City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
February 14, 2012
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. - Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission
Garl Fink, Chair
Ted Jensen
Steven Faurschou
Anna Barbieri
Dale Kehl
Dan Fazzini, Jr. (Alternate)

Community Development Staff
Mark McGrath – Director
Michael Meldrum – Principal Planner
Dan Udall – City Planner
Jean Gallegos – Admin Asst/Recorder

PUBLIC: Kevin Aguirre, Andrew Danson, Curt Cochran, Sarah Tobin, Rhine Lenhart, Ernest Burgess, Al Kessler

WELCOME: **Commissioner Fink** assumed duties as Chair and welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

Agenda/File #	Application	Applicants	Action
1. Review/approval of Minutes for January 10, 2012			Approved as presented.

MOTION: Commissioner Faurschou - I move for approval of the Consent Agenda consisting of the Minutes for January 10, 2012.
SECOND: Commissioner Barbieri

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**
Faurschou	**AYE**	**Fink**	**Chair**	**Kehl**	**AYE**
Fazzini	**AYE**	**Jensen**	**AYE**	**Barbieri**	**AYE**
Motion passes 5 to 0.					

HOME OCCUPATION

2. 1H12 – **Brittney Petterborg – 2131 W 5400 S** – Child Day Care. (Josh Roundy/Planning Intern) **7:03:07**

2.1. **Mr. Meldrum** presented this item. The applicant is requesting approval to provide child day care for up to twelve children. City Ordinance 13.57.057 allows hours of operation between 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. The applicant's proposed days and hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. The applicant must file a business license application with the City. The license will only be issued with approval from the Planning Commission. This request is for up to eleven (11) children from outside the home and one of the applicant's children for a total of up to twelve (12) children. The proposed hours of operation are compliant with Section 13.57.057. The yard is fenced with sections of wood (front), cinderblock (west side) and chain link (back and east side) that are in good condition. Staff did not observe any code violations that would prohibit the applicant from obtaining a business license. Adequate parking is available for resident and employee parking as well as for parents dropping off and picking up their children. All Class D home occupation requirements are specified in Section 13.57.057 of the zoning Ordinance. All requirements of this section have already been or will be complied with for this application.

Findings of Fact: Staff finds the following findings of facts or reasons regarding **File # 1H12:**

1. The home occupation is allowed as a conditional use in the R-1-8 zone.
2. The home occupation does comply with the hours of operation as identified in Section 13.57.057.
3. The applicant has supplied a letter to the Community Development Department indicating how she plans to accommodate handicapped children.
4. The home occupation meets all other applicable codes.

Staff recommends approval of File #1H12 with the following conditions:

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. The conditional Use Permit home occupation is subject to review upon substantiated and unresolved complaint(s).
3. **[Changed by Motion]** Fencing must be six feet in height and maintained in good condition. **Add slats if deemed necessary by applicant**.
4. If a sign is desired by the applicant, a maximum 3-square foot sign attached to the single-family home is allowed.
5. That adequate parking is provided on site to accommodate the homeowner's vehicles and customer vehicles coming to the home.

6. That the home occupation is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling for dwelling purposes and does not change the character of the dwelling or property for residential purposes.
7. That the applicant lives in the existing home.
8. Adequate outdoor lighting must be provided.
9. No additional Class D home occupation business licenses are allowed at this address while this business is in operation.
10. Hours of operation are limited from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.
11. That staffing requirements are maintained as required by the Utah State Health Department.
12. **[Added by Motion] Backing out on 5400 South is not allowed**
13. **[Added by Motion] Staff to do final review**

2.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: 7:04:48 **Brittney Petterborg**. **Commissioner Kehl** asked her if she had received a copy of the Staff Report relative to her application and she replied she had and had no questions or concerns. **Commissioner Jensen** asked her how wide her driveway was she replied that it is made for two cars but will accommodate three if necessary. **Commissioner Jensen** asked what people do when they drop off their children. **Ms. Petterborg** said that they also use the parking in the day care next door in the back, which is owned by her mother. That is where she parks her vehicle during the day. She added there is sufficient room in her driveway for cars to pull in, back up, and turn to exit the lot without backing onto 5400 South. 7:05:44. **Commissioner Fink** expressed concern about safety of people still trying to back out onto 5400 South. This will be doubly bad when they finally activate the overhead signage for 5400 South. **Ms. Petterborg** said most of the families that will be coming are already utilizing her mother's day care but have babies or are soon going to have one and that is why she decided to open up this home day care. That she would make sure her clients know the proper way to exit this site. That these clients know they can park in her mother's parking area and also in the first row of the dentist's office west of her mother's property. **Commissioner Fink** asked if there were a walkway between her home and the day care to the west and was informed there is not a walkway but the wall doesn't go all the way to the street. For access, the sidewalk in front must be used. **Commissioner Fazzini** had questions about the implied access agreement between this home day care, "Bear Essentials" and the White office building. **Wendy Pendleton (Brittney's mother)** advised that they have an agreement with Dr. White to utilize some of his parking for overflow. **Commissioner Fazzini** advised that there must be a written agreement in place between all concerned property owners. **Ms. Pendleton** said that they can obtain that from Dr. White who owns the office building to the west. **Commissioner Fazzini** said that having a written agreement is important in case the White office building ever changes owners or moves out. **Commissioner Kehl** advised that the Commission cannot solve all the problems involved here and the applicant's are responsible for that. **Mr. Meldrum** advised that Staff will work with the applicant to make sure everything is done correctly. 7:13:13.

At this point, **Commissioner Fink** opened up the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak in favor or opposition.

2.2 **SPEAKING**: **Sarah Tobin** - 7:13:46. **Mrs. Tobin** said that her family shares the back property line with that of the day cares. Her concern is not so much about the day care use but that she has two small dogs and would feel bad if they got hurt or hurt a child. The problem there is the fence line between the two properties is not very secure. There is also no privacy between the two properties as it is and suggested that perhaps slats be installed in the chain link. 7:14:47. **Commissioner Barbieri** asked if when the State of Utah conducts on-site inspections of day care operations, would not the safety issue of the fence be included. **Mr. Meldrum** said that is correct. 7:20:13.

No one else came forward to speak and **Commissioner Fink** closed the public hearing. 7:21:02.

2.3 **DISCUSSION**: **Commissioner Fink** expressed concern about the fence that allows children to stick their fingers through it. 7:21:38. **Ms. Pendleton** advised that they would do everything they can to take care of this. If slats are required by the Commission, then she felt the neighbor should share in that expense. **Commissioner Fazzini** said that the Commission cannot mandate something like that but suggested the applicant contact Staff and work it out with the neighbor. **Commissioner Kehl** felt that the issue of clients backing out onto 5400 South had not been completely dealt with yet. He felt that with two day care centers so close together this was a very important safety issue.

2.5 **MOTION: 7:26:03. Commissioner Kehl - I move for preliminary approval of File 1H12 with Staff Conditions, adding #12 that "Backing out on 5400 South is not allowed." Staff, including the City Engineer, will work with the applicant on that issue before final permission is given. 7:26:46**
SECOND: Commissioner Fazzini.
DISCUSSION: Commissioner Fink allowed that he would like to see something included about the fence. Not as a mandatory stipulation but rather an option to be worked out between the applicant and their neighbor to the rear. Commissioner Fazzini felt that had been covered in the prior discussion. Commissioner Fink agreed. Commissioner Jensen addressed Staff Recommendation #3, which says that fencing must be 6' in height and maintained in good condition. We could add to that to make it solid if necessary. If they deem it necessary, they can put one in there, otherwise they do not have to. Commissioner Barbieri asked for clarification as to whom he meant to have that option. Commissioner Jensen said that would be the applicant's choice. Commissioner Barbieri felt that if the State Board of Licensing came through and said it was safe, then the Commission would not have impotence to say it is not safe. She, therefore, supported the language suggested by Commissioner Jensen. Commissioner Fazzini added that the Commission must now address the amendment. Commissioner Kehl asked for clarification of that amendment. Commissioner Fink said that Commissioner Jensen just wants to add to #3 to make the fence solid if necessary. Commissioner Fazzini questioned the legal purpose for adding that. Commissioner Jensen said the purpose was to leave the decision up to the applicant. Commissioner Kehl agreed and amended his motion to add that verbiage. Commissioner Jensen said that he would like to propose to Commissioner Kehl. He liked the part about not being able to back out into traffic but wanted some kind of written cross access agreement so that there is no backing out onto traffic allowed. Something between the property owners where it says that they will allow access through their property and park on their property so that they don't have to back out. This would be between the

applicant and the adjacent property owners. Commissioner Kehl felt that was probably the best solution but was unsure if the Commission has that authority. He felt that the proposal should be taken to Staff for final. Commissioner Fazzini added that the motion covers everything. The solution to the problem will be dealt with by Staff and he did not feel the motion needed to be amended to cover that. Commissioner Jensen said that he then would stay with the original wording and add #13 that it comes back to the Planning Commission for final approval. Commissioner Kehl advised that he would like Staff conduct the final review and add specifically that the City Engineer approves this. Commissioner Jensen was concerned with putting that as an itemized number. Commissioner Fink asked Staff if they understand the intent of the motion and Mr. Meldrum said that he did, however, asked for clarification for Commissioner Jensen in asking if the solid fence was a requirement and if slating was included in that definition. Commissioner Jensen said that he was just saying that the Commission is okay with however the applicant decides to handle it and if they want to make it solid or chain link with slats, it is okay with the Commission. Mr. Meldrum said that it is already chain link – what he is asking is for a definition of "solid" and wanted to make sure that slating was included in that definition. Commissioner Kehl said to change the fence to something solid – at the discretion of the applicant. There are no mandatory requirements and Staff will conduct the final review.

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**
Faurschou	**AYE**	**Fink**	**Chair**	**Kehl**	**AYE**
Fazzini	**AYE**	**Jensen**	**AYE**	**Barbieri**	**AYE**
Motion passes 5 to 0.					

3. 2H12 – **Heather Vargas – 5234 South Kingswood Drive** – Family Child Day Care Home Occupation. (Dan Udall/City Planner) 7:34:41.

3.1 **Mr. Udall** presented this item. The applicant is proposing a child day care for 10 to 12 children. Proposed hours and days of operation are from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. There is a three car driveway on the site. The applicant is caring for two of her own children that are under the age of 6. A total of 1 to 2 vehicles will be coming to the home at a time. The applicant is providing an additional caregiver as required by the State of Utah and the City of Taylorsville for tending over eight children. No citizen complaints have been received. 7:36:17.

Findings of Fact for File #2H12:

1. That the applicant is proposing a family child day care home occupation and it is a conditional use in the R-1-8 zone.
2. That a maximum of 8 to 10 children are coming from outside the home each day the child day care is operated.
3. That two children under the age of six are the applicant's own children who will be attending the child day care.

Staff recommends approval of preliminary Conditional Use Application #2H12 with the following conditions:

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. That the use is reviewed upon substantiated and unresolved complaint.
3. That no more than 12 children can attend the home per day for the child day care.
4. A maximum of one name plate sign is allowed to be attached to the single-family home. The sign is allowed to be 3 square feet.
5. That adequate parking be provided on site to accommodate the homeowner's vehicles and customer vehicles.
6. Hours of operation can be allowed from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday – Sunday.
7. That the home occupation is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling and does not change the character of the neighborhood.
8. Provide adequate outdoor lighting.
9. That no other Class "D" home occupation is allowed while the child day care home occupation is under operation.
10. That an additional caregiver is required for the child day care home occupation. That an off street parking area Is provided for the caregiver.

3.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: **Heather Vargas** was present to answer questions. **Commissioner Fink** asked her if she had seen the Staff Report and she replied that she had and had no concerns with the conditions. **Commissioner Fazzini** wanted to make sure that Mrs. Vargas knew that the numbers on her home were too small and needed to be replaced. **Mr. Meldrum** informed her that the house numbers must be at least 4" high so that emergency vehicles can easily read them from the street. **Commissioner Fink** felt that this site allows plenty of access for this use. **Commissioner Kehl** advised her that her fence would require some minor repairs where some slats had been damaged. He also advised her that any all debris in must be removed prior to issuance of any license for day care. **Ms. Vargas** advised that would be taken care of.

Commissioner Fink opened the public hearing at this point. No one came forward and he closed the hearing and opened the meeting up for Commission discussion. 7:39:44.

3.3 **SPEAKING**: None.

3.4 **DISCUSSION**: None.

3.5 **MOTION: Commissioner Barbieri - I move for approval of File 2H12 based on the Findings of Fact and with Staff Conditions listed. 7:40:34**

SECOND: Commissioner Jensen - I would add the condition about assuring the fence is repaired and maintained. 7:41:03.

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**
Faurschou	**AYE**	**Fink**	**Chair**	**Kehl**	**AYE**
Fazzini	**AYE**	**Jensen**	**AYE**	**Barbieri**	**AYE**
Motion passes 5 to 0.					

CONDITIONAL USES

4. 43C11 – **Ryan and Shauna Smith** – 4870 South Southridge Drive – Conditional Use Permit for an Accessory Building. (Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner) 7:41:39.

4.1. **Mr. Meldrum** presented this item. The applicant obtained a Conditional Use Permit from the City in 2004. A letter has been submitted by the applicant outlining the reasons that they were not able to complete the detached garage within the time frame allotted by the issuance of a building permit. A building permit is valid for 180 days but may be extended upon a progress inspection. The applicants have conveyed to Staff that the reason they did not complete the project was due to a family medical emergency involving their parents, having their business burn to the ground and facing the possibility of foreclosure on their property. The property is zoned R-1-8 and occupies 0.21 acres. The detached garage is located in the southwest corner of the property and measures 1,179 square feet, 15 feet in height at the midpoint of the gable. The garage has been partially finished. The submitted site plan shows the garage being at 1 foot, 4 inches from the west property line and 3 feet from the south property line. These setbacks do not comply with current code requirements of 3 feet to a property line if a fire wall is used or 5 feet if no fire wall is used. Since the garage is partially completed and was in compliance with building setbacks at the time of issuance of the Conditional Use Permit and building permit, no modification to the setbacks is required. The applicant will need to work with the Building Division of the Community Development Department to obtain a building permit to complete construction on the detached garage. The Building Division will need to conduct an on site inspection to determine the structural soundness of building materials that have been exposed to the elements from the time of the initial building permit. Some materials may need to be removed due to this inspection.

Findings of Fact: Staff finds the following findings of facts or reasons regarding **File # 43C11:**

1. The detached garage is allowed as a conditional use (due to size) in the R-1-8 zone.
2. The applicant has received notification of violation from City Code Enforcement.
3. The applicant has been contacted by the Building Division of the Community Development Department regarding the current status of the garage.
4. The detached garage is not finished.
5. The applicant has supplied a letter outlining issues that explain why the garage has not yet been completed.

Staff recommends approval of File #43C11 with the following conditions:

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. The detached garage must be architecturally compatible with the home.
3. Obtain a building permit prior to recommencing any construction or demolition work.

4.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: 7:43:49. **Mr. and Mrs. Smith** were present, advised they had received a copy of the Staff Report and had no problems or concerns with anything therein.

4.3 **SPEAKING**: No one responded, therefore, **Commissioner Fink** closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for Commission discussion. 7:45:13.

4.4 **DISCUSSION**: **Commissioner Barbieri** indicated that the picture shows a dirt patch and wanted to know what the Code says relative to that. **Mr. Meldrum** said that the Code is silent.

4.5 **MOTION**: **Commissioner Jensen** - Based on the Findings of Fact, I move for approval of File #4C12 and that the Building Department approve final building. 7:46:51
SECOND: Commissioner Barbieri

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**
Faurschou	**AYE**	**Fink**	**Chair**	**Kehl**	**AYE**
Fazzini	**AYE**	**Jensen**	**AYE**	**Barbieri**	**AYE**
Motion passes 5 to 0.					

5. 3C12 – **Ryan Aguirre – 4166 South 1785 West** – Balloon Sign - (Dan Udall/City Planner)

7:47:31.

5.1. **Mr. Udall** presented this item. The applicant is proposing an inflatable balloon on the roof of a kiosk located on the north side of Carriage Square in the C-2 zone. The balloon is proposed to be 20' high x 10' wide. The applicant desires to have the balloon on site for a period of one year. The applicant stated that the balloon will be displayed from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday and will be anchored to the building. The balloon will be deflated and not displayed during any other time frame. It will be stored within the store during non-display hours.

Findings of Fact: Staff finds the following findings of facts or reasons regarding **File # 3C12:**

1. That the balloon on premises is a conditional use in the C-2 zone.
2. There are no balloon sign provisions provided within the City of Taylorsville ordinance.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the above stated Findings of Fact, Staff recommends allowing the Planning Commission to determine the appropriate amount of display time for the balloon.

5.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: 7:49:59. **Kevin Aguirre (brother of applicant)** was present for questions. **Commissioner Barbieri** asked how long the balloon has been up and was informed by **Mr. Aguirre** that it has not been up yet. **Mr. Meldrum** added that the balloon had been on display and was taken down due to a code enforcement issue. 7:52:11.

Commissioner Fink opened the public hearing at this point and inasmuch as no one came forward, closed the hearing and returned discussion to the Commission.

5.3 **SPEAKING**: None.

5.4 **DISCUSSION**: 7:52:45. **Commissioner Jensen** questioned the length of time requested (one year) and wanted to make sure the Commission does not violate the new Code, which is due out in March, 2012. **Commissioner Faurschou** agreed that the period of one year far exceeds any definition of this being a temporary use. He added that the large size of the balloon overpowers the small building. **Commissioner Jensen** added that the new Code has building design specifications included. **Commissioner Fink** advised that this type of signage for special promotions can only be up one week. That the Commission must either deny or approve this use tonight based on what is presented here tonight. 7:55:32.

5.5 **MOTION: Commissioner Jensen 7:56:12. - Based on the discussion this evening and based upon the fact that one year time period does not match current code or the new code, I move to deny File #3C12 as presented. SECOND: Commissioner Faurschou 7:57:13.**

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**
Faurschou	**AYE**	**Fink**	**Chair**	**Kehl**	**AYE**
Fazzini	**AYE**	**Jensen**	**AYE**	**Barbieri**	**AYE**
Motion to deny passes 5 to 0.					

6. 4C12 – **Karen Crespin – 3503 West Valley Heights Drive** – Animal Fancier Permit. (Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner) **7:57:45.**

6.1. **Mr. Meldrum** presented this item. The applicant is requesting approval for an Animal Fancier Permit amendment for twenty additional dogs. The applicant obtained an Animal Hobby Permit in 2005 for three dogs from the City (File 50C05) which was endorsed by Salt Lake County Animal Services and also obtained an Animal Fancier Permit in 2009 (File 23C09) for three additional dogs (Total of six), endorsed by West Valley Animal Services. The total number of dogs on the property if this application is approved would be 26. The rear yard of this property is fenced with a chain link fence that is in good condition. The dogs do not have access to the front yard. The deck on the back of the house has a gate to keep the dogs on the deck unless the owners are present. The gate can then be opened to allow the dogs to go down to a dog run where they are able to do their "business". The applicant has also stated in writing that the dogs have access to a dog run area that is located below their deck. The dogs are primarily kept indoors, except to exercise. **Mr. Meldrum** reviewed the content of the City Code, 8.12.090: Fancier's Permit; Authorized When: and felt that the proposed number of dogs is excessive in a residential area. Residentially zoned properties are neither intended nor designated for kennels nor breeding facilities for this number of dogs. **Mr. Meldrum** read the response from West Valley which was favorable for this application.

Findings of Fact: Staff finds the following Findings of facts or reasons regarding **File # 4C12:**

1. The animal Fancier permit is allowed as a conditional use in the R-1-8 zone.
2. The applicant has initiated the application on her own.
3. The twenty additional dogs are already on the property.
4. A recommendation from West Valley Animal Control was not received as of the writing of this Staff report.

Staff recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the facts and written and oral testimony and determine the appropriate course of action.

[Added by Motion] The number of dogs allowed needs to be reduced to 10 within a one year period.

6.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS**: **Karen Crespin** was present. 8:00:59. Mrs. Crespin wanted to let the Commissioners know, if this is approved, she did not intend to come back for more dogs. She has plans to sell two of the larger males. She has gone through all the AKC regulation requirements. Every morning she takes care of the dogs first thing in the morning, even before she has breakfast. 8:02:57. She keeps the dog's areas extremely clean. She explained the cleaning process for the feces by saying that she cleans the deck every day and also the dog run. There are no problems with any odor. She had a concern about saying that this is an animal hobby permit. **Mr. Meldrum** advised that her first application was a hobby permit but was approved as a Fancier's Permit. **Commissioner Fink** asked if she still has the original six dogs. **Mrs. Crespin** said that she has all the six dogs that were approved previously. **Commissioner Kehl** wanted to know if she was in the process of changing or adding onto the house. **Mrs. Crespin** said that they just have a few things to finish off. **Commissioner Kehl** asked that Staff convey the importance to Mrs. Crespin of her not putting dog waste in the sewer system and **Mr. Meldrum** said Staff would do so. **Commissioner Faurschou** asked her where the 20 extra dogs had come from and she implied that she had bought them. That she takes excellent care of her animals. They see

a Veterinarian at least once a year and are completely up-to-date on their shots. **Mrs. Crespin** commented that she had recently been working in her back yard and the neighbor children asked her if she still had her dogs, which she felt proves that they are not a nuisance to the neighbors. **Commissioner Kehl** wondered if there had been any complaints about her dogs and she said no, that she uses anti-barking devices and her dogs don't bark. **Commissioner Jensen** 8:14:03. asked if all the dogs had papers and she assured him that they do. She felt she is a good and responsible animal lover and her animals want for absolutely nothing. She understood that only one litter a year is permitted. 8:15:38 She admitted that a few of the extra 20 dogs did come from recent litters; however, most of them came from other places. She wants to give homeless animals the top priority **Commissioner Jensen** reminded her that the requirement is one litter per year but when they are adults, she must find homes for them. 8:17:24. **Commissioner Fink** commented that she is now down to 24 dogs and is talking about selling off some, when in fact, she actually has 28 dogs presently. He asked her what she felt would be a number she would be comfortable with in reducing the total number of dogs. She could not answer that because she feels like they are all her children. **Commissioner Faurschou** asked what the average life span was for this type of dog and **Mrs. Crespin** said it was about 10 years. **Commissioner Fazzini** noted that Mrs. Crespin had appeared before the Commission at least twice on this issue, yet somehow her total number of dogs has increased substantially, with the addition of 20 more dogs. **Mrs. Crespin** said that she actually has purchased them over the last several years and they have been placed in other homes for awhile and has recently brought them all to her home. 8:21:19.

6.3 **SPEAKING**: None. **Commissioner Fink** then closed the public hearing.

6.4 **DISCUSSION**: **Commissioner Barbieri** advised that while she appreciates the glowing report received from Animal Services, she did not feel the applicant has a clear understanding of this ordinance. **Commissioner Faurschou** felt that 28 dogs in any home are too many. He understood that they are well cared for but it is still way beyond the intent of the ordinance and the applicant needs to reduce the number of animals. **Commissioner Jensen** was concerned with the buying and selling of these pets, especially with there being so many homeless animals needing homes. He was more comfortable with establishing her limit to ten, to be reduced to that number within a certain time period.

6.5 **MOTION**: **Commissioner Kehl** 8:30:06. I move for approval of File #4C12 as presented by staff with the following changes: The number of dogs allowed needs to be reduced to 10 within a one year period.
SECOND: **Commissioner Jensen** seconded the motion and added that it is reviewable upon substantiated and unresolved complaint.
Commissioner Fazzini asked what will happen in a year and was informed by **Mr. Meldrum** that West Valley Animal Services will be asked to follow-up. 8:32:43.

VOTE					
Commissioner	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**	**Commissioner**	**Vote**
Faurschou	**AYE**	**Fink**	**Chair**	**Kehl**	**AYE**
Fazzini	**AYE**	**Jensen**	**AYE**	**Barbieri**	**AYE**
Motion passes 5 to 0.					

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Kehl** gave his report by saying that there were no Planning issues at the last City Council meeting. Mayor Wall presented his State of the City address, introduced the Youth Council and discussed the budget.

OTHER BUSINESS: Commissioners suggested that Staff bring a list of Planning projects and the Administrative Report to the next work session for discussion. **Mr. Meldrum** said that he would do so and also include some basic training.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Kehl** 8:36:47 and second by **Commissioner Faurschou** the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Jean Gallegos

Respectfully submitted by Jean Gallegos, Administrative Assistant/Recorder for the Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on March 20, 2012.