

CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING AT 7:00 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2016, AT THE CENTERVILLE CITY COMMUNITY CENTER AND CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 250 NORTH MAIN STREET, CENTERVILLE, UTAH. THE AGENDA IS SHOWN BELOW.

Meetings of the City Council of Centerville City may be conducted via electronic means pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 52-4-207, as amended. In such circumstances, contact will be established and maintained via electronic means and the meeting will be conducted pursuant to the Electronic Meetings Policy established by the City Council for electronic meetings.

Centerville City, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance, including hearing devices. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Blaine Lutz, Centerville Finance Director, at 801-295-3477, giving at least 24 hours notice prior to the meeting.

A notebook containing supporting materials for the business agenda items is available for public inspection and review at City Hall and will be available for review at the meeting. This agenda is also posted on the City's Website: www.centervilleut.net and on NovusAgenda at the following link: <http://centerville.novusagenda.com/agendapublic>

Tentative Time: (The times shown below are tentative and are subject to change during the meeting)

- 7:00 A. **WELCOME AND ROLL CALL**
 B. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
 C. **PRAYER OR THOUGHT – Commissioner Gina Hirst**
 D. **MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE – February 24, 2016**
 E. **COMMISSION BUSINESS**
- 7:10 1. **PARKS & RECREATION AND/OR TRAILS COMMITTEE PRESENTATION OF GOALS/PRIORITIES 2016/2017**
- 7:30 2. **PLANNING COMMISSION GOALS/PRIORITIES 2016/2017**
- 7:45 3. **LAND USE APPLICATION AND DECISION MAKING TRAINING BY CITY ATTORNEY**
 Review of zoning and land use applications and decision making matrix prepared by City Attorney
- 8:00 4. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
 • PC Meeting on March 23, 2016
 Bartile Sheds Amended Site Plan, The Manor @ Lund Lane Rezone & Conceptual Subdivision, Code Text Amendment for Deuel Creek Historic District, SMSC Public Space Plan
- 8:05 F. **ADJOURNMENT**



PRELIMINARY DRAFT

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, February 24, 2016

7:00 p.m.

A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Becki Wright

Cheylynn Hayman

David Hirschi, Chair

Gina Hirst, arrived at 7:20 p.m.

Kevin Daly

Logan Johnson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Scott Kjar

STAFF PRESENT

Corvin Snyder, Community Development Director

Lisa Romney, City Attorney

Kathy Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

VISITORS

Kevin Merrill

Ann Fadel

Robyn Mecham

Robin Carlsbough

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER

Chair Hirschi

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL

The minutes of the City Council & Planning Commission Special Work Session held February 10, 2016 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Hayman made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held February 10, 2016 were reviewed and amended. Commissioner Johnson made a **motion** to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Daly and passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Planning Commission Meeting
February 24, 2016

Page 2

PUBLIC HEARING – CODE TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR THE SOUTH MAIN STREET CORRIDOR (SMSC) OVERLAY ORDINANCE (CHAPTER 12-48) - Consider the code text amendments for the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Overlay Ordinance, which include Council directives and changes to the South Main Street Corridor (SMSC) Public Space Plan, and Maximum Unit Allowances and Density Caps for the South Main Street Corridor (if deemed necessary).

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, reported the City Council recently discussed the South Main Street Corridor Plan (SMSC) with regard to the public space plan and density as recommended by the Planning Commission. City Council members raised issue, specifically liability, with the public space plan elements and made a motion to remove all benches, planters, and drought tolerant grasses. In addition, it was moved that the light pole position be changed. This motion redirected these items back to the Planning Commission for further consideration. Mr. Snyder said he included the City Council minutes regarding this matter for the Commission's review and understanding. He explained the City Council did not specifically move for a change in the density at this time and did not specifically ask the Commission to review density. However, staff did publically notice amendments to the SMSC plan as a whole, so any items the Planning Commission discusses is acceptable and appropriate. Mr. Snyder said the City Council plans to discuss density in more detail at a future date. Mr. Snyder said the Commission is not expected to make any decisions tonight. The Commission may choose to look at additional information, re-discuss items as needed, or stay with their original recommendation.

