

Planning & Zoning Minutes

May 1, 2014

35 North 1st East
Rexburg, ID 83440

www.rexburg.org

Phone: 208.359.3020
Fax: 208.359.3022



CITY OF
REXBURG
America's Family Community

Commissioners Attending:

Thaine Robinson - Chairman
Dan Hanna W.C.Porter
Jedd Walker Cory Sorensen
Mark Rudd Gil Shirley
Bruce Sutherland Melanie Davenport
Steve Oakey

City Staff and Others:

Brad Wolfe- City Council Liaison
Natalie Powell – Planning Assistant
Nick Cummock – Community Development Intern
Elaine McFerrin – P&Z Coordinator

Chairman Thaine Robinson opened the meeting at 7:03 pm. He welcomed everyone.

Community Development Director Val Christensen was excused.

Welcome Newly Appointed P&Z Commissioner

Chairman Robinson welcomed Bruce Sutherland to his first meeting as a P&Z Commissioner.

Bruce Sutherland stated that he has served on various committees for over 30 years. When he finished his duty on City Council, he was asked by the Mayor to be on this Commission. He loves to serve. He really enjoys and appreciates all the work this board has done and the dedication of the Commissioners. He has been an advocate all along and is delighted to be able to serve as part of this Commission.

Roll Call of Planning and Zoning Commissioners:

Steve Oakey, Bruce Sutherland, Cory Sorensen, Mark Rudd, Thaine Robinson, Jedd Walker, Chuck Porter, Gil Shirley, Melanie Davenport

Richie Webb was excused.

Minutes:

1. Planning and Zoning meeting – April 17, 2014

Steve Oakey motioned to approve the Planning & Zoning minutes of April 17, 2014.

Cory Sorensen seconded the motion.

Melanie Davenport, Gil Shirley, Chuck Porter, and Bruce Sutherland abstained for having not been present.

None opposed. **Motion carried.**

Public Hearings:

1. 7:05 pm - Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment – Approximately 99 Valley River Drive – Open Space to Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use

Chairman Robinson explained the procedure that is followed for public hearings. The applicant will give a presentation of the proposal. The Commission and public may then ask clarifying questions. Public input testimony will then be taken. Staff will then give their evaluation, which will

be followed by Commission deliberation in order to come to a decision on the proposal. During public testimony and during the time of Commission deliberation, there cannot be any dialog between the public and the Commission.

Johnny Watson, JRW & Associates, 1152 Bond Ave. He is representing C.K. Chan of California, who owns the subject property and the property where Kmart and McDonald's are located. Mr. Chan recently became aware that his subject property's Comprehensive Plan land use designation is Open Space. The property was apparently put into this designation during the last review of the Comprehensive Plan in 2008; the property is adjacent to City property on the west that has a land use designation of Open Space.

The rest of C.K. Chan's property to the east has a Comprehensive Plan map land use designation of Commercial. Since the properties to the south of the subject property have elected to go to a Comprehensive Plan land use designation of Neighborhood Commercial/ Mixed Use, Mr. Chan is requesting this designation, as he feels it offers him the most flexibility in the future.

The property was shown on the overhead screen. It is just west of the K-Mart building.

Johnny Watson said people have asked if apartments are going to be put here. Mr. Chan has not expressed a desire for development for the property of any kind. It is just felt that this request would be in Mr. Chan's best interest as the property owner.

Mr. Watson felt the property's Open Space designation would have been caught before if Mr. Chan was a local resident, but where he lives in California, he just recently realized that part of his property was in this designation.

Gil Shirley asked if C.K. Chan owned the land just to the west.

Johnny Watson clarified that the land to the west (with land use designation of Open Space) is owned by the City.

Chairman Robinson asked for clarification on the size of the property beyond the existing parking lot.

Johnny Watson said the property is a very narrow parcel. He clarified that the parking lot is required parking to meet the City's ordinance for the existing structure. The owner cannot take the parking out, so it leaves him very little space (80 or 90 feet) to do something in the future.

Mark Rudd asked for clarification on if the property recently changed in its Comprehensive Plan land use designation.

Johnny Watson said when the City revised the Comprehensive Plan a few years ago, the parcel somehow got designated as Open Space rather than designated with the rest of Mr. Chan's commercial development. The zoning of the property is Light Industrial. If the Comprehensive Plan is successfully changed to Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use for the property, Mr. Watson would come back in for the property owner to ask for appropriate zoning. The owner feels this is a cleanup of both maps (Comprehensive Plan and Zoning) for his property.

