

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, January 9, 2019**

5 **5:00 p.m.**

6 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**

7 **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**

8 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
9

10 ***ATTENDANCE***

11
12 **Members Present:** Acting Chair Sue Ryser, Craig Bevan, Doug Rhodes, Graig Griffin, Jesse
13 Allen, Alternate Bob Wilde

14
15 **Staff Present:** Community and Economic Development Director Mike Johnson, Associate
16 Planner Andrew Hulka, Public Relations Specialist Dan Metcalf, City
17 Recorder and Human Resource Manager Paula Melgar, City Manager Tim
18 Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham

19
20 **Excused:** Chair Allen Orr, Christine Coutts

21
22 **WORK SESSION**

23
24 In the absence of Chair Allen Orr, Acting Chair Sue Ryser called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

25
26 **1.0 Planning Commission Business.**

27
28 **1.1 Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Cottonwood Heights Planning**
29 **Commission.**

30
31 Commissioner Ryser stated that the central duty of a Planning Commission Member is to
32 determine how to balance the public good of private rights and interest. She explained that
33 residents of the City of Holladay felt their concerns were not being heard regarding a project in
34 their community and decided to take legal action. She believed that serves as a reminder that they
35 are present to serve the citizens and need to make sure they are listening and making their concerns
36 known. Responsibilities of the Commission Members were reviewed. Commissioner Ryser
37 relayed Chair Orr's request that seniority be a priority, but she felt that should not be the only
38 guide.

39
40 Commissioner Griffin emphasized the need to be more involved with outside groups like the Urban
41 Land Institute and the Utah League of Cities and Towns. He also believed the role of the
42 Commission is to educate the public.

43
44 Commissioner Ryser discussed the importance of the new Chair being a strong communicator,
45 both in meetings and in other correspondence. Sending a representative to City Council Meetings
46 was recommended.

1
2 *Commissioner Wilde moved to nominate Commissioner Griffin to serve as Planning*
3 *Commission Chair. Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion. The motion passed with the*
4 *unanimous consent of the Commission.*

5
6 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to nominate Commissioner Coutts as Planning Commission Vice*
7 *Chair. Commissioner Griffin seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous*
8 *consent of the Commission.*

9
10 **1.2 Review Business Meeting Agenda.**

11
12 The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. Community and Economic Development
13 Director, Michael Johnson, stated that they have streamlined how they organize the agenda and
14 meeting procedure. The process for closing public comments was described.

15
16 City Manager, Tim Tingey, reported that he has been attending Planning Commission Meetings
17 for 22 years in multiple jurisdictions and this is the first community that allows citizen comments
18 outside the public comment agenda item. He emphasized the importance of the citizens being
19 heard.

20
21 **1.3 Additional Discussion Items.**

22
23 Mr. Johnson reviewed the request from YIP Cottonwood, LLC for a 149-room hotel located at
24 7354 South Canyon Centre Parkway and stated that this is the last portion of the project that has
25 not yet received its formal use entitlement. The layout design was described. He confirmed that
26 the project is designed and proposed as a Courtyard by Marriott and the public open space will be
27 a City-owned parcel. He explained that it is a conditional use request for the hotel use and the
28 addition of a third story. In terms of requiring conditions of the hotel and applicant, they must be
29 based on the impact that only the hotel is creating. The exterior details were reviewed.

30
31 Commissioner Coutts expressed concern with potential traffic.

32
33 Associate Planner, Andy Hulka, reviewed the request from Breen Homes for a General Plan Land
34 Use Map Amendment from Residential-Low Density to Residential-Medium Density and a Land
35 Use Map Amendment from R-1-8 to R-2-8. He reported that it includes a variance for a 15-foot
36 setback due to the steep slopes and fault line that was part of the geotechnical report. The report
37 has since been updated and it was determined that the fault line is closer to the street than
38 previously believed. Setbacks were described.

39
40 Mr. Tingey expressed his appreciation to staff.

