

1 NORTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING

2
3 July 8, 2014

4
5 The North Ogden City Council convened in an open meeting on July 8, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the
6 North Ogden City Council Chambers at 505 East 2600 North. Notice of time, place and agenda
7 of the meeting was delivered to each member of the City Council, posted on the bulletin board at
8 the municipal office and posted to the Utah State Website on July 3, 2014. Notice of the annual
9 meeting schedule was published in the Standard-Examiner on January 24, 2014.

10
11
12 PRESENT: Brent Taylor Mayor
13 Kent Bailey Council Member
14 Lynn Satterthwaite Council Member
15 Cheryl Stoker Council Member
16 Phillip Swanson Council Member
17 James Urry Council Member
18
19 STAFF PRESENT: Ronald F. Chandler City Manager
20 Craig Call City Attorney
21 S. Annette Spendlove City Recorder/H.R. Director
22 Gary Kerr Building Official
23 Anthony Bersamin Animal Control Officer
24
25 VISITORS: Joan Brown Andrea Porter
26 Miranda Hoggan Naomi Elmer
27 Kaylee Leichty Annelies Lippert
28 Tasha Urban Ashley Porokar
29 Tayler Wood Haylee Ware
30 Hannah Simmons Lexi Olsen
31 Stormie Elmer Tiffany Turner
32 Austin Halbert Nathan Christensen
33 Kade Peterson Kimberly Popham
34 Luanne Porter Blake Porter
35 Randall Winn Jonathan Call
36 Carol Campbell Bob Campbell
37 Rose Storey Hannah Porter
38 Hannah Goodrich Mark Olsen
39 Michele Olsen Clint Elmer
40 Raket Elmer Rachel Trotter

41
42 Mayor Taylor welcomed those in attendance.

43
44 Mayor Taylor offered the invocation and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.
45
46
47

48 **CONSENT AGENDA**

49 **1. Consideration to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2014 City Council Meeting**
50 **Council Member Bailey moved to approve the consent agenda. Council Member**
51 **Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

52
53 **Voting on the motion:**

54
55 **Council Member Bailey aye**
56 **Council Member Satterthwaite aye**
57 **Council Member Stoker aye**
58 **Council Member Swanson aye**
59 **Council Member Urry aye**

60
61 **The motion passed unanimously.**

62
63 **ACTIVE AGENDA**

64
65 **1. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

66
67 There were no public comments.

68
69
70 **2. PRESENTATION OF MISS NORTH OGDEN AND ATTENDANTS**

71
72 Mayor Taylor recognized Miss North Ogden Queen Rose Storey and Second Attendant Hannah
73 Porter. He added that Miss North Ogden 2005, Hannah Goodrich, was very instrumental in
74 revitalizing the Miss North Ogden pageant; the pageant was held two weeks ago and there were
75 eight contestants. He then read a brief statement providing information about both Ms. Storey
76 and Ms. Porter and stated he looks forward to their participation in North Ogden City events over
77 the next year.

78
79
80 **3. SWEARING IN OF YOUTH CITY COUNCIL OFFICIALS**

81
82 Mayor Taylor stated the Youth Council is a great way for young people of the community to get
83 involved and learn about City government and public service; the program has a new advisor this
84 year, Tiffany Turner, and she is doing a great job leading this great group of young people. He
85 provided a report of some recent activities the Youth Council has been involved in, after which
86 City Recorder Spendlove administered the oath of office to the new Youth Council officials:
87 Andrea Porter, Youth City Council Mayor, Lexi Olsen, Hannah Simmons, Haley Ware, Justin
88 Roylance, Stormy Elmer, and Kimberly Topham.

89
90 Youth Council Mayor Andrea Porter thanked the Mayor and Council for their support and for
91 allowing the Youth Council to be part of the City; her participation on the Youth Council has
92 been wonderful and afforded her many great opportunities.

93

94 **Mayor Taylor then reported the Council met in a work session earlier this evening and
95 participated in a site visit halfway up Mt. Ben Lomond to see the City's reservoir and review the
96 City's debris basins; he shared a few photographs from the visit.**

97
98 **4. PRESENTATION BY LACROSSE ORGANIZATION**
99

100 Mayor Taylor reported it is necessary to pull this item from the agenda; he noted it will be added
101 to a future agenda for further consideration.
102

103
104 **5. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A SIDEWALK LOCATED ON 2550**
105 **N. BY MAJESTIC ELEMENTARY**
106

107 City Manager Chandler stated staff has conducted research about the need for safe sidewalks
108 throughout the City, particularly around schools. The City has a map that has been in use since
109 2008 that identifies the areas that are lacking sidewalks as well as the routes that have been
110 identified for future sidewalks; he reviewed the map to highlight existing sidewalks and the areas
111 for which future sidewalks are planned. City Administration contacted Weber School District to
112 get a better understanding of the current bussing routes in the City and he identified the school
113 boundaries and the bussing routes on the map as well. He also identified the areas of the City
114 where students are not eligible to ride a school bus and must walk to either North Ogden
115 Elementary, Green Acres Elementary, or Majestic Elementary. He reviewed similar data for
116 North Ogden Junior High and Orion Junior High schools.
117

118 Mayor Taylor then indicated City Administration has spoken with the Parent Teachers
119 Association (PTA) for Majestic Elementary school and they are working to determine the
120 amount of money they may be able to contribute to the sidewalk project they have requested. He
121 noted an item will be added to the August 12 agenda to allow the Council to make a final
122 decision regarding the project.
123

124 Council Member Bailey asked if there will be sufficient time to construct a sidewalk prior to
125 school going back in session if a decision is not made until August 12. Mayor Taylor stated that
126 the sidewalk would actually be an asphalt path rather than a traditional sidewalk and he believes
127 the project could be significantly completed prior to the first day of school.
128

129 Council Member Swanson asked who will maintain the sidewalk, especially during the winter
130 months. Mayor Taylor stated sidewalk maintenance, including snow removal, is typically the
131 responsibility of the property owner, but in this case the path is 600 to 800 feet in length and he
132 anticipates the City will be responsible for maintenance and snow removal similar to the
133 maintenance that is performed on the City's trail system. He stated the issue has not been
134 specifically addressed, but he would anticipate the City will ultimately be responsible.
135

136 Council Member Urry stated that when this issue was initially discussed the school
137 communicated to the City that the path could potentially serve 69 students that are not eligible to
138 be bussed to the school. He indicated he would like to receive a breakdown of the number of
139 those students that actually walk to school; it may be that only 20 kids walk to school and would

140 use the path. He added there are many other streets in the City that are just as busy as 2550
141 North that do not have sidewalks and the parents living on or near those streets figure out a way
142 to get their children to school.

143
144 There was a brief discussion about the City's safe sidewalk plan and associated map, with Mr.
145 Chandler indicating the plan was specific to North Ogden Elementary, and not the two other
146 elementary schools in the City. Mayor Taylor stated there have been discussions about creating
147 a similar plan for other schools in the City and now may be the time to do that. Council Member
148 Bailey stated it may be wise to consider creating special improvement districts to provide for the
149 needed improvements rather than approving individual requests as they are made to the City. It
150 is not good government to only address the "squeaky wheel" and he would prefer to address
151 sidewalk needs in totality.

152
153 Council Member Urry asked if the school and school district has indicated any willingness to
154 participate in funding the project. Mayor Taylor stated they do not have the capacity to offer
155 funding for the project. Council Member Urry stated the school district may be able to consider
156 other options for increasing funding for bussing programs.

157
158 Mayor Taylor concluded by reiterating the item will be on the August 12 agenda for further
159 discussion and consideration and before that time City Administration will work to address the
160 questions and concerns raised during this meeting. Council Member Bailey stated he
161 understands there is a need for a sidewalk in the area, but expressed his concern about the fact
162 that the pathway could potentially be eliminated when the property upon which it will be located
163 is developed.

164
165 There was a brief general discussion about safety sidewalk grant opportunities through the Utah
166 Department of Transportation (UDOT) with Mayor Taylor noting the application period is each
167 fall and the City can apply for grant funds, but the grant program is very competitive.

168
169
170 **6. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING**
171 **0.274 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 860 E. 2100 N., PETITIONERS**
172 **LYMAN C. AND LONNIE C. BARKER**
173

174 A staff memo from City Recorder Spendlove noted the Council took action on this item, but the
175 proposed ordinance is being referred back to the Council for further review as updates have been
176 made to the legal description of the property being annexed. The changes that were made are
177 marked in red on the attached ordinance.

178
179 There was a brief discussion regarding the changes to the legal description, with Ms. Spendlove
180 indicating the changes are minor including changing the property size by a few feet.

181
182 **Council Member Swanson moved to adopt Ordinance 2014-16 annexing 0.274 acres located**
183 **at approximately 860 E. 2100 N., petitioners Lyman C. and Lonnie C. Barker. Council**
184 **Member Bailey seconded the motion.**
185 **Voting on the motion:**

186 Council Member Bailey aye
187 Council Member Satterthwaite aye
188 Council Member Stoker aye
189 Council Member Swanson aye
190 Council Member Urry aye

191
192 **The motion passed unanimously.**

193
194 Ms. Spendlove identified one additional typographical error in the legal description and asked
195 that the Council offer an amended motion to correct the error.

196
197 **Council Member Swanson moved to amend Ordinance 2014-16 annexing 0.274 acres**
198 **located at approximately 860 E. 2100 N., petitioners Lyman C. and Lonnie C. Barker to**
199 **correct the error cited by City Recorder Spendlove. Council Member Bailey seconded the**
200 **motion.**

201
202 **Voting on the motion:**

203
204 Council Member Bailey aye
205 Council Member Satterthwaite aye
206 Council Member Stoker aye
207 Council Member Swanson aye
208 Council Member Urry aye

209
210 **The motion passed unanimously.**

211
212
213 **7. PUBLIC HEARING TO TAKE COMMENTS ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF**
214 **THE NORTH OGDEN ZONING REGULATIONS TO ADD BEEKEEPING**

215
216 A staff memo from City Manager Chandler summarized a proposed beekeeping ordinance and
217 the "Utah Bee Inspection Act." Please note that individuals keeping bees must comply with
218 North Ogden's ordinance and Utah's bee inspection act. The following is a summary of the
219 attached ordinance. The Planning Commission recommends approval of the attached ordinance

- 220 1. Beekeeping is permitted in all residential zones.
221 2. A maximum of five (5) hives is permitted on lots less than one-half (1/2) acre.
222 3. 10 hives are permitted on lots larger than one-half (1/2) acre.
223 4. Beekeepers must register with the State of Utah.
224 5. Hives must be located at least three feet (3') from any property line.
225 6. Hives between three feet (3') and fifteen feet (15') must install a fly wall.
226 7. The beekeeper must provide water.

227
228 Mr. Chandler reviewed his staff memo, with a focus on how the proposed ordinance would be
229 enforced if adopted by the Council.

230

231 Council Member Urry inquired as to the number of North Ogden residents that are currently
232 registered as bee keepers with the State of Utah. Mr. Chandler stated he does not know the
233 answer to that question. Council Member Urry then inquired as to the number of boxes that are
234 considered hive. Mr. Chandler stated the definition of a hive is not based on the measurement of
235 boxes; rather one colony of bees constitutes a hive. Council Member Urry inquired as to the
236 proposed setback of a hive from the property line. Mr. Chandler answered three feet. Council
237 Member Urry asked if a flywall is required. Mr. Chandler stated a hive located between three
238 and 15 feet from the property line would require a flywall; hives set back 16 feet or further from
239 the property line would not require a flywall.

240
241 Council Member Satterthwaite inquired as to the motivation for creating this ordinance. Mr.
242 Chandler stated the issue was brought to the City's attention by some local beekeepers because
243 beekeeping is currently not listed as a permitted use in the City's zoning regulations. He stated
244 this means the beekeepers are operating illegally, though the use has been ignored over the years.
245 He stated this change would make beekeeping legal in the City. He noted Ogden City went
246 through a similar exercise recently and they have reported they have not noticed an increase in
247 the number of beekeepers in the City.

248
249 Council Member Urry inquired as to the penalty for a beekeeper not registered with the State of
250 Utah. Mr. Chandler stated the State can shut them down and confiscate their bees; there may be
251 a fine associated with illegal beekeeping as well. He noted the State's regulations are quite
252 extensive and he reviewed a few of the State of Utah requirements.

253
254 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if beekeepers will be given a specific amount of time to
255 come into compliance with State regulations. Mr. Chandler stated it may be that the majority of
256 beekeepers in the City are already in compliance; the only thing this ordinance will change is that
257 beekeeping will now be a permitted use in North Ogden.

258
259 Council Member Bailey stated that he is aware of some of the beekeeping operations in the City
260 and they are not located on residential, quarter-acre lots. It is concerning to him that the City
261 would allow beekeeping on residential lots of any size and he asked if that issue was taken into
262 consideration. Mr. Chandler answered yes; staff and the Planning Commission reviewed
263 ordinances used in many other communities throughout the State and found the size of lot is not
264 an issue and of more importance is the number of hives permitted on a lot. The Planning
265 Commission was comfortable that beekeeping be permitted on residential lots of all sizes as long
266 as the owner meets the setback requirements. Council Member Bailey asked if there is any
267 history relative to bees becoming a nuisance to adjacent property owners. Mr. Chandler stated
268 the City has not received any police reports regarding issues with beekeepers. Anthony
269 Bersamin, Animal Control Officer, noted that since last June he has only received one call
270 regarding a concern about beekeeping. He stated he has spoken to Ogden City and they have
271 experienced no problems either. Council Member Bailey asked what would happen if
272 beekeeping became a nuisance for property owners; he asked if the ordinance allowing
273 beekeeping or the nuisance ordinance would take precedence. Mr. Bersamin stated he cannot
274 answer that question, but the State of Utah regulations would likely trump the City's regulations.
275 Council Member Bailey asked if the State will respond to nuisance complaints. Mr. Chandler
276 stated he believes the State would only get involved in the event that a dangerous bee species

277 were to occupy a beehive. He added that the City could implement a sunset provision for the
278 ordinance to require that it be reviewed after a defined period of time to determine if it is
279 working or if changes need to be made.

280
281 Council Member Urry stated that it may be a good idea to include an article in a City newsletter
282 asking beekeepers to register with the State of Utah so that other residents understand where
283 beehives are being kept in the event that they have an allergy to bees. Mr. Bersamin stated he
284 would also like to understand the location of beehives.

285
286 Council Member Stoker stated she knows of an incident in Willard where there was a problem
287 with bees and she is aware the State of Utah was very involved in the incident; they do not let
288 beekeepers run amuck and their regulations are very strict. She stated she feels the City or a
289 resident would receive the same response in the event that there were an issue in North Ogden.

290
291 Council Member Swanson stated he spoke with a local bee supply owner and he indicated that
292 unless someone actively attacks a hive or if a hive has become aggressive the bees are generally
293 not an issue. He stated he feels confident the ordinance recommended by the Planning
294 Commission is sufficient and will provide for safety in the City relative to beekeeping. There
295 was a brief discussion regarding setbacks and flyway barriers, with a focus on whether
296 beekeeping would be permitted at a townhome. Mr. Bersamin stated he believes the covenants,
297 conditions, and restrictions (CCRs) recorded against a townhome complex would likely prohibit
298 an activity like beekeeping.

299
300 Mayor Taylor opened the public hearing at 7:44 p.m. There were no persons appearing to be
301 heard.

302
303 **Council Member Swanson moved to close the public hearing at 7:44 p.m. Council Member**
304 **Stoker seconded the motion.**

305
306 **Voting on the motion:**

307
308 **Council Member Bailey** **aye**
309 **Council Member Satterthwaite** **aye**
310 **Council Member Stoker** **aye**
311 **Council Member Swanson** **aye**
312 **Council Member Urry** **aye**

313
314 **The motion passed unanimously.**

315
316
317 **8. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE TO ADD**
318 **REQUIRMENTS FOR BEEKEEING TO THE NORTH OGDEN ZONING**
319 **REGULATIONS**

320

321 **Council Member Stoker moved to adopt Ordinance 2014-17 to add requirements for**
322 **beekeeping to the North Ogden Zoning Regulations. Council Member Swanson seconded**
323 **the motion.**

324
325 Discussion regarding lot sizes upon which beekeeping would be permitted ensued, with Mr.
326 Chandler reiterating the ordinance is written to permit beekeeping within any residential zone of
327 the City. He noted the Council can add a sunset provision to the ordinance if they desire.
328

329 Council Member Swanson asked if the Ogden City ordinance permits beekeeping in all
330 residential zones. Mr. Chandler stated he cannot answer that question definitively, but he
331 believes that is the case. Planning Commissioner Brown stated the Ogden City ordinance does
332 permit beekeeping in all residential zones regardless of lot size.
333

334 Council Member Bailey stated that he likes the idea of a sunset provision, but he would also like
335 staff to determine whether it is appropriate to limit beekeeping to a minimum lot size, and if not,
336 why that is the case. Council Member Satterthwaite stated he would also like to consider
337 precedent set in other cities via the ordinances they use to regulate beekeeping.
338

339 **Council Member Bailey offered a substitute motion to table consideration of Ordinance**
340 **2014-17 to a later date. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**

341
342 **Voting on the motion:**

343
344 **Council Member Bailey** aye
345 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye
346 **Council Member Stoker** aye
347 **Council Member Swanson** aye
348 **Council Member Urry** aye
349

350 **The motion passed unanimously.**

351
352 **9. PUBLIC HEARING TO TAKE COMMENTS ON AMMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF**
353 **THE NORTH OGDEN ZONING REGULATIONS TO ADD REQUIREMENTS FOR**
354 **SHORT TERM LENDERS**
355

356 A staff memo from City Planner Scott stated when the Planning Commission is acting as a
357 recommending body to the City Council; it is acting in a legislative capacity and has wide
358 discretion. Examples of legislative actions are general plan, zoning map, and land use text
359 amendments. Legislative actions require that the Planning Commission give a recommendation
360 to the City Council. Typically the criteria for making a decision, related to a legislative matter,
361 requires compatibility with the general plan and existing codes. On February 5, 2014 the North
362 Ogden Planning Commission (NOPC) made a motion directing staff to prepare a title loan
363 ordinance as requested by the City Council. On April 16, 2014 the North Ogden Planning
364 Commission discussed the basis for establishing a title loan ordinance. The following issues were
365 discussed and determinations made:

- 366 • Establishing a separation requirement between title loans, community center, school, or
367 other public gathering place, or sexually oriented business was deemed appropriate.
- 368 • A maximum number of businesses was not appropriate.
- 369 • The existing site plan and architectural standards are sufficient.
- 370 • Establishing standards for disclosure requirements that the title loan business must give to
371 loan applicants is appropriate.

372
373 On May 7, 2014 the Planning Commission reviewed a draft ordinance based upon the above
374 discussion. The Planning Commission gave direction to expand the section on location to give
375 examples similar to the separation standards in the retail tobacco specialty business standards.
376 They found that 660 feet is approximately a block separation and that it is adequate. Staff was
377 asked to bring an example of a notification sign to the public hearing where a decision on the
378 appropriateness of the sign size will be made. On June 4, 2014 the Planning Commission
379 conducted a public hearing regarding the draft ordinance. No one from the public testified at the
380 hearing. The Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend the City Council adopt the
381 attached ordinance.

382
383 EXISTING ZONING ORDINANCE LANGUAGE

384 11-2-1 Definitions

385 LENDING INSTITUTION: Any bank, insurance company, savings and loan association, or any
386 other person in the business of lending money or guaranteeing loans, any person obtaining,
387 arranging or negotiating loans or guarantees as agent or broker, and any person in the business of
388 buying or selling loans or instruments for the payment of money which are secured by title to or
389 a security interest in real estate.

390
391 The following extracts from the General Plan apply to this consideration.

392
393 Commercial Development

394 North Ogden's goals and policies concerning commercial developments address the aesthetics
395 and location of commercial developments. The desire of City officials is to provide an attractive,
396 pleasing environment in which to shop or work with in a commercial core. Enough vacant
397 property exists in North Ogden to accommodate future commercial growth. In order to function
398 efficiently, proposed commercial developments should be evaluated for adequate internal
399 circulation for automobiles and pedestrians with limited access points to the major streets serving
400 the developments. The focus of commercial development in North Ogden should be to provide
401 services that support the resident population of the City and adjacent areas. Regional commercial
402 centers would be inconsistent with citizen desires and the direction of this Plan.

403
404 Commercial Development

405 New commercial and other business development will enhance the community when meeting the
406 objectives of the General Plan. An improved standard of function, quality, and appearance is
407 expected by the citizens.

408 The memo offered the following summary of potential City Council considerations.

- 409 • Is the proposed amendment consistent with the North Ogden City General Plan?
- 410 • Does the proposed use meet the requirements of the applicable City Ordinances?
- 411 • Are the new ordinance standards appropriate?

412 The Planning Commission recommends the City Council adopt the title loan ordinance.

413

414 City Manager Chandler summarized the staff memo.

415

416 Council Member Urry referenced a strip mall in the City that includes a beauty shop and fitness
417 center and stated the northernmost office building on the property is approximately 100 feet from
418 a short term lender and it houses the Montessori child care center. He added that the same short
419 term lender is also within 1,000 feet of Zion's Bank. Mr. Chandler stated a traditional bank is
420 not considered a short term lender. He noted the short term lender that is currently open for
421 business in the City came into the City under the existing laws and he will be grandfathered
422 under those laws; the new ordinance cannot be used to drive that company out of business.

423

424 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if it would be possible to require the existing business to
425 use the same type of signage as is referenced in the proposed ordinance. Acting City Attorney
426 Craig Call stated that once a business is established and has relied upon the ordinances that were
427 in place at the time of their establishment, they cannot be displaced but the City can regulate
428 them. He feels the signage requirements can be imposed upon the existing business because it is
429 a reasonable requirement.

430

431 Council Member Urry stated that it is his understanding that a short term lender is highly
432 regulated by the financial regulating arm of the federal government and the proposed ordinance
433 may be an overabundance of caution. Mr. Chandler stated that the proposed ordinance does not
434 regulate the business aside from the regulation regarding signage; rather, the ordinance simply
435 allows the placement of this type of business within a zoning designation of the City. He stated
436 the business would only be allowed in the commercial or commercial 2 zones of the City and
437 within those zones they must meet distance requirements. He added that the ordinance also
438 dictates that the business follow certain federal acts and regulations, though those regulations are
439 not spelled out.

440

441 Council Member Bailey stated he read through a similar ordinance used by Ogden City and that
442 Ogden City limits the number of short term lenders permitted in their community; he wondered
443 why the Planning Commission did not recommend a limit on the number of short term lenders
444 that can locate in North Ogden. Council Member Swanson stated that may be a self-limiting
445 issue based on the amount of commercial and commercial 2 zoning coupled with the required
446 setbacks. Council Member Bailey stated that may be the case, but according to the formula used
447 in Ogden City, the number of short term lenders permitted in North Ogden should be capped at
448 three. He stated he is comfortable with that number. He then added that Ogden City also limits
449 short term lenders to locate on certain streets within their permitted zones, such as Harrison
450 Boulevard, Washington Boulevard, Wall Avenue, Riverdale Road, and 12th Street. He stated
451 that is very clever and he would entertain a similar restriction in North Ogden. He then inquired
452 as to the difference between the City's Commercial 2 Zone and the Commercial Planned Zone.
453 Mr. Chandler stated the Commercial 2 Zone is a General Commercial Zone and the Commercial
454 Planned Zone is one in which a developer creates a plan for the development.

455

456 Council Member Satterthwaite stated the question in his mind is whether this is actually a zoning
457 ordinance or a licensing ordinance; the distance issue is a zoning issue, but he wondered if the

458 signage regulation is a licensing issue. He then wondered what has driven the City's
459 consideration of requiring statements on a sign relative to the lending practices of short term
460 lenders. Mr. Chandler stated the language to be included in the required signs was patterned
461 after what Ogden City requires. Mr. Call added that he is not aware of additional signage
462 required by other entities. He then noted he has compared the proposed ordinance with Ogden
463 City's ordinance and found that it includes more limitations than Ogden. He stated an area of
464 concern can be created if the industry for which the ordinance applies expresses discomfort with
465 the regulations being imposed, but he is encouraged that representatives of the industry were
466 involved with the development of Ogden City's ordinance.

467
468 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the signage issue should be in the zoning ordinance or
469 licensing ordinance of the City. Mr. Call stated the City's licensing ordinance requires zoning
470 consistency and, for that reason, it does not particularly matter which section of the ordinance the
471 signage regulation are included in.

472
473 Council Member Urry stated he is confused by the definitions section of Ogden City's ordinance;
474 it lists several types of businesses and he wondered if they are governed and limited the way
475 short term lenders are. Mayor Taylor stated the section dealing with short term lenders is part of
476 a larger zoning ordinance in the City.

477
478 Council Member Stoker asked if the ordinance requires a short term lender to use signage to
479 inform customers of the daily interest rate. Mr. Chandler answered yes and referenced the
480 section of the ordinance that requires posting of the interest rate with an example of the amount
481 of interest a customer would be charged based upon the dollar amount being borrowed. Council
482 Member Satterthwaite stated he would like the fees to be translated to annual percentage rates
483 (APR) to allow the customer to compare with the rates charged at other lending institutions so
484 they can make a more informed choice. There was a general discussion regarding the signage
485 requirements, with Mayor Taylor stating staff can research the issue to determine if there are
486 state or federal regulations that restrict the information to be included on an informational sign.

487
488 Council Member Bailey stated he feels it is not possible to reach a conclusion on this issue
489 tonight, but he asked that staff research the legality of some of the restrictions included in the
490 ordinance, such as the restriction that a short term lender not be allowed to locate within a certain
491 distance of schools or other land uses.

492
493 Mayor Taylor opened the public hearing at 8:20 p.m.

494
495 Randy Winn, 2412 N. Barker Parkway, stated that he appreciates the caution the Council is
496 taking in approaching this issue; he does not think short term lenders are an asset to the City and
497 he likes the idea of being more restrictive than Ogden because he does not want to encourage
498 businesses of this type to locate here.

499
500 There were no additional persons appearing to be heard.

501
502

503 Council Member Swanson moved to close the public hearing at 8:21 p.m. Council Member
504 Satterthwaite seconded the motion.

505

506 **Voting on the motion:**

507

508 Council Member Bailey aye

509 Council Member Satterthwaite aye

510 Council Member Stoker aye

511 Council Member Swanson aye

512 Council Member Urry aye

513

514 **The motion passed unanimously.**

515

516 Council Member Urry stated he would like to refer this issue back to staff to be reworked. He
517 stated he would like the number of businesses of this type permitted in the City to be less than
518 15. Council Member Bailey agreed and stated he also agrees that businesses of this type are
519 predatory in nature and if the City can help to minimize exposure of the businesses to North
520 Ogden residents that is what he would prefer to do. Council Member Urry stated he would like
521 to limit the number of businesses to three. Council Member Swanson agreed, but noted that the
522 City could limit the number of businesses to two just to allow for competition; he would also like
523 to limit the businesses to being located on certain streets in the City.

524

525

526 **10. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE TO MAKE**
527 **AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE NORTH OGDEN ZONING REGULATIONS TO**
528 **ADD REQUIREMENTS FOR SHORT TERM LENDERS**

529

530 Council Member Bailey moved to table consideration of an ordinance to make amendments
531 to Title II of the North Ogden Zoning Regulations to add requirements for short term
532 lenders. Council Member Stoker seconded the motion.

533

534 There was a brief discussion regarding the items the Council would like staff to research before
535 bringing the item back to the Council for further consideration.

536

537 **Voting on the motion:**

538

539 Council Member Bailey aye

540 Council Member Satterthwaite aye

541 Council Member Stoker aye

542 Council Member Swanson aye

543 Council Member Urry aye

544

545 **The motion passed unanimously.**

546

547

548

549 **11. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER AN APPLICATION TO**
550 **DECLARE PARCEL 170450029 SURPLUS PROPERTY LOCATED AT**
551 **APPROXIMATELY 2976 N. 300 E.**
552

553 A staff memo from City Planner Scott explained Norma Klein is requesting that the City owned
554 property, parcel 170450029 located at approximately 2976 North 300 East be declared surplus
555 and offered for sale. The property is zoned R-1-10; it requires that lots be a minimum of 10,000
556 square feet and a minimum of 90 feet of street frontage. This lot is approximately 4,800 square
557 feet with 19 feet of frontage; thus making it non-conforming as to size and frontage. A home
558 could not be built on this parcel. The property provides an access point to several interior parcels.
559 It is not wide enough by itself to become a street. There are several potential access points to
560 these interior parcels if they were ever able to be developed into a subdivision. It would require
561 the cooperation of several different property owners. Any development on this parcel must meet
562 North Ogden City ordinances. There appears to be a power easement over the parcel. The City
563 does not have any water or sewer lines on the property. There are no city plans to utilize this
564 parcel. Norma Klein is interested in this parcel in order to provide better access to her adjoining
565 farm parcel and is willing to maintain the property.
566

567 **GENERAL PLAN**

568 The General Plan calls for “All development in the community should be built on land suitable
569 for the intended use.”

570 There are no current plans for the farm to be subdivided. There is not sufficient width to be able
571 to make this parcel into a road meeting city standards. The memo offered the following summary
572 of potential City Council considerations:

- 573 • Is there a public purpose to retain this parcel in city ownership?
- 574 • Is the proposal consistent with the General Plan?

575 Legal Counsel has advised, that the City can specify that the property must be purchased by a
576 neighboring property owner; however, the process for selling city property must be complied
577 with. Since the City has no infrastructure on this parcel and any future development would be
578 done as part of a subdivision application; there is no public purpose to retain this parcel. Staff is
579 recommending that the City Council declare parcel 170450029 surplus; further that this parcel be
580 advertised for sale to all adjoining property owners. The criteria for selecting the successful
581 bidder will be:

- 582 1. Does the property when combined with the adjoining property make the combined lot
583 conforming?
- 584 2. The sales price is subject to the bidder providing an appraisal with the appraiser approved
585 by the City.
- 586 3. The successful bidder will process a boundary line adjustment to combine this property
587 with their adjoining property.
588

589 City Manager Chandler reviewed the staff memo and used the aid of a map to orient the Council
590 to the location of the subject property. There was a discussion regarding requirements to
591 construct roads upon the future development of the property and Council Member Urry asked if
592 the City has disclosed to Ms. Klein that she would be responsible for paying for that road
593 construction, after which the roads would be dedicated back to the City. Mr. Chandler answered
594 yes.

595 Council Member Bailey asked if Ms. Klein is also aware that other people may bid to purchase
596 the property and she is not guaranteed to be the successful bidder. Mr. Chandler answered yes
597 and noted that the City would only accept bids from the three adjacent property owners in order
598 for the property to be combined with their property to make a larger developable lot. Mr. Call
599 added that the City always has the right to reject bids or proposals.
600

601 Mr. Chandler stated staff has suggested that Ms. Klein simply request an easement across the
602 City's property to allow for the development she desires, but she was insistent that she have the
603 opportunity to purchase it. Council Member Bailey asked if the City can reject that request and
604 offer an easement, to which Mr. Chandler answered yes. Council Member Bailey stated he feels
605 that would be a better solution for Ms. Klein and the City.
606

607 **Council Member Bailey moved to deny an application to declare parcel 170450029 surplus**
608 **property located at approximately 2976 N. 300 E.; he encouraged Administration to offer**
609 **an easement to Ms. Klein by which she would still be responsible for maintenance of the**
610 **property. Council Member Urry seconded the motion.**
611

612 Council Member Satterthwaite asked why Ms. Klein was so insistent on being allowed to
613 purchase the property. Mayor Taylor read an email from Ms. Klein to the City Planner where
614 she indicated ownership of the property would allow her to keep the area free and clear from
615 overgrowth and debris in order to more easily move farm machinery into her property. The land
616 has been used for alfalfa growth and to graze horses for a number of years and they plan to keep
617 it that way. Council Member Bailey stated the City can grant the easement and stipulate that she
618 maintain the easement. Mr. Chandler stated that is correct.
619

620 There was a general discussion regarding adjacent properties and potential problems for future
621 development of the area due to encroachment onto public property.
622

623 **Voting on the motion:**
624

625 Council Member Bailey	aye
626 Council Member Satterthwaite	aye
627 Council Member Stoker	aye
628 Council Member Swanson	aye
629 Council Member Urry	aye

630
631 **The motion passed unanimously.**
632
633

634 **12. DISCUSSION ON AN AMENDED SR AGREEMENT BETWEEN UTAH**
635 **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FARR WEST, PLEASANT VIEW AND**
636 **NORTH OGDEN**
637

638 A staff memo from City Manager Chandler explained State road 134 (2700 North) is classified
639 by UDOT as category 3: System priority-urban importance. According to UDOT rule 930-6-1, a
640 category 3 road is designed for the following.

- 641 1. Category 3 is appropriate for use on highways that have the capacity for high speed and
642 relatively high traffic volumes.
643 2. Category 3 highways are designed and intended to achieve a posted speed of 50 mph or
644 higher in areas without signals and 40 mph or higher in areas with signals.
645 3. These facilities provide for interstate, inter-regional, intra-regional, and intercity travel
646 needs in urban areas.
647 4. Direct access service to abutting land is subordinate to providing service to through
648 traffic improvements.
649

650 Rule 930-6-1 also provides the following information about spacing standards and was included
651 in the Council packet for review. The proposed agreement specifies the following.

- 652 1. Existing and future traffic signals will be as shown on the attached map.
653 2. Traffic standards will be installed when the traffic meets the minimum traffic as defined
654 by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
655 3. Other intersections within the City will not be considered for future traffic signalization.
656 4. Access may be denied at any location for existing or proposed access at UDOT's
657 discretion.
658 5. UDOT, at its discretion, may restrict access at any and all un-signalized intersections or
659 access points to right-in and right-out only movements.
660 6. If access is restricted through the use of raised medians, the City and UDOT will work
661 together to identify the most suitable landscaping.
662 7. The cost of landscaping improvements is typically borne by the City.
663

664 Mayor Taylor summarized the staff memo; he stated there is a potential joint commercial
665 development between Farr West and Pleasant View cities planned for property near 1700 West
666 and 2700 North; the development would require a new traffic signal, which is not included in the
667 original agreement entered into between North Ogden, Harrisville, Farr West, and Pleasant View
668 in 2006. The agreement specified the future location of lights agreed upon by all entities part of
669 the agreement. He then used the aid of a map to orient the Council to the location of future
670 traffic signals and indicated the City has been working with the Utah Department of
671 Transportation (UDOT) to receive approval of a traffic signage on 2700 North west of
672 Washington Boulevard to accommodate a future commercial development behind Walgreen's.
673

674 Farr West Council Member Paul Dinsdale offered a brief history of the creation of a traffic
675 master plan as well as the joint commercial development between his city and Pleasant View.
676 The plan identified the need for the traffic signal that is subject to the agreement amendment and
677 UDOT was very receptive to the recommendation for the signal.
678

679 Council Member Bailey inquired as to the plan for the property north of the traffic signal; he
680 asked who will be helped by approval of the signal. Mr. Dinsdale stated the cities of Farr West
681 and Pleasant View as well as the many motorists that drive the congested stretch of road on a
682 regular basis will be helped by the signal. He reviewed land uses in the area as well as
683 associated traffic flow caused by ingress and egress points for the businesses located along the
684 corridor.
685

686 Mayor Taylor referenced item three in the agreement and stated it indicated that other proposed
687 traffic signals on 2700 North within municipal jurisdictions will not be considered; that is very
688 concerning to him because it would prevent the City from gaining approval for the traffic signal
689 he mentioned earlier west of the Walgreen's development. He stated he would like to enter into
690 the agreement to assist Pleasant View and Farr West, but he would like for the agreement to be
691 amended so it is not damaging to North Ogden's future traffic signal proposals.
692

693 Mr. Chandler reported on his conversation with UDOT regarding the proposed signal on 2700
694 North to accommodate a new commercial development; minimal spacing between traffic signals
695 on a category three road (which 2700 North is classified as) is 2,640 feet or a half-mile. UDOT
696 indicated that the traffic signal would not be entertained and that any traffic associated with the
697 new development should be routed onto 2550 North; any access onto 2700 North would be right-
698 turn only. He noted, however, that he conducted additional research and found that UDOT rule
699 930-6-1 states that a corridor agreement in the form of a signal control plan or access corridor
700 control plan may supersede an access category assignment, which is essentially what the
701 proposed interlocal agreement would do. He understands Farr West and Pleasant View are
702 facing timing restrictions, but he would recommend an amendment to the agreement to permit
703 the North Ogden signal on 2700 North at approximately 300 East. Mr. Dinsdale added that all
704 traffic data supporting a traffic signal is available and can be used to argue the reasoning for a
705 signal with UDOT.
706

707 The Council discussed the proposal to request a signal on 300 East with Council Member Bailey
708 stating this is the first time the Council is hearing of this issue and he wondered if there are
709 alternate traffic routing options for a future potential commercial development. Mayor Taylor
710 stated the advantage of the proposal signal is that it would allow people to make a left turn out of
711 the commercial development onto 2700 North; the signal would also assist traffic exiting the
712 Lee's Marketplace development as well.
713

714 Council Member Stoker stated routing traffic to 2550 North will be problematic because of the
715 potential future traffic increase associated with Smith's Marketplace. Mayor Taylor agreed and
716 added that one of the sections of the original 2006 agreement indicates that the signal at 2550
717 North and Washington Boulevard will eventually be relocated to 2300 North. Mr. Chandler
718 stated that City Administration has actually received verbal confirmation from UDOT that they
719 do not plan to relocate the signal at 2550 North. There was a general discussion regarding traffic
720 signalization in the general area as well as along Highway 89 in Pleasant View and Farr West.
721 There was a focus on the proposed signal at Hillsboro Street on Pleasant View Drive, after which
722 Council Member Urry stated he does not feel the Council is in a position to make a decision
723 regarding this issue this evening and he would like for additional study to be completed before
724 the item is brought back to the Council. Mr. Dinsdale stated the decision regarding the signal
725 near the joint commercial development on 2700 North has already been made and this is just a
726 matter of getting approval to amend the agreement.
727

728 Council Member Swanson stated he can see the advantage of installing a traffic signal on 2700
729 North at 300 East and he feels the issues and concerns expressed about the signal can be
730 mitigated. He stated he feels the signal is key to drawing a viable tenant to the commercial

731 property in North Ogden. There was a discussion regarding the importance of the three
732 communities working together to provide for quality developments in the community at large.
733

734 Council Member Urry indicated this was a campaign issue and many residents are very
735 interested in making improvements that will lessen traffic congestion on 2700 North approaching
736 Interstate 15. Council Member Stoker agreed and stated the traffic signal at 300 East is
737 definitely needed and other improvements are also needed to mitigate traffic issues on 2700
738 North.
739

740 Council Member Satterthwaite stated that he does not think the signal at Hillsboro Drive is
741 needed as badly as traffic signals in other areas of the City or further west on 2700 North. He
742 stated he feels it is necessary to complete a comprehensive traffic study taking into consideration
743 all areas and signalization needs for the City.
744

745 Mayor Taylor noted there are serious negotiations taking place regarding the development of the
746 commercial property behind Walgreen's and it is his opinion that a traffic signal would further
747 those negotiations.
748

749 There was a general discussion regarding the executed agreement as well as the amendment to
750 the agreement, with Mayor Taylor stating it is his understanding that UDOT is interested to see if
751 North Ogden supports Pleasant View's and Farr West's request for a signal on 2700 West before
752 proceeding with authorization.
753

754 Council Member Bailey stated he would be supportive of moving forward with an agreement
755 that would help all cities that are party to the agreement achieve their goals. He stated that it is
756 important to have a clear understanding of the locations where traffic signals are needed in North
757 Ogden before making final amendments to the agreement. He stated he agrees that the signal at
758 Hillsboro Drive is not needed. The rest of the Council concurred more work is necessary before
759 taking action on this issue, with Council Member Satterthwaite indicating that he would like for
760 the City to move swiftly. There was a general discussion regarding Pleasant View and Farr
761 West's timeline for gaining approval of the agreement amendment, with Mr. Dinsdale stating he
762 does not feel UDOT will proceed with approval of the proposed traffic signal without an
763 executed agreement. He then reviewed the scope of the joint commercial development and
764 highlighted potential changes to traffic routing and signalization associated with the project.
765 Mayor Taylor asked for consensus from the Council for the Administration to proceed in
766 discussions with Pleasant View, Farr West, and UDOT as well as a traffic engineer in order to
767 develop a firm proposal for proceeding in addressing this issue. He stated he will provide a
768 report to the Council within the next month regarding the results of this process. All Council
769 Members offered their support for Mayor Taylor's proposal regarding continuing negotiations.
770

771
772 **13. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER COMMITTEES AND**
773 **COMMITTEE MEMBERS**
774

775 Mayor Taylor provided the Council with an update regarding the committees he has been
776 working to form; he provided all Council Members with a copy of his working list relative of

777 potential committee members. Not all people included on the list have agreed to be appointed to
778 a committee, but he hopes to have committee rosters finalized within the next couple of weeks
779 for approval by the Council. He facilitated a discussion regarding different methods of forming a
780 committee: committees can be created by ordinance and in that case they will be considered a
781 public body and must adhere to the Open and Public Meetings Act, or committees can voluntary
782 in nature and will not work with City funds and do not need to be considered public bodies. He
783 reviewed the types of committees that should be considered a public body and those that may be
784 more appropriate as informal voluntary committees. He asked for feedback from the Council
785 regarding the types of committees the City should create.

786
787 Council Member Satterthwaite asked if the General Plan Committee will be a recommending
788 body or if they will approve the changes to the General Plan. Mayor Taylor stated they will be a
789 recommending body. Mr. Call agreed the committee should be a public body because they will
790 take formal votes regarding the recommendations they will be forwarding to the Council; it is a
791 good idea to publicly notice their meetings and keep minutes of their proceedings. Mr. Chandler
792 stated it is a good idea to keep minutes of the General Plan Committee because there will be
793 public input and recommendations throughout the meetings of the committee; it will be helpful
794 for the Planning Commission and City Council to have access to that information in a formal
795 document. There was then a discussion regarding the intent and purpose of the General Plan
796 Committee, after which the Council agreed the General Plan Committee should be a formal
797 committee for which public records should be kept.

798
799 Discussion regarding other committees included on the list ensued.
800

801 **Council Member Swanson moved that the General Plan Steering Committee, Cherry Days**
802 **Committee, and Economic Development Committee be formalized committees, with the**
803 **Dog Park Committee, Fiscal Policy Committee, and Volunteer Committee being informal**
804 **volunteer committees. Council Member Bailey seconded the motion.**

805
806 **Voting on the motion:**

807
808 **Council Member Bailey** **aye**
809 **Council Member Satterthwaite** **aye**
810 **Council Member Stoker** **aye**
811 **Council Member Swanson** **aye**
812 **Council Member Urry** **aye**

813
814 **The motion passed unanimously.**

815
816 There was a brief discussion regarding the schedule of various committee meetings, after which
817 Mayor Taylor noted he will provide the Council with an update regarding the members that have
818 agreed to participate on the various committees.

819
820
821 **14. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CANCEL THE JULY 22, 2014 CITY COUNCIL**
822 **MEETING**

823 Mayor Taylor stated he and Council Member Bailey, who is also the Mayor Pro Temp, will not
824 be available for the July 22 meeting and he asked that the Council approve the cancellation of the
825 meeting.

826

827 **Council Member Stoker moved to cancel the July 22, 2014 City Council Meeting. Council**
828 **Member Swanson seconded the motion.**

829

830 **Voting on the motion:**

831

832 **Council Member Bailey** aye

833 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye

834 **Council Member Stoker** aye

835 **Council Member Swanson** aye

836 **Council Member Urry** aye

837

838 **The motion passed unanimously.**

839

840

841 **15. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

842

843 Carol Campbell, 3679 Lakeview Drive, informed the Council that she distributed 250 fliers and
844 cards regarding the dog park during the Cherry Days parade; she received great feedback and
845 questions and it seems that people are very supportive of it.

846

847 Randy Winn, Barker Parkway, stated the discussion regarding the 2700 South corridor was very
848 significant and it was valuable for Farr West Council Member Dinsdale to be present; he thinks
849 both proposals regarding new traffic signals are very sensible. North Ogden is a City with
850 limited commercial options and the intersection of 2700 North and Washington Boulevard is
851 very important. He stated he feels the Council's conclusion about a way forward was
852 appropriate and it is a good idea to get a traffic engineer involved.

853

854

855 **16. CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, AND STAFF COMMENTS**

856

857 Council Member Urry reported the senior citizen board will meet next week; the meeting will be
858 advertised as a class and there has been discussion about giving North Ogden residents first
859 priority for attending the class so they are not turned away. The classes are very popular and the
860 board has asked that the City consider allowing the senior citizens to use the basement of the
861 library to accommodate the growing class sizes. Mayor Taylor stated that would be a good use
862 for the library basement. Council Member Urry then discussed the Cherry Days celebration and
863 noted it was his understanding that the reason the City agreed to assist with the Miss North
864 Ogden pageant was that the City has 501C3 status and the pageant does not. He stated that
865 moving forward he would prefer that no money from the City be spent on the event and that they
866 be required to gain their own 501C3 status. There was a discussion regarding the process to gain
867 501C3 status, with Council Member Urry recommending that the pageant begin the process soon
868 so it is complete by next year's celebration. He then reported regarding the positive feedback he

869 received regarding the Cherry Days celebration, after which there was a discussion regarding the
870 Council's float in the Cherry Days parade. Council Member Urry thanked City staff that worked
871 hard to make the event a success.

872

873 Council Member Satterthwaite echoed Council Member Urry's comments regarding the Cherry
874 Days celebration. He then asked for a report regarding the status of the Public Works facility
875 project. Mr. Chandler reported on a recent design meeting for the facility and noted the
876 contractor plans to commence work later this month with a completion date near Thanksgiving.

877

878 Council Member Stoker stated that as the City reviewed the General Plan she would like for
879 there to be a focus on home business regulations in the City. Mr. Chandler reported the Planning
880 Commission has begun reviewing the City's regulations regarding home businesses independent
881 of the General Plan review.

882

883 Council Member Urry asked that traffic and transportation issues, namely Utah Transit Authority
884 (UTA) bus routes, be considered during the General Plan review as well.

885

886 Council Member Bailey thanked those that put their time and effort into making the Cherry Days
887 celebration a success.

888

889 City Recorder Spendlove noted the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) annual conference
890 will be held September and she facilitated a discussion regarding those Council Members that
891 plan to attend in order for her to make hotel reservations.

892

893 Mayor Taylor also thanked staff for producing a great Cherry Days event this year.

894

895

896 **17. ADJOURNMENT**

897

898 **Council Member Swanson moved to adjourn. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the**
899 **motion.**

900

901 **Voting on the motion:**

902

903 **Council Member Bailey** aye

904 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye

905 **Council Member Stoker** aye

906 **Council Member Swanson** aye

907 **Council Member Urry** aye

908

909 **The motion passed unanimously.**

910

911 **The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.**

912

913

914

915 **RDA**

916

917 **1. DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING**
918 **THE PREPARATION OF A DRAFT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**
919 **AREA PLAN**

920

921

922 A staff memo from City Manager Chandler stated creating a community development area
923 (CDA) begins when the City's Redevelopment Agency adopts a resolution authorizing the
924 preparation of a draft community development project area plan. The project area plan must
925 contain the following.

- 926 1. A description of the boundaries of the project area.
- 927 2. A general statement of the land uses, layout of principal streets, population densities and
928 building intensities of the project area and how they will be affected by the community
929 development.
- 930 3. The standards that will guide the community development.
- 931 4. Show how the purposes of the State laws will be attained by the community
932 development.
- 933 5. Be consistent with the general plan.
- 934 6. Describe any specific project or projects that are the object of the proposed community
935 development.
- 936 7. Identify how private developers, if any, will be selected to undertake the community
937 development and identify each private developer currently involved in the community
938 development process.
- 939 8. State the reasons for the selection of the project area.
- 940 9. Describe the physical, social and economic conditions existing in the project area.
- 941 10. Describe any tax incentives offered private entities for facilities located in the project
942 area.
- 943 11. Include an analysis or description of the anticipated public benefit to be derived from the
944 community development, including the beneficial influences upon the tax base of the
945 community; and the associated business and economic activity likely to be stimulated.
- 946 12. Include other information that the agency determines to be necessary or advisable.

947 As part of the plan creation, the RDA must hold a public hearing. The hearing must be scheduled
948 30 days prior to the public hearing.

949

950 Mr. Chandler reviewed his staff memo.

951

952 **Board Member Urry moved to approve Resolution 13-2014 authorizing the preparation of**
953 **a draft Community Development Project Area Plan. Board Member Swanson seconded**
954 **the motion.**

955

956 **Voting on the motion:**

957

958 **Board Member Bailey** **aye**

959 **Board Member Satterthwaite** **aye**

960 Board Member Stoker aye
961 Board Member Swanson aye
962 Board Member Urry aye

963
964 The motion passed unanimously.
965

966

967 **2. ADJOURNMENT**

968

969 Board member Satterthwaite moved to adjourn. Board Member Swanson seconded the
970 motion.

971

972 **Voting on the motion:**

973

974 Board Member Bailey aye

975 Board Member Satterthwaite aye

976 Board Member Stoker aye

977 Board Member Swanson aye

978 Board Member Urry aye

979

980 The motion passed unanimously.

981

982

983 The motion passed unanimously.

984

985

986 The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

987

988

989

990

991 _____
Brent Taylor, Chairman

992

993

994

995 _____
S. Annette Spendlove, MMC

996 Secretary

997

998

999 _____
Date Approved