Bruce Sutherland said there should be some sort of adjustment if it is the mistake of the City.

Jedd Walker asked the Comprehensive Plan land use designation of the main K-Mart property. It was clarified that the Comprehensive Plan land use designation for K-Mart is Commercial. The zoning of the property is Community Business Center.

Chairman Robinson asked if anyone in the audience had any clarifying questions to help them understand the proposal.
There were no questions.

Natalie Powell did not have any additional clarifying information from staff.

Chairman Robinson opened the public input portion of the hearing.

In Favor: None

Neutral: None

Opposed: None

Written Input: None

Chairman Robinson closed the public input portion of the hearing and asked for the staff evaluation and recommendations.

Natalie Powell presented the Community Development Department staff report. She stated she is filling in for Val Christensen, who is attending a planning conference. Mr. Christensen and Public Works Director John Millar did not have concerns. Staff felt this is just a cleanup. If development does occur in the future, all necessary water and sewer are there.

Chairman Robinson asked if any of the Commissioners wished to declare a perceived or direct conflict of interest with this proposal.

Mark Rudd declared a perceived conflict, in that he owns property just to the south of the subject parcel. His property is next to the subject property, and it is the property that will be addressed in the 2nd public hearing before the Commission tonight. His family is in the process of selling the property.

The Commissioners had no objections to Mr. Rudd remaining on the dais to participate in this hearing process.

Cory Sorensen said as the land use designation of the subject property may be a mistake as was mentioned, maybe there can be reimbursement of the fee or part of the fee to the property owner. This could be addressed at the City Council meeting.

Steve Oakey motioned to recommend approval to the City Council of the Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment request to change the land use designation for the property at approximately 99 Valley River Drive, from Open Space to Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use. **Gil Shirley** seconded the motion.

None opposed. **Motion carried.**

As it was not yet the time for the scheduled second public hearing (7:30 pm), **Chairman Robinson** brought up one item for discussion.

A P&Z meeting is scheduled for July 3rd, the day before the July 4th holiday weekend. The Chair asked if the Commissioners would be available for that meeting, or if because of the coming holiday,

the July 3rd meeting should be cancelled. It would be good to decide on this issue ahead of time because of possible future applicants and the scheduling of land use issues. The Commission discussed the issue.

Bruce Sutherland motioned to cancel the July 3, 2014 P&Z meeting because of its closeness to the July 4th holiday. **Cory Sorensen** seconded the motion. None opposed. Motion carried.

Dan Hanna arrived at 7:25 pm.

2. 7:30 pm - Conditional Use Permit (CUP) – 325 North 1st East – to allow 100 % residential and zero percent commercial in a Mixed Use 2 zone

Bob Smith, Hutchison Smith Architects, 270 North 27th Street, Boise. He is representing Community Development Inc., the developers for this project; they were not able to attend tonight's meeting.

Mr. Smith said they were before the Commission a couple of years ago regarding the Rockwell Court Apartments on West 7th South, which were built by them and recently completed.

Tonight, the developer is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for 100 percent residential and zero percent commercial. The subject property is just to the south of the property that was addressed in the first hearing tonight.

A PowerPoint was viewed.

The subject property has unique challenges. It is in the Mixed Use 2 (MU2) zone, changed from Light Industrial a few years ago. The adjacent businesses are zoned Light Industrial (LI).

In the past, this property was a gravel pit. It was filled with rubble from at least one building in addition to dirt and various debris. There is an average of about 10 feet of fill and up to 14 feet that the developer essentially will have to completely remove and then replace with structural fill underneath their building. It is a very expensive lot to build on. They are proposing an affordable housing project of 48 unit, 3-story project. Financially, the way this is feasible is that there are tax credits as part of the financing package. That makes the project viable. The property is in the flood plain. The property is on the high end of the sewer line, so the sewer line that comes up 1st East is very shallow. It is forcing the building up a couple feet above the flood plain.

The south half of the block is residential. To the east are the school district facilities. There are also the existing storage buildings and businesses.

