



Harrisville City Planning Commission Minutes

Harrisville City Offices

363 W Independence Blvd – Harrisville

Wednesday, July 8, 2026 – 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners: Angie Francom, Chair
Chad Holbrook, Vice Chair
Isaac Thomas
Christina Palmer
Ruben Morales

Staff: Sarah Wichern, City Planner
Cynthia Benson, Deputy Recorder

Excuse: Jennie Knight, City Administrator
Bryan Fife, Public Works Director

Visitors: Stephen Everts, Bradley Gygi, Gabe Gygi, Shawn Douglas, Jane Douglas, Randy Smith, Rodney Dopp, Lynnae Dopp, Jeneal Shaw, Lisa Larose, Mike Dalpiaz, Chuck Sheets, Randy Bick, Roger Shuman, Kirk Nigro, Marvin Farrell.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Francom called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance. Jennie Knight, City Administrator, and Bryan Fife, Public Works Director, were excused from the meeting.

2. CONSENT APPROVAL – of Planning Commission meeting minutes from June 10, 2026.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas motion to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes of June 10, 2026. Commissioner Palmer second the motion. Motion passed with all in favor.

3. DISCUSSION/ACTION/RECOMMEND – to grant Site Plan Amendment for Misty Meadows church house addition located at approximately 2360 North 600 West.

Sarah Wichern said the city engineer and herself reviewed the submitted plans for code and engineering compliance and found four (4) items to be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit or the commencement of any construction. These are outlined in the memo. The project involves improvements to an existing church, including construction of a building addition, expansion of the parking lot, installation of a new pavilion, and modifications to the site's landscaping.

MOTION: Commissioner Holbrook motion to grant Site Plan Amendment for Misty Meadows church house addition located at approximately 2360 North 600 West subject to City Planner's Memo dated June 30, 2026, Harrisville City Municipal Code, and any other staff or agency requirements. Commissioner Morales second the motion.

Angie Francom	Yes
Chad Holbrook	Yes
Isaac Thomas	Yes

Christina Palmer **Yes**
Ruben Morales **Yes**

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

4. DISCUSSION/ACTION/RECOMMEND – for consideration of Ordinance 571: an ordinance amending the official zoning map and adopting a master development agreement (MDA) for certain parcels located at approximately 640 West Harrisville Rd. (Item tabled on June 10, 2026)

Chair Francom said this item was tabled in the Planning Commission meeting of June 10, 2026. She continued by saying because we have received public comments pertaining to this ordinance, including some received upon the commissioner's arrival tonight, we are going to reopen the public hearing to include the comments we have received since the last public hearing of June 10, 2026. We request further comments regarding new information for more time to consider and discuss. All comments sent after the closing of the hearing in June have been included for consideration. Meaning if you made a comment at our last meeting of June 10th, or you have sent one into the city via email or other forms of delivery, we want all of them to become part of the official record. All comments up to and during the meeting of last month are included on the city website. Anything added tonight we would ask for time and consideration for everyone present. We do not need to hear the same comment, but if you have new comments then you are welcome to approach when the public hearing is opened. These comments the commissioners have received today will be passed along to staff to become a part of the record and can be dealt with in the appropriate manner.

Sarah Wichern reminded the commissioners this is a legislative item which gives leeway to how the item is considered. There is no obligation to approve. This is under the commissioner's discretion with what they feel is best for Harrisville City. Before we have our public hearing, we will hear from our applicant so he can describe the project. We will then reopen the public hearing and conclude with the commissioner's discussion to decide what action is needed for this proposal.

Randy Smith stood at the request of Chair Francom. He said he was prepared to give a few more details about the project and to address some of the public comments from last month's meeting. This is a legislative process. Because of this the Planning Commission is the recommending body and then this goes to the City Council based on this there is no strict checklist like an administrative review. Instead, the commission leans on the General Plan specifically on public health and safety, long-term compatibility, infrastructure compacity, and those elements to see if this project is viable and can be recommended. But this is at your discretion.