Lisa Romney, City Attorney, said she was asked by some of the City Council members to specifically point out their concerns with liability related to the public space plan, which is why the removal of these public space elements has been suggested. She referred to the City Council minutes from January 21, 2016. She also explained the noticing decision for these amendments. She said the City Council did not remand the density decision back to the Commission for review at this time but staff did notice the entire SMSC plan for tonight's discussion. She said this is a matter of general policy and practice so the acting body can discuss any issues as needed. Often times as one item is discussed another issue may arise or conflicts within the ordinance are discovered and this noticing practice allows for those discussions to take place.

Chair Hirschi said the Planning Commission spent a great deal of time wrestling with these issues and ultimately arrived at a comfortable decision which was recommended to the City Council. He said there may be some items that warrant additional discussion because there were some unknowns, i.e., UDOT requirements, possibility of additional property acquisition, possible speed limit adjustments, etc. Chair Hirschi said it seems as though the City Council may have

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Planning Commission Meeting
February 24, 2016

Page 3

1 had some additional information from what the Planning Commission reviewed. He asked if any
2 new information has been presented since the Planning Commission's review. He asked if any
3 empirical evidence regarding liability was presented. He said the Planning Commission should
4 be provided with the same level of information prior to any additional recommendations. Chair
5 Hirschi said reducing the speed limit on Main Street may help limit liability. This is information
6 that should be reviewed. If a lower speed were allowed perhaps a greater public space is
7 possible. He said there may be some modifications that would allow flexibility with the public
8 space elements.

9
10 Mr. Snyder said a landscape architect was hired to graphically create the public space
11 elements. This rendering with graphic details was not available when the Planning Commission
12 reviewed this matter, but was present for City Council consideration. Some City Council
13 members saw a liability with these elements that they were not comfortable with. He said there
14 was no empirical data presented regarding liability. Mr. Snyder said the City Council did have a
15 bit more clarification regarding UDOT standards and expectations. UDOT prefers break-away
16 elements and looks at liability from the standpoint of the roadway; any element that a vehicle
17 could collide with is considered a liability for UDOT.

18
19 Commissioner Wright said she is struggling to see the liability with some of these
20 elements. She said there are many light poles already located within the city that are not break-
21 away. She would like to see all information and reports prior to any further decisions so that an
22 informed recommendation can be made. Perhaps the Commission needs to provide more
23 evidence as to why these elements are appropriate and not a liability. She said she would like to
24 look at data with regard to reducing the speed limit, perhaps the Police Chief is willing to
25 provide some information. She would like to review the history of the SMSC plan and
26 understand how it has evolved. Commissioner Wright also suggest the Planning Commission not
27 discuss density at this time as the City Council has not sent a specific directive to do so.

28
29 Commissioner Hayman questioned the realistic risks of these public space elements. She
30 would like to see information from other cities with similar public spaces to understand what
31 level of liability is represented. She said removing these elements will significantly change the
32 vision for Main Street. She also mentioned the height of the planter boxes and vegetation could
33 easily be adjust to increase visibility.

34
35 Commissioner Hirst said generally public space elements are traffic calming and are safer
36 for pedestrians as they create more space and a barrier from traffic. She too would like more
37 information regarding true liability.

38

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Planning Commission Meeting
February 24, 2016

Page 4

1 Ms. Romney said she is willing to provide a legal description and explanation of liability.
2 She said property ownership is not the only factor in liability.

3
4 Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing.
5

6 Robyn Mecham said the original zoning for Main Street mirrored that of the city's
7 gateway, Parrish Lane. She said Main Street is not Centerville's gateway but rather the middle of
8 town. The original idea for Main Street was walkability with small shops. She said this idea is no
9 longer feasible but rather Main Street is more likely a soft commercial area. She said potential
10 parking at the rear of these commercial buildings also hinders walkability. She said given the
11 lack of walkability on Main Street no pedestrian will be looking to sit down on a bench. She said
12 the area being discussed is not even the entirety of Main Street but rather only a few blocks. She
13 questioned how many amenities really need to be included in this limited area. She said these
14 few blocks are the thoroughfare for the Junior High School. She is concerned a student who
15 skateboards or bikes this area, and falls in this public space, causing injury, is a liability for the
16 City. She agreed that information from the Police Chief regarding public amenities would be
17 helpful. She also suggested the Commission consider the maintenance costs for these amenities.
18 She suggested the Commission speak with the Public Works Director regarding installation
19 costs, maintenance costs and employee time required for such elements. She said planter boxes
20 with tall grasses are a potential visual hazard. She said a small child walking this area could be
21 obscured from a drivers view and that child could easily walk into traffic unseen. She said she is
22 on the Transportation Committee and it is not likely that UDOT will lower the speed limit on
23 Main Street especially for only a few blocks. The remainder of Main Street northward would not
24 be pleased with a reduced speed limit. She also mentioned density should be limited stating that
25 Main Street should not be turned into an apartment row.

26
27 Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing.
28

29 Commission members discussed several items of information, data, and clarification they
30 would like to review before making any further decisions. These items included the following:
31

- 32 • Legal analysis of liability including risk vs. benefit.
- 33 • Information from other cities with similar public space elements and their experience
- 34 with such elements including installation and maintenance costs.
- 35 • Presentation and/or a report from the Landscape Architect who completed a graphic
- 36 rendering of Main Street with the public space corridor and elements as provided to
- 37 the City Council.
- 38 • Timeline and/or report of the history of the Planning Commission's discussions and
- 39 recommendations to the City Council regarding the SMSC Plan.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Planning Commission Meeting
February 24, 2016

Page 5

- Planter box options including box height and alternate vegetation options.
- Review and/or report regarding public safety issues and traffic calming techniques, including a perspective from the Police Chief.
- Criteria and/or the process required with UDOT for requesting a speed limit modification.
- Information and/or a report from the Trails Committee regarding urban pathways for this area.
- Information and/or a report from the Police Chief regarding types of accidents and tickets along Main Street.
- Information and/or a report from UDOT regarding speed data and violations for Main Street.

Chair Hirschi made a **motion** to table this matter including the public hearing until the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for March 23, 2016. In addition, Chair Hirschi moved to direct staff to provide the information as listed in the bullet points above. Staff will work with Chair Hirschi to determine which items may be ready for discussion on March 23, 2016. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hayman and passed by unanimous vote (6-0).

DISCUSSION – Continuation of discussion regarding 2016/2017 Planning Commission Goals and Priorities

Chair Hirschi explained the Planning Commission has been invited to a work session with the City Council to discuss goals and priorities on March 23, 2016. The Planning Commission's goals and priorities should be submitted to the City Manager by March 15, 2016. Chair Hirschi reviewed the list of goals discussed at the last Planning Commission meeting (February 10, 2016) and asked the Commissioners to respond with their top priority as well as any other goals that have not yet been added to the list.

Commissioner Wright she would like to add park development to the list. She recently served on the Parks and Recreation Committee and she discussed the recent approval of the RAP tax which allocates money for parks. She suggested meeting with the Parks and Recreation Committee to get their opinion on future parks and park upgrades. She said her top priority would be to delegate the approval of simple applications to staff in order to free up more time for the Planning Commission to proactively plan.

Chair Hirschi agreed a review of administrative decisions is the top priority. He said if this is done first, then prioritizing the other items may not be as necessary because the Commission will have more time to plan and work on each item.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

Planning Commission Meeting
February 24, 2016

Page 6

1 Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, discussed the Routine and Uncontested
2 policy of the City. He explained this policy currently has no applications listed within the policy.
3 He said the Commission would need to review all administrative decisions and decide which
4 applications they feel may be appropriately added to this policy then make a recommendation for
5 City Council approval.
6

7 Lisa Romney, City Attorney, offered to put a chart together of all administrative
8 decisions with each step of the approval process for each application. She will also include which
9 public hearings are required and which are a courtesy. This may help the Commission in their
10 discussion and recommendation. The Planning Commission agreed this would be helpful and
11 also agreed this is the top priority.
12

13 Chair Hirschi asked the Commission to further review the list of goals and come to the
14 next Planning Commission meeting ready to discuss additional prioritization.
15

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

17

- 18 1. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be Wednesday,
19 March 9, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.
20 2. Upcoming Agenda Items:
21 • 2016-2017 Goals/Priorities
22 • Parks & Recreation Committee and/or Trails Committee presentation of their
23 Goals/Priorities
24 • Planning Commission Training including Administrative Decision Review
25
26

27 The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.
28
29

30
31 _____
32 David Hirschi, Chair
33
34

Date Approved

35 _____
Kathleen Streadbeck, Recording Secretary

**CENTERVILLE CITY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
655 North 1250 West, Centerville, Utah 84014
(801) 292-8232**

PLANNING STAFF MEMORANDUM

DATE: FEBRUARY 24, 2016
TO: CENTERVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: CORY SNYDER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
MEMO: 2016/17 PLANNING COMMISSION GOALS DISCUSSION

BACKGROUND

As previously done each year, the Planning Commission develops a prioritized list of planning goals or issues for City Council consideration. This prioritized list is completed and forwarded to the City Council by March of every year. The City Council has tentatively scheduled a joint work session with the Commission on March 23, 2016, prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission Meeting. The City Council would like to host the work session that evening and then allow the Commission to be excused to conduct the scheduled Commission meeting, while the Council continues to address other City matters and goals.

PLANNING COMMISSION GOALS – *Preliminary Draft from 02/10/2016*

- **South Main Street Corridor Plan, including Pages Lane Area** – With the understanding that the City Council is discussing further SMSC Zoning edits, the Commission also desires to take a closer look at the Pages Lane Commercial Area to encourage appropriate re-use planning for the area.
- **West Centerville Neighborhood Area** – The Commission believes that with the closure of the Masco facility and the operational changes for the Trinity facility, there remains opportunities to guide future development and re-development within this neighborhood.
- **City Trails and Pathway Element** – With the completion of the pedestrian pathway of the I-15 overpass, recent development of the Legacy Trail and DNR&G rails to trails, the Commission believes that taking a macro look at City Pathways and Trails is warranted.
- **Foothills Plan Elaboration** – The Commission believes that there should be a greater focus on the recreational expectations and opportunities of the Foothills Area.
- **Greater Proactive Planning by the Planning Commission** - Review administrative decisions and procedures, including elimination of public hearing for conditional use permits and staff approval for some administrative decisions.
- **Subdivision Ordinance Updates and Recodification** – Continuation of this previous goal to bring the Ordinance up-to-date and improve compliance with recent state statutes.

CENTERVILLE CITY DECISION MAKING MATRIX FOR ZONING AND LAND USE APPLICATIONS
LEGISLATIVE DECISIONS – CITY COUNCIL
MARCH 1, 2016 – PAGE 1 of 5

Application Type	Type of Decision Legislative, Administrative Quasi-Judicial	Final Decision Authority Zoning Admin Planning Com City Council	Planning Commission Public Hearing	Planning Commission Decision	City Council Public Hearing	City Council Decision	Zoning Administrator Decision	Board of Adjustment Decision	Appeal Authority
General Plan Enactment or Amendment 12-21-070	Legislative	City Council	Yes (Statutory)	PC Recommendation (Statutory)	Yes (Ordinance)	CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court
Zoning Ordinance Text Enactment or Amendment 12-21-080	Legislative	City Council	Yes (Statutory)	PC Recommendation (Statutory)	Yes (Ordinance)	CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court
Zoning Map Enactment or Amendment 12-21-080	Legislative	City Council	Yes (Statutory)	PC Recommendation (Statutory)	Yes (Ordinance)	CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court
Subdivision Ordinance Enactment or Amendment 15-1-114	Legislative	City Council	Yes (Statutory)	PC Recommendation (Statutory)	Yes (Ordinance)	CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court
Temporary Zoning Regulation 12-21-210	Legislative	City Council				CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court
Planned Development Overlay / Rezone 12-41-010	Legislative	City Council	Yes (Statutory)	PC Recommendation (Statutory)	Yes (Ordinance)	CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court

CENTERVILLE CITY DECISION MAKING MATRIX FOR ZONING AND LAND USE APPLICATIONS
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS – PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 1, 2016 – PAGE 2 of 5

Application Type	Type of Decision Legislative, Administrative Quasi-Judicial	Final Decision Authority Zoning Admin Planning Comm City Council	Planning Commission Public Hearing	Planning Commission Decision	City Council Public Hearing	City Council Decision	Zoning Administrator Decision	Board of Adjustment Decision	Appeal Authority
Concept Site Plan 12-21-110	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Acceptance					
Final Site Plan 12-21-110	Administrative	Planning Commission		PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Site Plan Amendment - Staff 12-21-110	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Conceptual Site Plan Amendment – Planning Commission 12-21-110	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Final Site Plan Amendment – Planning Commission 12-21-110	Administrative	Planning Commission		PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Conditional Use 12-21-100	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Special Exception 12-21-120	Administrative	Planning Commission		PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Landscaping Waiver 12-51-050	Administrative	Planning Commission		PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Parking Modification 12-52-110	Administrative	Planning Commission		PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment

CENTERVILLE CITY DECISION MAKING MATRIX FOR ZONING AND LAND USE APPLICATIONS
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS – PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 1, 2016 – PAGE 3 of 5

Application Type	Type of Decision Legislative, Administrative Quasi-Judicial	Final Decision Authority Zoning Admin Planning Comm City Council	Planning Commission Public Hearing	Planning Commission Decision	City Council Public Hearing	City Council Decision	Zoning Administrator Decision	Board of Adjustment Decision	Appeal Authority
Home Occupation – Permitted 12-62-040	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Home Occupation – Conditional Use 12-62-060	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Public Utility Substation – Permitted 12-64-040	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Public Utility Substation – Conditional Use 12-64-060	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Residential Facilities for Elderly or Disabled 12-65-040	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Sexually Oriented Business – Conditional Use 12-66-040	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Wireless Telecomm Facility – Permitted 12-67-050	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Wireless Telecomm Facility – Conditional Use 12-67-050	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment

CENTERVILLE CITY DECISION MAKING MATRIX FOR ZONING AND LAND USE APPLICATIONS
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS – SUBDIVISIONS
MARCH 1, 2016 – PAGE 4 of 5

Application Type	Type of Decision Legislative, Administrative Quasi-Judicial	Final Decision Authority Zoning Admin Planning Comm City Council	Planning Commission Public Hearing	Planning Commission Decision	City Council Public Hearing	City Council Decision	Zoning Administrator Decision	Board of Adjustment Decision	Appeal Authority
Conceptual Subdivision Plat 15-2-101	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Acceptance					
Preliminary Subdivision Plat 15-3-101	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					City Council
Final Subdivision Plat 15-4-101	Administrative	City Council		PC Recommendation	Yes (Ordinance)	CC Final Decision			District Court
Subdivision Plat Amendment 15-9-101	Administrative	City Council			Yes (Ordinance) (Statutory)*	CC Final Decision			District Court
Subdivision Plat Amendment – Street Vacation	Administrative	City Council			Yes (Statutory)	CC Final Decision (Statutory)			District Court
Small Subdivision Waiver/Lot Split 15-2-107	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Small Subdivision Waiver/Flag Lot 15-5-102	Administrative	Planning Commission	Yes (Ordinance)	PC Final Decision					Board of Adjustment
Boundary Line Adjustment / Exchange of Title 15-9-110	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment

CENTERVILLE CITY DECISION MAKING MATRIX FOR ZONING AND LAND USE APPLICATIONS
ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS – ZONING ADMINISTRATOR AND BOA
MARCH 1, 2016 – PAGE 5 of 5

Application Type	Type of Decision Legislative, Administrative Quasi-Judicial	Final Decision Authority Zoning Admin Planning Com City Council	Planning Commission Public Hearing	Planning Commission Decision	City Council Public Hearing	City Council Decision	Zoning Administrator Decision	Board of Adjustment Decision	Appeal Authority
Permitted Use 12-21-090	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Sign Permit 12-21-160	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Temporary Use Permit 12-21-170	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Building Permit -- Zoning Compliance 12-21-140	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Routine and Uncontested Matters 12-21-180	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Planning Commission
Administrative Interpretation 12-21-190	Administrative	Zoning Administrator					Zoning Administrator Final Decision		Board of Adjustment
Variance 12-21-130	Administrative	Board of Adjustment						Board of Adjustment	District Court
Nonconforming Use or Structure 12-21-150	Administrative	Board of Adjustment						Board of Adjustment	District Court
Appeals 12-21-200	Quasi-Judicial	Board of Adjustment						Board of Adjustment	District Court