The analysis the developer has done of the property is that a commercial component that could be compatible with the planned low income apartments is just not feasible because of the lack of traffic count on this side street and the availability of commercial one block away that is much more desirable and affordable to build on.

A survey of the property was shown. There is an easement along the north that the City has designated as an access drive into the park. The City would construct a road way here for park access.

Mr. Smith stated that a lot line adjustment application has been submitted to the City. There would be 2 rather than 3 parcels. The one north parcel of land is all they are asking about tonight. He reiterated that they are requesting zero percent commercial and 100 percent residential for this north parcel.

The property has a lot going for it for residential apartments. It is close to the park and is within walking distance of stores and downtown. A building site plan drawing showing parking and a small playground area for young children was shown.

Ideally, the developer would eventually like to build a second building to the south. This would involve purchasing the 4 existing storage buildings. The developer has made some efforts toward this but has not yet gotten far.

Photos of the Rockwell Court Apartments were shown. The developer is proposing the same siding and shingles and color scheme for this new project. Rockwell Court Apartments were essentially filled the day they were made available. There is a big demand in Rexburg for affordable family housing.

Chairman Robinson said since you are only asking for the north portion, that still leaves the south part of the property available for commercial in the next phase of development at this point in time. **Bob Smith** said that was correct.

Steve Oakey said Mr. Smith commented that commercial was not viable here. The opposite was just done in the first hearing tonight. Why do you want to reduce your property options rather than keeping all options available? Other properties could be affected by this CUP. As per the previous action, there is growing commercial and residential in a mixed use area. This seems to be limiting rather than increasing options.

Bob Smith said they are only limiting what they do on this piece of land. They are not changing the zoning of the property or the adjacent properties.

Chairman Robinson said at this time in the meeting, we are only asking questions to better understand the proposal. He clarified that this is a Conditional Use Permit request only. The applicant is allowed to ask for zero percent commercial and 100 percent residential. There is a commercial requirement in MU2 unless this Conditional Use Permit is granted.

Dan Hanna said this proposal is a pretty standard type of conditional use permit request. The **Chair** said the City has encouraged commercial, but several developers have come in wanting residential only.

Mark Rudd asked for clarification that this CUP request is being asked for just one half of the property at this time – the north half.

Bob Smith said that was correct. This is just Phase 1. The second part of development on the south part of the property would depend on whether the storage building properties can be purchased. The drawings were submitted so the Commission would understand what the developer's overall intentions are for the property.

Chairman Robinson clarified that the request is for zero commercial and 100 percent residential use in phase 1 only.

He asked if there were any questions from the audience to help them understand the proposal. There were none.

Natalie Powell had no other clarifying information from staff.

Chairman Robinson opened the public input portion of the hearing.

Chuck Porter declared a direct conflict of interest and recused himself. He owns one of the storage buildings that the subject property is adjacent to. He wished to testify during the public hearing.

In Favor:

Melvin Rudd, 1852 North 2190 East, Sugar City. His family owns the subject property. The project is a great fit. A few years ago, another developer wanted to build here. The reason the property is zoned MU2 is because that was the only zone the city would let the developer use even though the developer did not want to use it. It took 10 months for the city to move ahead with what the developer asked for. By then the developer's funding had dried up, and he could not move forward. There have been a few proposals over the years for the land. This property would have been built on 10 years ago but Mr. Rudd could not get the city or planning and zoning to move fast enough for the developer. So, time is of the essence. This is a great project. It is next to the city park and is close to everything. This cleans up an eyesore. It would be beautiful for the community.

Neutral:

Steve Hart, 285 Mill Hollow Rd. He is an owner of one of the four storage buildings (the 2nd from the southernmost building). A concern is if there is a new apartment complex with a lot of children, he is a little worried about them getting between the storage buildings; it is not safe. He is also worried about security. At first he thought that the developer could put up a fence to stop children from going between the storage buildings. However, he has talked to some of the storage building owners and thinks the property line is close to the buildings, so he thought of putting gates up between the buildings. His main concern is that if something is built, he needs to have access to the back of the storage building. An easement may be needed. Mr. Hart would want the zoning to stay as it is currently - Light Industrial, so he can continue to use the property as it has always been used. He wants this zoning protected. Many times they drive in and out of those buildings with trailers and trucks. Also, at times there is increased traffic on the road, which is also a safety concern, especially because there would be more children here. If the developer is interested in buying the storage building, Mr. Hart would want to negotiate now rather than later. He has not heard a price. An LID (Local Improvement District) was required for him as a property owner to put in sidewalk from the former Sonic location to the city lift station location, and the storage building owners were required to put in sidewalk. The only place that does not have sidewalk is owned by the City near the lift station across the street to the north.