General Plan does support and allows for mixes of housing opportunities at various income levels and to build sustainable mixed income neighborhoods across the city without separating neighborhoods by income. In 2023 update, the city identified zoning overlays in the development agreements, like being proposed today, as its own chosen tool for adding density where standard zoning makes housing unattainable. This application is using that tool.

We understand this is a real change for the neighbors. There are farming activities nearby. Concerns about compatibility deserve to be heard and not dismissed. They are important. This ordinance does exist to do what Harrisville has always done. It lets families put down roots here generation after generation. The family this project serves are outsiders. They are Harrisville's own kids and grandkids priced out of the town they grew up in.

We talked about this last time, the Weber County Area Median Income (AMI), using just the county

and not any surrounding area with a 5-year average so it is not a very volatile number, is \$102,071. The ordinance identifies 120% AMI, and the State also identifies 120% AMI as an affordable metric. Another metric the State has is moderate income housing which is 80% AMI. The project is not heading for that metric. There were comments during the public comments last month about moderate income housing. Randy Smith clarified that metric is different than those metrics used for this project.

In Harrisville, and basically every city across Utah, there are families who are priced out of the market, to no fault of their own. They do not have the same opportunities that their parents when they bought their first home. This project is not meant to offer people a free outcome. It is meant to offer them fair opportunity to get into home ownership, which is the number one builder of personal financial independence and wealth. This project aims to provide a product aimed at their actual income levels.

The plan is thirty-one (31) lots, one of them is the existing house that faces Harrisville Road which is carved out of the whole and thirty (30) new homes. This is the same plan that the commission has seen before and under the ordinance at least half of these new homes will be offered at that target value price of \$498,000. We worked through our formulas. We worked through our product. Randy Smith said he worked through the math today. He pulled today's mortgage rates and added them all up. He found someone who was well-qualified with an AMI of 100% could mortgage this home. They would not need to do the 120% AMI. The goal was to build a cottage home including a detached 2-car garage for under \$500,000. The homeowner can choose to lower their price by foregoing the garage.

They are requesting some variances with the project which are allowed with the HOAZ ordinance. His justifications are as follows:

- 1) Lot size is 4,000 sq feet minimum. He apologized for the lots not meeting this standard and said he will adjust the lot lines to hit this requirement. He is not asking for a variance for this. He will adjust the concept to meet this requirement.
- 2) All lot widths of 46 feet.
- 3) No HOA. No association dues.
- 4) Each home will have a real yard and a nice space.

Every target value home will carry a 20-year deed-restriction which requires owner occupied which means the owner of the home lives in the home. The ordinance does allow for some exceptions to that, but generally that is the idea. This does not mean they cannot sell the home. If they sell the home, the 20-year deed restriction does not reset, the new owners will be required to live in the home. There is pride in home ownership. This is the goal and the mechanism that is happening in this project also.

For the first thirty (30) days, any of these target value priced homes are listed, are listed exclusively where they can only except contracts from first home buyers and critical and essential workers. There is a list in the ordinance. They are not asking for any variance with this. We will offer it this way and they will get first-right of refusal, the first chance to purchase these homes which is the intent of this ordinance. After that period, we can go broader than this. This does not change the deed restriction. The deed restriction is there regardless of the buyer.

The design offers two-story garage forward plans and the cottage plans with the optional rear garage in multiple architectural styles, different roof lines, different architectural elements creating variety and adding to what is already out in that part of the community. Randy Smith added the product is a timeless high quality fantastic product. They use Hardy board which is pre-colored and does not need to be painted for fifty (50) years. They do not use wood which can rot. They only use high-quality products and are proud of it.

In respect to the neighbors, the neighbors are good stewards and that is the standard they are building

to. Every lot that backs up against someone else's lot whether it is agricultural or other, a privacy fence installed by the developer. This is included in the cost of any home anyone buys. Mostly will be installed before they build their house. They will have a fence. This is not an option. This way the fencing looks uniform and the same around the community. Nice privacy fence to separate the homes.

The application is for an overlay. It does not change the base zoning. The adjacent properties are still next to a property that is zoned the same as it was and the same as theirs. It just has an overlay on it. It does not impact the neighbor's use. They can still farm. They can still do the things they are doing. They just have more families living by them. They recognize that is the difference.

Every HOAZ approval is its own discretionary decision on its own development agreement. It does not set a precedent. It does not mean it has to be approved next door or anywhere else. Everyone has to stand on its own merits. He hopes to show this one can stand on its own merits and recognizes it is a hard decision.

A small five (5) acre parcel on West Harrisville Road. It is not a template for the ag land around it. Those are different sized lots. The buy right zone is for single-family detached residential homes. It is just the lot size the zoning overlay is changing. It is not changing the use of single-family detached residential. They are not asking for special treatment. They are just asking to use the flexibility the commission has already built into the ordinance. The ordinance states there are some design standards the city would like to hit. They are looking to deviate a little from those such as:

- 1) The ordinance asks for lot frontage to be forty (40) feet if there is not garage forward and fifty (50) feet for garage forward. They are asking to average them all at forty-six (46). The reason is because they want a wider lot on the cottage to fit a drive lane down the side of the house and still fit a three (3) bedroom, two (2) bathroom house, to get to that back garage. They are asking for the tradeoff which is four (4) feet less on the garage forward plans and six (6) feet more on the garage rear plans. This is one of the requests they have.
- 2) They are also requesting on the cottage lots to sit a little more forward because there is no front driveway. The driveway would be on the side of the home. They are asking to allow the front porch to go into the front setback four (4) feet. They recognize they still need to work with the engineer on this. That is the current request keeping the house at the minimum setback but allowing the porch to intrude. This is to maximum backyard space which is premium and to give as much space as they can and also to open up the tighter lots to allowing for access to the garage in the back.
- 3) Lastly, they are asking for a modified road section which was shown last time. They are asking for twenty-eight (28) feet road way. The engineer would like to have thirty (30). The package shows twenty-eight (28), but they are going to update that to thirty (30) feet. When making the motion this is one piece the commission would want to include as a condition since the application has it as twenty-eight (28).

Seems every year State Legislation presents bills to mandated smaller lot sizes state wide. This year was House Bill 184 which was defeated. This pattern repeats year after year and we hear about some new zoning requirements. We expect the same next year. ULCT wants partnerships not preemption. Kudos to Harrisville to lead the charge at finding away. You are the first, as far as I know, kind of the only like city to say, okay, we are going to make a way. And this is what the League of Cities and Towns is saying, yeah, allow the cities to find a way, and you guys are going for it. It has been approved, it is in ordinance, and it is completely discretionary.

Randy Smith respectfully asked the Planning Commission for a positive recommendation to the City Council for adoption of this ordinance. The plan they are proposing falls squarely within your rights

to recommend this for approval. It has all the aspects.

When we do our planning and surveying, the engineers and surveyors gave us the calculation of 5.0 acres to the 10th. So, the site surveyed is actually 4.964 acres. We are .037 short from being five (5) acres. As far as the development agreement goes, a development agreement can decide that it is okay, but he wanted to be very straightforward with everybody on how the ordinance is written there is a specific section in the ordinance that says, you can vary from these things if you show us why, but the acreage requirement is not in that section. For clarity, do we round up to the 10th or is it not okay? What options do we have? He acknowledges, as an engineer, 4.964 is not five (5). We have had a great relationship with the city staff and have been transparent about Fieldstone values. They stay above board. It is how we operate.

The next thing to discuss is density. The ordinance asks for six (6) per acre. We are asking for six and a quarter. Basically, it is one additional home to fit in there. They are asking to average the lots out to forty-six (46) feet. They are asking for porch extensions to be within the setbacks. And the modified road section. These are the pieces. He is open to conversation. He would rather have the commission tell him they cannot handle the one extra house and take it out or whatever it might be. If the project does not pencil, unfortunately they will not build it. He wants to make the project work.

It is his understanding the development agreement can help with the acreage piece. If not, there are other options for instance. The Planning Commission recommend for approval and in the same recommendation, they can recommend amending the HOAZ ordinance to move the acreage section to the flexibility section of the ordinance to allow the City Council and Planning Commission to review and allow flexibility.

Randy Smith recommends a motion to recommend approval of Ordinance 571 to the City Council subject to the concept plan being updated to include 30-foot asphalt width. By putting this in the motion, it would require them to fix it from the concept plan of twenty-eight (28) feet to thirty (30).

Randy Smith said he could provide the city with studies regarding demands, costs, value comparisons, affected values on neighboring properties, state laws about protecting existing agricultural uses, and water drainage. As for the water drainage, Randy Smith said he met with the neighbor and has seen his house and the things talked about in the last meeting. Randy Smith feels this development would help him a lot. Randy Smith understands having a storm basin over there is a bit frightening but by doing so this development would cut off the flood irrigation and the irrigation water will be routed away from Warren's property. Part of the development is to install offsite storm sewer pipes in West Harrisville Road to collect excess storm water and store away from the site. The storm water basin proposed for a one hundred (100) year storm will fill up and drain in less than eight (8) hours. In a ten (10) year storm, it is less than four (4) hours. That means statistically a storm that happens once every hundred (100) years fills up and empties. It does not hold water. The state does have some permanent water retention requirements, but they are easy enough to work through. Once the condition is improved on the property, he will not need to run his sump pumps at all. Ground water is shallow. The conditions today, compared to the conditions they are proposing, are an improvement. He can give the commission information on infrastructure compacity. All cities have minimum infrastructure sizes. The minimum sizes of infrastructure are capable of serving much more than this area currently and they are bringing in more to bring in that storm sewer that does not exist currently.

Chair Francom thanked Randy Smith for his presentation. She asked staff the procedure for the public hearing. Sarah Wichern said now would be a good time to have the public hearing and then after the commissioners have collected all their thoughts, have the commissioners discussion. She also reminded the audience that outbursts and applause are not acceptable in this forum. If you agree with someone,

please come up and let us know. This way, we will know that you have been heard.

Chair Francom thanked Sarah Wichern before reviewing the rules of a public meeting which were three (3) minutes or less and if you will state your name when you get to the podium. As a clarification, this is to reopen the public hearing that began at the June 10th, 2026, meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Palmer motioned to reopen the public hearing from the June 10, 2026, meeting. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion.

Angie Francom	Yes
Chad Holbrook	Yes
Isaac Thomas	Yes
Christina Palmer	Yes
Ruben Morales	Yes

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

Roger Shuman said I am a rural residential land owner. I understand also the issues the city faces with my position I hold in the city as the Mayor. I also realize too that you have a general plan. We can sit back and debate what the general plan rule is and what words mean but at the end of the day I think the intent that was done in 2019 when it was put into place, it was there to help protect the interests of the people that are building around or that just bought property next to this particular property. I do not think it does enough to drop in a high-density development right in the middle of a fully agriculture area. Just like I said in my letter to you, I do not think it is the right place for this development. I do not think it gives you enough room to mitigate between other properties. If you look at the general plan, it states in there you can go to semi-rural residential, not just rural residential. And the intent of that was so that you could transfer from one size property to the next, not necessarily jumping from a rural residential lot that goes into 4,000 square foot lots. That is a big change. The developer gave you a real good sells pitch. I think you need to read between the lines of the sales pitch. You developed a lot of property with a lot of high density providing all different types of living in Harrisville City. I do not think we have any obligation to put it in this particular space. I think there are other places within Harrisville that it might fit but in this one that does not.

Mike Dalpais said after listening to the developer, we have to change sizes. We have to encroach four (4) feet. To me it is a definite sign that it is too small. There is going to be a time and place for this kind of development, but I do not think this is the place.

Kirk Nigro said I appreciate the developer for presenting and coming with some counter arguments with some of the discussion we had before. I think that is a good approach and want to give kudos for that. I am definitely on the mayor's side. I feel this high dense area is not a good fit where it is at. I fully understand that dense housing has its place. Typically close to amenities, close to areas that have a reasonable step to it, not just pure rule too dense right next to each other, right in the middle of nothing around it. That is concerning. I do know what when they talked about the overlay, when we were adopting that ordinance, we said the overlay is not going to be shoved in on us. We will have the ability to comment and control and be able to maintain the culture that we have here in Harrisville. When I hear staff say we have an obligation that seems to be a different tone that now anyone can come in and force their development on us is concerning. The other one I have is if we have variances to the ordinances or they are asking for exceptions or differences or even asking to amend the ordinance to get their development in place, that does set a really slippery slope for any developer coming in especially some of the higher power developers. You get attorneys involved. I deal with that daily. It is a tough situation by vocation, and I have been on the other side. I get it but sometimes you have been

because the momentum happens the resources are not available to defend that. We have to stand firmly to whatever the ordinance is. The other comment I have is there are variances which are not complying with the ordinance. Should a permit get in place? I think you mean there are people that definitely feel I have standing that will challenge and will appeal that permit. So even if that does get approved it is not following the ordinance. Morgan County dealt with that with Lord Angeles Peaks. It was a nasty nightmare. The issue that you run into is this is the first that is coming into place. We love our town. We love the culture and if we do not feel it is fit, we are going to fight tooth and nail to prevent this from happening and ensure everyone follows the rules as they are stated. We will hold the city accountable as well as those that are making the decision to upholding the rules that we have in place.

Shawn Douglas said I would counter the five (5) acre is not challengeable. That is a minimum. It is not in the area that is negotiable. Where do you start that? It says five as a minimum. He suggested that you change the ordinance. So, every time somebody comes in, we are going to rewrite this overlay zone because somebody has 4.75, the next guy has three? Can we just rewrite the ordinance every time it comes? I think that is a terrible slope to be on too because you set an ordinance, you set a precedence, you told us what it would be. When you set this ordinance up, you said it would be a minimum of five (5). Why would we change that? The other thing stated directly from your general plan is that you will protect the residential and agricultural areas. Tell me how this protects them? I just do not see that when you are putting thirty (30) neighbors in a neighborhood that only has 15 to 20 total from the railroad tracks to Highway 89. Where's the compatibility of parks? You are putting young families in here. You know they are going to have a bunch of kids. It says that you are going to provide a path to a park. Does Highway 89 provide a pathway to a park? Where is the park? There's just so many problems with this in the fit with the neighborhood. Like we have been here thirty (30) plus years. Most of the people on that road have been here twenty (20) plus years. Where is the compatibility with us? We rely on you as our neighbors, our protectors, to take care of the people that are here. Like it is great to have new people come and maybe some of them will be Harrisville residents that are already here and they have a family and that, but you have provided a ton of this type of density across the street and at a way cheaper price. Now, I get attainable housing, but when you put a number to his price per square foot, is \$400 a square foot attainable? That's some of the highest price real estate per foot that you have in Harrisville right now. When you do it by the square foot by selling the price, I would just ask that you protect us that have been here first and then find a way to bring new people in without destroying what we already have.

Steve Everts said I was born and raised in Ogden City in a low rent district. These houses are crummy looking. They are a lot like the crummy houses in Ogden City. I deliver newspapers for many years. They were crummy sixty (60) and seventy (70) years ago and they are crummy today. This will turn into a slum of Harrisville. We are better than that. We need better things than that and I think it would be a bad thing to do to put that many houses on five (5) acres of ground. That is way too many and we can do better.

Randy Bick said I want to throw my support behind these people that spoke. This is our community. I look at these pictures on the walls. That is not our community. What he is planning and having him sit up here and try to fit this and fit that and move this and squeeze that. That is not Harrisville. He knew how many houses he could put on that lot when they bought that property. One acre per house. That is our code. That is our ordinances. I do not think this is the right place for that. It does not fit our neighborhood at all. As it has been said many times, we cannot show flexibility to this or we are going to turn into all these other cities with these crappy housing developments shoved in there and ruin our community. There are not very many places like Harrisville left. And you are our neighbors and you do belong to our community. There is no place for this. We can do better than this. We can build a nice housing development there with a few homes that fit our community and cramming all these people into this district is not going to help. I know I have said this before. This is our home. You are part of

our home. Do not allow this. If you allow this, we will never stop. Every time a house gets sold, we will go through the same crap again and again. So, please turn this down and get better planning so that we do not have all this around us. This is our home.

Lynnae Dopp said I would appreciate hearing from the Planning Commission if you can tell us how putting this high-density community enhances and improves our surrounding neighborhoods. How will our citizens and city benefit from this anomaly? Please tell us why we should be happy if the city decides to encourage this odd development in our backyards.

MOTION: Commissioner Morales motioned to close the public hearing. Commissioner Palmer seconded the motion.

Angie Francom	Yes
Chad Holbrook	Yes
Isaac Thomas	Yes
Christina Palmer	Yes
Ruben Morales	Yes

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

Sarah Wichern addressed the city has an obligation to hear the applications that come in. We as staff feel it has met the criteria to be heard but there is no obligation, which has been stated several times. This is a legislative decision. There is no obligation to approve this. This ordinance is specifically set for the city to determine where this overlay is appropriate to use. It was set as an overlay zone not a mandatory rezoning for specific areas. For that reason, we entertain all the applications which come into the city. The Planning Commission then decides the appropriateness of the location.

Chair Francom asked Randy Smith to come back to the podium to address more questions. Commissioner Holbrook asked the developer what the square footage of the cottage versus the two-level homes. Randy Smith replied that the cottages are currently designed at 1,200 square feet with three (3) bedrooms, two (2) bathrooms, and vaulted ceilings. The two (2) story units, again with no basements because ground water is shallow, are designed at 1500-1600 square feet with an open to below section. There is an option to close the open to below to add a room which may adjust the square footage.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if they added a garage to the backyard, how much usable space would there be between the garage and the fencing or how much usable space would there be for a family. Randy Smith replied the garage would be an accessory structure and would follow the ordinance for setbacks. The garage would encompass the side with the driveway. It would be in the corner of the property to line up with the side driveway. Commissioner Holbrook clarified his question and asked what the size of the yard would be. Randy Smith replied that the lots vary. Some are deeper than others. The rear setback is twenty (20) feet minimum but the lots with a rear garage are deeper.

Commissioner Holbrook asked were the houses around this development considered with the house designs. Randy Smith said we do not typically model after the older architectural styles. Commissioner Holbrook then asked if these designs were typical boiler plat designs in terms of housing completed on other projects. Randy Smith replied he had never built this before. They designed these products for this project. The garage forward plans are adjustments to products they have built before in multiple places and very similar. It is common among builders to have the farmhouse style. Transitional is a little newer. The Craftsman style is a common architectural style used through a lot of developments. There will be similarities with that, but the product displayed is designed for this project. They have

not built that exact product yet. Randy Smith explained how he was supposed to use production delivery products, but his company seems to design new products for every project. The cottage homes were designed specifically for this project. He recognized he is asking for variances to hit the city's set price point. Generally, developers get their approvals and then sell a home for whatever they want to get their money back. They have never done a price-controlled product. It is high risk, but they are willing to go after it because it is important to us. The people who live in these homes cannot be here tonight to represent themselves to say please approve this. This is a true story about every home project I have completed in other cities. The other true story is it is okay to be angry. No matter where we propose this, we will have the same response. He has this response on every project in every city. He has been doing this for a long time. Change is hard. People will say they support development, just not here. He said he does not envy the Planning Commissioners position. It is a hard position to be in. I present and then it is discretionary. The commission decides what the recommendation is and ultimately the council decides whether or not we get to build it.

Commissioner Palmer asked the cost difference between the cottage homes and the 2-story homes. Randy said they are committed to locking down the cottage homes with the garage at \$498,000. They are contractually obligated to offer at that price, which is 15 of the 30 new homes. The other ones depend on options chosen and sometimes lot premiums are around the \$530,000-\$540,000 range. I am not committing to that. The market will dictate the price for the garage forward homes.

Chair Francom confirmed there is no HOA for this project. She explained the decision for the Planning Commission is to decide if there is enough variability, too much sameness, the right balance, is this a good fit for the community, is this the best location, and the right timing.

Randy Smith said to the variability, he displayed one plan for each house. There will be different color palettes to the homes. They also do not let houses across the street or next to each other be the same, forcing a mix in the community.

Commissioner Morales commented looking at the other side, the owner has acreage which he would like to see some use of, like building a subdivision, and not leave it static. At the same time, to the degree of what is being proposed, and the current residents, eventually maybe in the future.

Randy Smith said as a developer, yes, I can build four (4) one acre lots. New construction on a one (1) acre lot is around \$1.5 million plus. He could do something in between as well, but it will not hit the price point. No rental product. That is the barrier I am facing. They do not build any rental products. They sell all their homes. He just wants to build homes.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if there were any communities being built around here. Randy Smith answered they have a development in Riverdale at the old drive-in theatre that is active. There is an open model there if the commission wants to see their product. The lots are a little bigger there. There are more communities further south. The commission can view all the products offered by Flagship homes on their website. They do have a map with access to Harrisville Park.

Chair Francom reminded the commission and those in the audience that the motion tonight will be passed along to the City Council whether or not the commission recommends adopting or not adopt ordinance 571 and the MDA. Both items will need to be mentioned in whatever motion the commission decides. Sarah Wichern added this is a recommendation to the City Council. There will be another public hearing at the City Council stage no matter the recommendation is coming from this body.

Commissioner Holbrook thanked the developer for his presentation and for sharing with the commission the positive and not so positives of the development. One of the things he has come to

understand more than any other is that we have two (2) Harrisville's. We have a rural and agricultural Harrisville, and we have a more modern less rural Harrisville. He has concluded this is not a good fit for this particular part of Harrisville but would be a great fit in another part of Harrisville.

MOTION: Commissioner Holbrook motion is to not adopt Ordinance 571 and pass along a negative recommendation to the City Council. Commissioner Morales second the motion.

Angie Francom	Yes
Chad Holbrook	Yes
Isaac Thomas	Yes
Christina Palmer	Yes
Ruben Morales	Yes

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS – (3 minute maximum)

Randy Bick said he wanted to say thank you for standing up for Harrisville. I really appreciate it. There were some excellent comments made. The developer gave a good presentation. This is not the right place.

Shawn Douglas said I can only imagine the position you were in tonight. There is pressure from both sides. As a Harrisville resident for thirty (30) plus years, I applaud you for listening to us. I feel you are making the right decision. I know he disagrees with us. Thank you again from the bottom of my heart.

Lynnae Dopp said thank you. Thank you very much. We appreciate you recognizing our objections and our concerns. We have lived in Harrisville for forty-six (46) years. This does not fit. We appreciate you recognizing that. Thank you. Thank you.

Mayor Shuman said I appreciate the work the Planning Commission does. I served for nineteen (19) years on the Planning Commission, so I know the kinds of stresses and problems you run into with all these different opinions. It is important that we follow the general plan. The things we put forth. The work that has gone on years before which some of you have been a part. Those are the things we are looking for the vision of the city and how that all fits together.

Steve Everts said thank you very much for your service. Thank you for listening to us and we appreciate you 100%.

Kirk Nigro said thank you for your consideration. Thank you for the process, even the guidance with any misunderstandings. I really appreciate the process. We appreciate dollars being invested in the community. That spot just did not seem like a good fit.

6. COMMISSION/STAFF FOLLOW-UP

There was no follow-up from the commissioners or the staff.

7. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Palmer motion to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Morales second the motion. Motion passed with all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM.

**Angie Francom
Chair**

**Cynthia Benson
Deputy City Recorder**