MacDonald

Mrs. MacDonald summarized that this subdivision has been discussed by the Council several times, with the final plats of Phases 7 and 8 being discussed at the previous meeting. She summarized that these two phases were designed in conjunction with one another, however, only Phase 7 will be developed at this time; construction of Phase 8 will begin at some point in the future, but is being presented to the Council with Phase 7 because they were engineered together. The Council has previously approved the request for an exception to start Phases 2 & 7 at the same time as Phases 3-6. The Council has also approved the Final Plat of Phase 2, but construction of Phase 1 was put on hold while the developer focused on other phases. The applicant has now submitted the final plats for Phases 7 and 8 and is requesting they both be approved at this time. If approved, Phases 1 through 8 of the subdivision will all have been given final plat approval, however, due to the City's Code restricting simultaneous develop of phases, they only have approval to build Phases 2 through 7 at this time.

Mr. Davis confirmed for Council Member Chatterton that the phases will have the required amount of accesses for the number of lots and also that the 1200 S road should be completed by the end of summer.

The Council had no further discussion.

Council Member Petersen motioned to approve the Final Plat for Phases 7 and 8

Council Member Judd seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed

10. Consideration of Approval of the Amended Plat for the Community Garden Lot – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that this item was discussed earlier in tonight's Administrative Session and summarized that this property is owned by the City and located in the Sandy Meadows Subdivision at 2150 W 470 N. The property was originally designated as a detention pond for the subdivision, however, that detention pond was no longer needed once the Bison Pointe Subdivision to the west was developed. At that point, the lot was converted into use as a community garden lot. The community garden will no longer be in operation and the City would like to change the use of the parcel into a buildable lot. To do so, the subdivision plat will need to be amended to designate the lot as such. Additionally, when the amended plat was being prepared, the surveyors discovered that the existing fence line is not on the actual property line, and the setback of the house to the west was measured from that fence line rather than from the actual property line. Because the fence has been in place for more than 20 years, the amended plat designates the fence line as the new property line, thereby requiring that the lot with the existing home be recorded as a "new" amended lot, Lot 1, and the City's property will be designated as Lot 2 on the new "Sandy Bison West" plat map. He explained that the County Recorder requested that the amendments to the two lots be done on one plat. Mr. Davis noted that the City's property is decreased by about 800 sq. ft. with this property line change, but Utah State Law requires that a fence line that has been in place over a period of years be held as the property line.

The Council had no further discussion.

Council Member Petersen motioned to approve the amended plat

Council Member Dawson seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed.

****Mayor Craythorne disclosed that he is the owner and developer of the following subdivision and recused himself.***

Mayor Pro Tem Petersen presided over the meeting for this agenda item. *

11. Consideration of Approval to Place the Littlefield Subdivision Phase 2 on One0Year Warranty – Mr. Boyd Davis

Mr. Davis stated that Phase 2 of the Littlefield Subdivision is a one-lot subdivision located at 710 N 2400 W. Phase 2 includes the cul-de-sac that was unfinished at the north end of 2400 W. All of the required items have been completed, including the silicone on the asphalt, streetlight, and sidewalk. Staff recommends that Phase 2 be put on one-year warranty.

The Council had no further discussion

Council Member Chatterton motioned to approve

Council Member Henderson seconded the motion

The Council unanimously agreed.

12. Discussion Regarding Current Drought Conditions – Mr. Kyle Laws

Mr. Laws stated that the Davis and Weber Counties Canal Company has issued notice that they will be shutting off the secondary water on September 1st, which is a month earlier than the already adjusted date of October 1st, which was already going to be shortening the water season by two weeks (regular shut off date is October 15th). In a previous meeting, the Council had discussed the drought conditions and agreed that the requirement to complete landscaping of new construction

should not be enforced, but DWCC is asking that cities go a step further and actually discourage any new landscaping to be done. Staff stated that funds for the landscape costs would be placed in an escrow account to ensure that the landscaping could be completed by the homeowner when water conditions improve.

Mayor Craythorne stated that with this notice from DWCC, he would like to have the Council consider the option of closing down the City's Splash Pad in the near future rather than on the Monday after Labor Day weekend. The Mayor believes that residents will be understanding of why it was being shutoff early and that it shouldn't be too polarizing of an issue. However, he felt that it is a decision big enough that it needed to be made by the Council rather than himself or City Staff. The Council agreed that in light of the current conditions, it would be appropriate to turn the Splash Pad off early. With the Pioneer Day holiday the coming weekend, the Council felt that it should remain open through Saturday, July 24th. Staff was directed to place signs as soon as possible at the Splash Pad in order to inform those who go there in the next few days that it will be turned off, as well as posting it on Facebook and the City's website.

13. Motion to Move into a Closed Session

Council Member Dawson motioned to move into a Closed Session
Council Member Petersen seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed.

Closed Session

1. Motion to Open Closed Session

Council Member Petersen motioned to open the Closed Session
Council Member Judd seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

2. Call to Order and Roll Call

Mayor Erik Craythorne called the July 20th, 2021 Closed Session to order

Roll Call -

Mayor Erik Craythorne
Council Member Gary Petersen
Council Member Annette Judd
Council Member Jerry Chatterton
Council Member Andy Dawson
Council Member Kent Henderson
Planning Commission Chair Brian Vincent

Kyle Laws, City Manager
Boyd Davis, Assistant City Manager
Ryan Harvey, Administrative Services Director
Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director
Paul Rochell, Public Works Director
Casey Arnold, City Recorder

3. Closed Discussion Regarding the Sale and/or Purchase of Real Property, Pursuant to UCA §52-4-205(1)(d)

4. Motion to Adjourn Closed Session and enter the General Session

Council Member Chatterton motioned to close the Closed Session and enter the General Session
Council Member Henderson seconded the motion
The Council unanimously agreed

14. Motion to Adjourn the General Session

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


ERIK R. CRAYTHORNE, MAYOR August 17th, 2021



CASEY ARNOLD, CITY RECORDER August 17th, 2021