Chuck Porter, 1236 Fairview Ave. He owns the northernmost building of the 4 buildings adjacent to the subject property. The applicant has already addressed some of the concerns he had because of his building's location. The applicant has said the buildings are storage buildings. Mr. Porter's building is a full-fledged functioning shop – with power, heat, water, office, and mezzanine. As long as he owns the building he wants that right to continue. On the issue of trying to put commercial business or a store near a housing development, that would be difficult. As Commissioner Richie Webb had said in a past meeting, there would probably need to be a cluster of stores for it to be viable. He does not have a problem with the request for 100 per cent residential.

Cody Howard, 642 Harvest Drive. He is all for change and for development. He owns properties to the south of this request. There is a road right-of way that goes into the property. He does not own the road, but he has access. Phase 2 of this project would encroach on that road right of way. It limits the space he has for turning trucks around and for accessing his buildings.

He is very concerned with the drainage. Right now, the subject property slopes down toward his office, and all the drainage goes in that area. He has told the developers that he would be happy to sell out if the price is right, and he would relocate.

Another concern is that there is currently residential on one side of his business, and this development would mean residential on the other side. His commercial business would be stuck right between two residential areas. He does manufacturing, and there is noise. It could limit the capability of his continuing to do his business the way it is right now. He is not totally opposed to the change. Please take into consideration the problems that he sees.

Opposed: None

Written Input: None

The public input portion of the hearing was closed.

Chairman Robinson asked if anyone wished to declare a perceived or direct conflict of interest.

Mark Rudd declared a direct conflict of interest and recused himself. His family owns the subject property.

Chairman Robinson clarified that the Commission is looking at zero percent commercial and one hundred percent residential in phase 1 on the north end of this development, for this CUP request, possibly with conditions.

Steve Oakey said he would not stand in opposition to this zone change.

The **Chair** clarified that this is a Conditional Use Permit request.

Steve Oakey stated he would not go against this CUP request for two reasons. The first is that the applicant is making this request in order to have more options in the development of this land as the applicant sees fit. Secondly, Melvin Rudd testified that several past attempts at developing this land were not successful. Based on zoning restrictions and the slowness of bureaucracy, those projects were turned away. Mr. Oakey does not want to see this project turned away.

Steve Oakey motioned to recommend approval to City Council of this Conditional Use Permit request for The Grove Apartments at Riverside. **Bruce Sutherland** seconded the motion.

Gil Shirley said he agreed with Chuck Porter regarding Richie Webb's comment on businesses near residential. This property would be a really hard place to incorporate commercial that would do well. He feels this would be better as the requested 100 percent residential.

Melanie Davenport said given the park development nearby, she could see this property as housing. One consideration is that the ballparks get used into the night for several months a year. She would want a good buffer here.

Jedd Walker said he wanted to concur with the proposal for zero percent commercial, but since this is a conditional use permit request, he wanted to discuss appropriate conditions. One concern is the adjacency of commercial property to the residential. He suggested a condition of a fence just for the safety of the children, along the south property line.

Cory Sorensen said the purpose of a mixed use zone is to mix commercial and residential, but you also have to look at the location. In this case, there is a lot of commercial within a half block that

residents here would be able to go to. He agrees with buffering to protect both the Light Industrial and the residential. Children need to be safe, but business owners also need to run their businesses. **Dan Hanna** stated that when looking at conditions, the Commission typically looks at fencing, or a landscaping buffer. Mr. Hart brought up an important issue of protecting children from exploring around the storage buildings.

Jedd Walker said regarding buffering between the development and the park, he does not see that as much of a concern. If the developers see that as a detriment to their development, they can buffer it. His main concern is the south property line. Mr. Howard's concern about the easement would be a discussion issue when Phase 2 came forward.

Cory Sorensen asked if the sidewalk is continuous on the whole block. If there are any areas where there would be unsafe pedestrian movement a condition could address the issue. The subject property was viewed. The sidewalk is continuous, except for the portion in front of land that the City owns.