41
42 **1.4 Adjournment.**

43
44 *Commissioner Ryser moved to adjourn the Work Session. Commissioner Allen seconded the*
45 *motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

1 The Work Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

2
3 **BUSINESS MEETING**

4
5 **1.0 WELCOME/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

6
7 Chair Graig Griffin called the Business Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. and welcomed
8 those in attendance.

9
10 **1.1 Ex Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**

11
12 There were no public comments.

13
14 **2.0 BUSINESS ITEMS**

15
16 **2.1 (CUP-18-012) Public Hearing and Action on a Request by YIP Cottonwood, LLC for**
17 **a 149-Room Hotel Located at 7365 South Canyon Centre Parkway.**

18
19 Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and stated that it is a Conditional Use Request from YIP
20 Cottonwood, LLC for the construction and operation of a 149-room hotel and approval to construct
21 a third story. The first round of entitlements approved a Master Development Plan for the site and
22 conceptual future phase site plan and granted approval for a multi-level parking structure on which
23 the proposed building will be located. The hotel is one of the last to apply for its use entitlement.
24 The overall impacts were studied with traffic being one. The previously approved office building
25 plan was displayed with a rough outline of the proposed hotel and hotel massing. The architecture,
26 design, and materials had been reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Commission
27 (ARC). The building grade was reviewed. It was reported that the previous Community
28 Development Director along with other City staff, used the Old Canyon Racquet Club grade to
29 establish the natural grade. Staff recommended approval with the condition that any applicable
30 conditions from the original Master Development Plan be complied with and that the applicant
31 meet all relevant portions of the Municipal Code. Mr. Johnson emphasized that the Planning
32 Commission as the land use authority, has final approval authority for the conditional use.

33
34 City Engineer, Brad Gilson, reported that the applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Study in
35 October 2011 and then submitted an additional study from 2014. He explained that the 2011 study
36 included counts much higher than are currently being proposed. He confirmed that the 2014 study
37 is consistent with the current proposed use. The traffic impact process was reviewed. Residents
38 concerns included volume, access onto Wasatch Boulevard, queuing, and traffic stacking to the
39 entrance to the condominiums. He presented ways to mitigate traffic and confirmed that they will
40 be coordinating with the developer. Proposed conditions will include striping on Canyon Centre
41 Parkway and signage prohibiting blocking the intersection.

42
43 The applicant stated that this is a family owned business and they have been working with the
44 developer for over two years. They were open to suggestions regarding traffic especially since
45 hotels have different traffic patterns. She suggested speaking to their management company and
46 had had discussions with Hales Engineering who is also aware of the City's concerns. She

1 emphasized that the hotel is a separate issue from the traffic in the neighborhood and they have no
2 control over the actual site development. They have studied traffic patterns related to check in and
3 check out times and confirmed that neither will occur during peak traffic hours. She encouraged
4 discussion and described their plans for an independent shuttle to the ski resort and other amenities.
5

6 Chair Griffin opened the public hearing.
7

8 Jim Rock reported that he serves on the Board of Directors for the Canyon Racquet Club
9 Condominium Association and is one of the original residents of the property. He expressed
10 opposition to the proposed conditional use request and believed that if the Planning Commission
11 approves the project, mitigation needs to be provided. He commented that the addition of a third
12 story will only add to the current traffic situation. He believed that skiers that patronize the hotel
13 will only contribute to the peak traffic as ski resort times coincide with rush hour. He requested
14 there be no left turn during rush hour, that the road be striped with two lanes, and that parking be
15 provided on the south side where appropriate. He also emphasized the need for a trash and
16 recycling provision.
17

18 Chris McCandless identified himself as the original developer and asked to speak at the end so he
19 could address some of the public's concerns.
20

21 Leslie Kovack commented that she has been enduring the Canyon Centre construction for some
22 time and was strongly opposed not only the third story, but the hotel altogether. She commented
23 that the traffic is so congested that they cannot get out of their neighborhood. In addition, they
24 constantly have skiers cutting through their neighborhood. Light pollution was also of concern as
25 well as increased noise. She expressed frustration with the proposed height and the lack of respect
26 for the surrounding homeowners.
27

28 John Goodell addressed traffic and noise concerns along Wasatch Boulevard and stated that his
29 backyard flows down on the west side. They are directly impacted by traffic, which has gotten to
30 the point that at least half of the day, their backyard is unusable. He recommended reducing speeds
31 along Wasatch Boulevard.
32

33 Bill Currin reported that he lives at the Canyon Racquet Club Condominiums and serves as
34 President of the Board of Directors. He agreed with Mr. Rock's comments and asked the Council
35 to review the letter submitted to Mr. Johnson the previous day. He expressed concern with traffic
36 and especially the intersection at Wasatch Boulevard. He requested that the striping and parking
37 along the center lane be mitigated.
38

39 Todd Gottlieb agreed with Mr. Rock and suggested that a "Do Not Block" sign be posted in front
40 of the Canyon Centre Court development. He expressed concern with egress and ingress.
41

42 Hogan Gottlieb expressed concern with the additional traffic the proposed hotel will add.
43

44 Ivria Gottlieb requested a crosswalk or speed bumps to ensure safety when crossing the street.
45

1 Jeff Chatalain was concerned with the speed and noise of the traffic along Wasatch Boulevard
2 from the 7-Eleven. He believed that the 2014 traffic study was outdated and recommended a new
3 one be conducted because the traffic is currently out of control. He questioned who is responsible
4 for patrolling the area and stated that he hasn't seen a Highway Patrolman in the area for years.
5 He recommended a dedicated lane be added and the 7-Eleven entrance along Wasatch Boulevard
6 eliminated.

7
8 Mr. Johnson confirmed that Wasatch Boulevard is classified as a State Highway and is owned and
9 operated by UDOT. They are in the middle of their Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for
10 Little Cottonwood Canyon which extends along Wasatch Boulevard to Big Cottonwood Canyon.
11 They are in the middle of a two to three-year EIS period and are proposing to present alternative
12 scenarios and options for public feedback in March.

13
14 Chair Griffin explained that the David Weekley Homes project did not turn out as well as hoped.
15 Staff had worked exceptionally hard and what they see is a much closer and more careful depiction
16 of what is actually to be constructed.

17
18 Bryan Isaac commented that the current traffic conditions are ridiculous and the residents have a
19 difficult time getting in or out. He asked how many fatal accidents have occurred near the 7-
20 Eleven. Weekend traffic is out of control and he urged the Commission to mitigate the number of
21 hotel units.

22
23 Mark Machlis explained that when the City purchased the Prospector Office Development, UDOT
24 demanded that acceleration and deceleration lanes be added due to the 50 mph speed limit. He
25 expressed frustration with the proposed development being done without those lanes and
26 questioned why UDOT signed off on it. On-street parking was also identified as a concern.

27
28 Cameron Hemphill, a resident of the David Weekley Development, emphasized the danger of
29 exiting the neighborhood and commented that parking is a challenge. He commented that trash
30 and recycling become a clean-up effort when cans are set on the street. He suggested there instead
31 be an assigned designated area.

32
33 Woody Noxin expressed concern with traffic and recommended only right turns be allowed during
34 rush hour to prevent cars from entering his neighborhood.

35
36 Robert Winslow, a Prospector Drive resident, commented that the exit onto Wasatch Boulevard is
37 very dangerous. The proposed project will only add to the existing safety concerns. He
38 encouraged mitigation measures to eliminate further issues.

39
40 Chris McCandless explained that as the developer of the project, they are willing to sit down with
41 the City Engineer to discuss ways to address the residents' traffic concerns. The parking structure
42 will allow people to park at the base and take the bus up the canyon, which will help alleviate and
43 mitigate traffic concerns. The proposed 300 parking stalls will triple the amount of parking that is
44 presently available at the Mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon and the surrounding parking lots.
45 With eight years spent developing the project, the Shared Parking Plan ensures that they are parked
46 appropriately while continuing to allow public use to utilize the structure and use rapid transit.

1
2 Project amenities were next reviewed. Mr. McCandless explained that there are two plazas at or
3 near grade that allow access to Wasatch Boulevard. Park improvements will be completed near
4 the end of construction. The contract calls for grading and currently, there will be enough tax
5 increment associated with the Community Development Plan of approximately \$700,000 to pay
6 for the park improvements.
7

8 As part of the Development Agreement, there is a unique Shared Parking Agreement that utilizes
9 the parking to the extent possible. Mr. McCandless confirmed that there are 80 stalls available
10 24/7. During holidays and weekends, 300 stalls will be available. He explained that the shared
11 plans and easements are technical documents and confirmed that there is nothing on record
12 allowing David Weekley homes to utilize the parking.
13

14 Commissioner Allen asked if it is possible to walk between the proposed restaurant and hotel on
15 grade. He commented that there appears to be a curved drive connecting the northern and southern
16 parking areas, which have impacted the pedestrian connectivity from Canyon Road to Wasatch
17 Boulevard since an additional road now has to be crossed.
18

19 Mr. McCandless noted that the project has 70 feet of fall from one corner to the next and is a
20 challenging project. They want to ensure connectivity through the proposed sidewalk design. He
21 confirmed that they will work to create a reasonable pedestrian access.
22

23 Mark Machlis stated that in the original Master Plan, it was envisioned that UTA would provide
24 pickup for the aforementioned 80 stalls and hotel guests. Since then, UTA has stated that they
25 cannot do that and felt it was unrealistic to expect 80 people and 140 hotel guests to cross Wasatch
26 Boulevard to catch the bus. He understood it was the design of the Master Plan that made it
27 impossible to have both acceleration and deceleration lanes and enter the development midway.
28

29 Lynne Kraus stated that after listening to the CDRA meetings, she was of the understanding that
30 the parking will not be free. Those choosing to park in the stalls will be charged an hourly rate.
31

32 Mr. McCandless explained that the provisions in the Development Agreement allow them to
33 charge for the actual costs of anything other than overhead and maintenance. The parking will be
34 regulated and the preliminarily rate is determined to be a daily rate.
35

36 Mr. Rock asked if there will be a charge for parking and stated that they would like to see parking
37 on Canyon Centre Parkway be restricted to residential.
38

39 Commissioner Ryser asked if it would be worth the time and money to complete an additional
40 traffic study now, during the ski season, to get actual data. She also questioned how many hotel
41 guests will generate traffic during peak morning and afternoon hours. She questioned whether the
42 current roads can handle the numbers from the hotel.
43

44 It was reported that the information that is important to analyze in the study is the trip generation
45 and impact on the system. It was noted that the 2014 study is consistent with what is currently
46 proposed. What is used are generally traffic engineering principles to provide trip generation

1 figures. Chair Griffin pointed out that if the City’s expert is telling them the data is adequate, that
2 is what the Commission should base their information on.

3
4 Mr. Johnson reported that the two separate concerns include asking if the hotel requires any added
5 conditions in terms of traffic and implementing mitigation measures outside of the hotel to address
6 those concerns. Although all concerns are legitimate, he did not know if they are tied directly to
7 the impact of the hotel.

8
9 Commissioner Allen requested a revised site plan showing pedestrian connections between all uses
10 in the development. New landscaping to screen the exposed portion of the parking garage under
11 the hotel was also suggested.

12
13 Gary Gowers from Beecher Walker Architects, believed it was important to reiterate that they are
14 only one piece of the puzzle. The portion of the parking garage that is exposed is not a part of
15 their project. He emphasized that they are present to focus on the hotel and not a portion of the
16 development that may have been missed. The hotel has the ability to invite their customers into
17 their amenities and they are not responsible for the parking stalls provided by the overall
18 development.

19
20 It was Mr. Johnson’s understanding that regardless of whether the hotel comes to fruition, what is
21 shown in terms of surface parking is constructed and installed. He confirmed that the height is
22 required to comply with all of the ordinance and height requirements.

23
24 Mr. McCandless explained that when they obtained their Conditional Use and Building Permits
25 for the parking structure, it included a landscaping plan. The exterior of the parking structure will
26 be sided with rock. He confirmed that the landscaping plan is outside the scope of the hotel.

27
28 There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

29
30 *Commissioner Ryser moved to continue the public hearing for CUP-18-012 to the meeting of*
31 *January 23, 2019. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilde. Vote on motion:*
32 *Commissioner Bevan-Nay, Commissioner Allen-Nay, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye,*
33 *Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Commissioner Ryser-Aye and Chair Griffin-Aye. The motion passed*
34 *4-to-2.*

35
36 **2.2 (ZMA-18-001) Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council on a Request**
37 **from Breen Homes for a General Plan Land Use Map Amendment from Residential**
38 **– Low Density to Residential – Medium Density and a Zone Map Amendment from**
39 **R-1-8 to R-2-8 on the Properties Located at 7559 & 7571 South Prospector Drive.**

40
41 Associate Planner, Andy Hulka, presented the staff report and stated that the request includes
42 amendments to both the General Plan Land Use Map and the Zone Map. The site is located east
43 of Wasatch Boulevard and south of the Canyon Centre project. The land use map was reviewed.
44 Mr. Hulka explained that the property is currently designated Residential Low-Density and what
45 is proposed is Residential Medium-Density along with a zone change to R-2-8 Residential Multi-
46 Family that allows single-family and two-family homes. An updated fault setback image was

1 reviewed. Mr. Hulka confirmed that the applicant is consolidating both of the lots into a single
2 one-acre lot. The applicant was proposing to build one duplex.

3
4 Peter Smith from Breen Homes stated that they are trying to maximize the use of the land.

5
6 Chair Griffin opened the public hearing.

7
8 Tracy Palmer thanked the Commissioners for their dedication. She stated that they live adjacent
9 to the subject property and have noticed large numbers of people lodging there to be close to the
10 ski resorts. She was opposed to the proposal since it will create additional traffic. She also wanted
11 to preserve her privacy.

12
13 Brian Isaac asked what the applicant intends to do with the duplex and stated that he has placed
14 over 200 calls to the Police Department regarding issues with the nearby ski rental properties. He
15 stated that they are run down and detract from the neighborhood. He was opposed the proposed
16 duplex being used as a rental and stated that it is not zoned for that. Enforcement was encouraged.

17
18 Mary Machlis stated that they have been trying to get the City to enforce rental laws on the
19 duplexes to the north. They have had issues with traffic, parking on the street, and people coming
20 in and out. She resented the fact that they cannot get anything enforced. She was opposed to the
21 proposal and asked that it remain single-family.

22
23 Matt Lipscomb stated that he lives on Prospector and had spoken to the owner, Adam Breen, who
24 stated that his plan is to rent half of the duplex during the winter months. He understood that
25 Mr. Breen intends to sell the one side and rent it out to make a profit during the winter season. He
26 stated that each side will be 2,700 square feet in size. Mr. Lipscomb expressed his opposition to
27 the proposed project.

28
29 Mark Machlis commented that they have always had problems with renters of the adjacent
30 duplexes who he believed rent by the room. As a real estate broker, he was opposed to the proposed
31 rezone and the unit being turned into a rental. He believed the rezone is where the use can best be
32 controlled and recommended the request be denied.

33
34 Ashley Kovack expressed concern with the units becoming rentals and urged the Commission to
35 oppose the rezone. She questioned how development was possible on the property since there is
36 a fault line running through it.

37
38 The applicant, Adam Breen, stated that they are in the early stages and want to get approval before
39 proceeding with the design of the project. He confirmed that the density is not increasing and their
40 goal is not to have a rundown rental unit. He understood the problems that can come with rentals.
41 They had considered making the proposed units weekend ski rentals but they were too early in the
42 planning process to confirm that.

43
44 There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

1 Commissioner Bevan expressed his opposition to spot rezoning and adamantly opposed
2 consideration of the proposed request.

3
4 Commissioner Ryser asked about short-term rental rules. Mr. Johnson pointed out that on public
5 streets, regardless of the zone, rentals of less than 30 days are not legally permitted.

6
7 Chair Griffin was in favor of the request and believed that consolidation of the lot would put the
8 project at half the density of the surrounding homes. He commented that it is less than ideal for a
9 single-family home and is well buffered with a limited envelope.

10
11 Commissioner Ryser expressed concern about the possibility of it being utilized as a future rental.

12
13 Commissioner Allen explained that if the surrounding duplexes decrease in value and are not well
14 maintained, the result will be to build something new. If something new has to be built on the
15 existing duplex lots, it would have to be single-family. Given the land use, the new application
16 would be out of place.

17
18 *Commissioner Bevan moved to recommend denial to the City Council of ZMA-18-001 for both*
19 *the land use and zoning request from Breen Homes for a General Plan Land Use Map*
20 *Amendment from Residential-Low Density to Residential-Medium Density and a Zone Map*
21 *Amendment from R-1-8 to R-2-8 on the properties located at 7559 & 7571 South Prospector*
22 *Drive. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilde. Vote on motion: Commissioner*
23 *Bevan-Aye, Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye,*
24 *Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Chair Griffin-Nay. The motion passed 5-to-1.*

25
26 **2.3 (ZTA-18-003) Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council on a Request**
27 **from Kimley-Horn for a Zoning Text Amendment to Amend Section 19.82.040 – Wall**
28 **Signs.**
29

30 Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and stated that the request is a minor proposal to amend the
31 wall sign text of the City’s zoning ordinance. He explained that the existing ordinance specifies
32 that wall signs are permitted to occupy 15% a wall façade with frontage on a street. Wall signs
33 must also be limited to a maximum height of six feet, which is the portion proposed to be amended.
34 The applicant proposed wall signs be incorporated into any building with a setback of 150 feet and
35 a façade greater than 350 linear feet that with a maximum height of 12 feet while still maintaining
36 an area of 15% of the wall. They also proposed adding language to allow up to five wall signs that
37 meet that requirement. He specified that what is proposed is an amendment to the zoning text that
38 would apply City-wide to any properties meeting the requirements. The alternative option staff
39 recommended was the elimination of the six-foot height requirement and limiting any wall sign to
40 no more than 15% of the sign area. Staff believed this was a more equitable sign standard that still
41 meets the intent of the ordinance. The current ordinance definition was reviewed.

42
43 Chair Griffin opened the public hearing.
44

1 The applicant, Bryce Christensen, stated that Target is proposing a 2019 remodeling program that
2 includes both interior and exterior remodels. The 15% requirement allows flexibility but also
3 limits the amount of signage that can be placed on the building.
4

5 *Commissioner Wilde moved to approve ZTA-18-003 a request from Kimley-Horn for a zoning*
6 *text amendment to amend Section 19.82.040 Wall Signs along with staff's alternative #2 so long*
7 *as the terminology is restructured to read as a single paragraph. The motion was seconded by*
8 *Commissioner Bevan. Vote on motion: Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Commissioner Allen-Aye,*
9 *Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Chair Griffin-*
10 *Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*
11

12 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

14 **3.1 Approval of Minutes for October 17, 2018.**

15
16 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to approve the minutes of October 17, 2018. The motion was*
17 *seconded by Commissioner Wilde. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the*
18 *Commission.*
19

20 **3.2 Approval of Minutes of November 7, 2018.**

21
22 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to approve the minutes of November 7, 2018. The motion was*
23 *seconded by Commissioner Wilde. Vote on motion: Commissioner Bevan-Abstain,*
24 *Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Commissioner*
25 *Ryser-Aye, Chair Griffin-Aye. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.*
26

27 **4.0 ADJOURNMENT**

28
29 *Commissioner Bevan moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ryser.*
30 *The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*
31

32 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.
33

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Cottonwood*
2 *Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, January 9, 2019*

3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: _____