Bruce Sutherland felt the request makes a lot of sense.

Chairman Robinson said it is wise to consider conditions for the motion, although this motion was prematurely made.

The Chair stated that a Conditional Use Permit is allowed in certain zones for certain uses. When looking at a CUP request, the Commission's job is to identify the impacts, find out if the impacts can be mitigated, and possibly address the issue in a condition. Conditions help to mitigate any impacts to the neighborhood. The Commission does not have to make any conditions, but they have the opportunity to do so.

The Chair reiterated that this issue is for Phase 1 of the development.

Cory Sorensen proposed that there could be a condition added to the stated motion - a 5 foot privacy fence on the entire south border of Phase 1 of this project, for the protection of children and other residents.

Melanie Davenport suggested requiring a buffer such as trees along the west side.

Steve Oakey stated that before we start adding complexities to the proposal, he would think that there are probably liability issues and best practice issues for architectural design that probably include some form of buffer. Everyone on this Commission probably has a fence in their back yard. Those fences came about because we chose to put fences in our back yards.

Steve Oakey clarified that he maintains his motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit as requested, with no conditions. **Bruce Sutherland** agreed that his second was for no conditions.

There was a call for the vote.

Those In Favor:	Those Opposed:
Dan Hanna	Cory Sorensen
Steve Oakey	Thaine Robinson
Gil Shirley	Jedd Walker
Bruce Sutherland	Melanie Davenport

Motion did not carry.

Chairman Robinson said the residents who would be living in the new apartments need to be protected from the Light Industrial that is next to them.

Cory Sorensen said a fence is a very inexpensive, simple solution to have as a buffer.

Natalie Powell gave the staff report. Through the Development Code 1026, some of these issues are in place – fencing, buffering between residential and commercial uses, etc. Those issues are reviewed at the time of the building permit review process when the site plan is submitted and reviewed according to the code, through an in-house staff review. With the existing buildings, the development could have a buffer on the north side. The City would work with the applicant to find something agreeable.

She clarified that this is a CUP request and not a rezone request.

The applicant is just asking that the commercial 10 percent requirement in MU2 be reduced to zero percent.

The **Chair** said this request is different from anything the Commission has done because of the 2 phases involved regarding the conditional use permit.

Natalie Powell said it may be that the second phase of development would support the commercial percentage. We are just looking at the first phase now.

Property owners would work together on any easements. Landscaping requirements are in the code. Lights from the park area can be shielded to focus downward – lighting cannot trespass on to another property. The residents who would be living here may want to be able to access the park – it would be a benefit to them. Public Works Director John Millar’s review indicated that all sewer and water are ready to go.

Mrs. Powell said that the City will look into the issue of no sidewalk in front of the City property right away.

Steve Oakey asked if it would be possible to take the fence decision out of the Commission’s hands and put it into the hands of the property owners and the developer who in good faith would determine whether it would be in their mutual interest to have the said fence that there seems to be conflict about.

Natalie Powell said the city would require the development to have some type of fencing or buffering.

Steve Oakey said he would prefer that the neighbors negotiate between themselves rather than the rules being handed down from governing bodies.

The Chair said the only way to do that is with conditions.

Jedd Walker suggested a mutually agreed upon buffer between neighbors as a condition.

Dan Hanna said he is a bit confused between a fence as safety and a fence as buffering. The main safety concern is between each storage building. A security fence between buildings could be a suggestion, to suffice until a second phase of development.

Chuck Porter in the audience said there is already an existing security fence near his building.

Melanie Davenport said requiring a fence is a reasonable request.

Jedd Walker concurred with Mrs. Davenport that a fence is needed, along the south property line.

A second motion was then made:

Dan Hanna motioned to recommend approval to City Council of this CUP request for zero commercial and 100 percent residential, with one condition: there shall be a 6-foot fence on the south border of Phase 1 of this development, going east to west and around Chuck Porter's storage building. **Melanie Davenport** seconded the motion.

Jedd Walker said the condition may need to be amended. It is not necessary to require that the fence go around Chuck Porter's building. Where the fence ends on the east side could be worked out with Mr. Porter.

Steve Oakey said he would oppose this motion, as he wishes that the decision could be passed back to the property owners to negotiate in their best interest rather than the Commission deciding how to best secure their property.

Chairman Robinson called on Bob Smith to make one comment only on this issue.

Bob Smith said they would be happy to put up a fence; it is a good idea.

Cory Sorensen said there could be one simple condition: put up a buffer fence along the south border. How it is done – let them figure it out. Ultimately we want to protect both sides by having a fence on the south.

The Chairman said one of the main duties of this Commission is to look out for the safety and welfare of the residents of Rexburg. We are asking for a fence for safety purposes only. The developer is willing to do so. We are really not buffering anything here. The Commission would be wise to put the fence as a condition, in order to make it happen.

A call for the vote on the second motion as it was stated by Mr. Hanna was made.

Those In Favor:	Those Opposed:
Dan Hanna	Steve Oakey
Thaine Robinson	Bruce Sutherland
Melanie Davenport	Cory Sorensen
Jedd Walker	Gil Shirley

Motion did not carry.

A third motion was then made:

Steve Oakey motioned to recommend to City Council approval of this CUP with one condition: to allow neighbors to decide on the fencing amongst themselves.

Motion died for lack of second.

Cory Sorensen said a CUP allows someone to come in and ask for something. The Commission places conditions on that request based on what they feel is correct. How many times have we conditioned a project because this body feels it is important, even though that issue may be in the code? The safety is important on both sides.

The issue is simple – a safety fence is important for children and other new residents, and for neighboring property owners. Let them decide how it is built.

It is important; a fence needs to be stated as a condition by this body. We have jumped into too many quick, hasty motions.

A fourth motion was made:

Steve Oakey motioned to recommend approval to the City Council for a Conditional Use Permit for the property located at 325 North 1st East (The Grove at Riverside Apartments) to allow 100 percent residential and zero percent commercial in a Mixed Use 2 zone, and to include one (1) condition:

1) A fence shall be built on the south side (of Phase 1) of the subject property, to be negotiated between the developer and neighboring property owners. **Gil Shirley** seconded the motion.

Those in Favor:

Steve Oakey
Bruce Sutherland
Cory Sorensen
Gil Shirley
Thaine Robinson
Jedd Walker
Melanie Davenport

Those Opposed:

Dan Hanna

Motion carried.

The Standard CUP requirements stated in the Development Code No.1026 – (“Standards Applicable to Conditional Use Permits” Section 6.12B) - which include addressing nuisances, safety hazards, etc. - apply to this Conditional Use Permit. The standards apply for all conditional use permits.

From City of Rexburg Development Code Ordinance No. 1026:

6.12B. - Standards Applicable to Conditional Use Permits. *The approving body shall review the particular facts and circumstances of each proposed conditional use and shall find adequate evidence to show that the proposed use will:*

1. *Constitute a conditional use as established in Table 1, Zoning Districts, and Table 2, Land Use Schedule.*
2. *Be in accordance with a specific or general objective of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and the regulations of this Ordinance.*
3. *Be designed and constructed in a manner to be harmonious with the existing character of the neighborhood and the zone in which the property is located.*
4. *Not create a nuisance or safety hazard for neighboring properties in terms of excessive noise or vibration, improperly directed glare or heat, electrical interference, odors, dust or air pollutants, solid waste generation and storage, hazardous materials or waste, excessive traffic generation, or interference with pedestrian traffic.*
5. *Be adequately served by essential public facilities and services such as access streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer service, and schools. If existing facilities are not adequate, the developer shall show that such facilities shall be upgraded sufficiently to serve the proposed use.*
6. *Not generate traffic in excess of the capacity of public streets or access points serving the proposed use and will assure adequate visibility at traffic access points.*
7. *Be effectively buffered to screen adjoining properties from adverse impacts of noise, building size and resulting shadow, traffic, and parking.*
8. *Be compatible with the slope of the site and the capacity of the soils and will not be in an area of natural hazards unless suitably designed to protect lives and property.*
9. *Not result in the destruction, loss or damage of a historic feature of significance to the community of Rexburg.*

Unfinished/Old Business: None

New Business: None

Compliance: None

Non controversial Items Added to the Agenda: None

Report on Projects: None

Tabled Requests: None

Building Permit Application Report: None

Heads Up:

May 15, 2014:

1. Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment – City of Rexburg – 3rd West Neighborhood – Moderate High Density Residential to Low-Moderate Density Residential

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm.