

Midway City Planning Commission Regular Meeting August 17, 2016

Notice is hereby given that the Midway City Planning Commission will hold their regular meeting at 5:00 p.m., August 17, 2016, at the Midway City Community Center
160 West Main Street, Midway, Utah

Attendance:

Mickey Oksner – Chairman
Stu Waldrip
Bill Ream
Natalie Streeter
Nancy O’Toole
Jim Kohler

Staff:

Michael Henke – City Planner
Lindy Rodabough – Amin Assistant
Wes Johnson - City Engineer

Excused

Steve Nichols – Co-Chairman
John Rather

6:50 P.M. Work/Briefing Meeting

- City Council Liaison Report, no action will be taken and the public is welcome to attend.

7:00 P.M. Regular Meeting

Call to Order

- Welcome and Introductions; Opening Remarks or Invocation; Pledge of Allegiance
Opening Remarks or Invocation.
 - ❖ Invocation was given by Commissioner Waldrip
 - ❖ Chairman Oksner led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Regular Business

ITEM: 1

Review and possibly approve the Planning Commission Minutes of July 20, 2016

Motion: Commissioner O’Toole: I move that we accept the minutes as they are.

Seconded: Commissioner Streeter

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O’Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

ITEM: 2

Midway City is considering a Code Text Amendment of Section 16.5: Commercial C-2 and C-3 zones. The Planning Commission will consider all permitted and conditional uses in the C-2 and C-3 zones and could possibly remove and add some uses. Furthermore, other regulations, such as setbacks, will be reviewed and may be amended.

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of this item is to review the permitted and conditional uses in the C-2 and C-3 zones along with the regulations included in this section such as setbacks. The City Council has directed staff and the Planning Commission to review the uses and to make a recommendation regarding if the listed uses comply with the vision of the City’s General Plan. This discussion was initiated because of some of the issues that have arisen because of development in the commercial zones.

The chart on the following page has uses that are highlighted in red. The red highlighted uses, based on the last discussion with the Planning Commission, will be removed from the code. Text in yellow are potential additions to the code. On page four there is another chart that is specific to the proposed Tourism Overlay District.

USES	C-2	C-3
Retail, grocery, and service stores (up to 25,000 sq. ft.) Tobacco sales and e-cigarettes (no more than 5% of total retail)	P	P
Professional offices and clinics	P	P
Auto detailing, gas stations and car washes	C	N
Alcohol dispensing establishments	C	C
Residential Facilities for Elderly Persons	C	C
Rest Homes/Nursing/Convalescent Facilities	C	C
Day Care (*as a component of another permitted or conditional use in the C-3 zone)	C	C*
Photo, art, and craft galleries, retail show rooms	P	P
Engraving, publishing, and printing	P	P
Fraternity buildings, clubs, and lodges	C	C
Mortuaries and wedding chapels	P	C
New and used vehicle sales	C	N
Hospitals	P	P
Hotels/motels, bed and breakfast establishments	C	P
Cafes and restaurants	P	P
Public and quasi-public buildings (police/fire stations)	P	P
Recreational activity businesses	P	C

RV, ATV, motorcycle, side by side UTV, OHV sales	C	N
Barber, beauty shops, massage therapy and day spas)	P	P
Vehicle parking	P	P
Repair shops (other than auto)	C	C
Veterinarian and pet grooming services	C	C
Walk-in theaters and outdoor theaters	C	C
R-1-7 Residential	P	P
Mixed Use (20% minimum commercial, up to 20 residential units per acre)	C	C
Commercial PUDs and commercial condominium projects	C	C
Private academies/studios (education, art, dance, sports, etc.)	C	C
Carpentry and woodworking shops (no outside storage)	C	C
Electrician shops (no outside storage)	C	C
Plumbing shops (no outside storage)	C	C

Section 16.5.2 Site Development Standards

Site Development Standards

A. Minimum lot area: none

B. Minimum building setback from property line for all commercial structures:

1. Front. 10' minimum and 30' maximum from the property line; however, an accessory or secondary building may be allowed by the City Council to be set back further provided all provision of this Title are met.
2. Side. None
3. Rear. None
4. Fuel pumps. 20 feet from any street
5. Setback from residential zones or existing residential uses. 15 feet
6. The City Council, upon an applicant's request, may approve a setback different than listed in this section based on specific circumstances of the site and building orientation or specific use of a proposal.

C. Building Heights

1. Minimum: 8 feet (see Section 16.13.110)
2. Maximum: 35 feet (see Section 16.13.100)

D. All building sizes and setbacks are also subject to the requirements of the building code adopted by the City Council. Building heights shall be subject to this Title.

E. All parking shall be located at the side or rear of the main building on each commercial zoning lot. The City Council, upon an applicant's request, may approve a parking plan different

than listed in this section based on specific circumstances of the site and building orientation or specific use of a proposal.

F. Each new construction commercial building must have a door facing Main Street if the lot fronts Main Street.

G. Notwithstanding any other provision contained herein, structures and setbacks must comply with Section 16.13.15: Clear View Triangle of Intersecting Streets.

H. A landscaping plan is required for all permitted and conditional uses in the commercial zones. The plan will be reviewed by the Visual and Architectural Committee during the approval process and must meet the requirements found in Section 16.13.22.

TOURISM OVERLAY DISTRICT:

Below is the list of uses for the newly proposed Tourism Overlay District. The purpose of this district is to create a community gathering area that is focused on tourism and retail. This district will be walkable and is envisioned to have central plazas with surrounding commercial and arts related businesses and activities on the street level and residential on the upper floor. The Tourism Overlay District would cover the area found on the map on the following page. The uses found on this chart are all uses already found in the C-2 zone.

USES	C-2	C-3
Retail, grocery, and service stores (up to 15,000 sq. ft.) Tobacco sales and e-cigarettes (no more than 5% of total retail)	P	P
Professional offices and clinics	P	P
Alcohol dispensing establishments	C	C
Day Care (*as a component of another permitted or conditional use in the C-3 zone)	C	C*
Photo, art, and craft galleries, retail show rooms	P	P
Hotels/motels, bed and breakfast establishments	C	P
Cafes and restaurants	P	P
Public and quasi-public buildings (police/fire stations)	P	P
Recreational activity businesses	P	C
Barber, beauty shops, massage therapy and day spas)	P	P
Vehicle parking	P	P
Walk-in theaters and outdoor theaters	C	C

Mixed Use (50% minimum commercial, up to 20 residential units per acre, above or below commercial)	C	C
Commercial PUDs and commercial condominium projects	C	C
Private academies/studios (education, art, dance, sports, etc.)	C	C

Commissioners discussion and motions

*To or not to separate veterinarian and pet grooming services

Motion: Commissioner Waldrip: I move that we leave veterinarian and pet grooming services just the way it is.

Seconded: Commissioner O’Toole

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any further discussion

There was none

Ayes: Ream, Streeter, Waldrip, and O’Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

*RV, ATV, motorcycle, side by side UTV, OHV sales

Motion: Commissioner Ream: I move that we take out RV from that line and add in rentals at the end.

Seconded: Commissioner Streeter

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any further discussion

There was none

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O’Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

*Section 16.5.2 Site Development Standards

Motion: Commissioner Waldrip: Mr. Chairman I move to leave it the way it is.

Seconded: Commissioner O’Toole

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any further discussion

Commissioner Waldrip: The reason is because it gives the City Council the flexibility that I think is needed in the transition. As the commercial uses in the commercial zone become predominate, there is unavoidably a friction between the historic residential uses and the newer commercial uses. I think rather than drawing bright lines in the code, that it is a better idea to have elected officials deal with that friction on a case by case basis and make what we hope will be intelligent decisions that balance the needs of commercial developers versus the existing residential uses. It’s a tough problem in any community and it will continue to be a tough problem in our community - and if we try to draw bright lines it makes it more difficult for both sides.

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

*Hotel/motels, bed and breakfast establishments

Motion: Commissioner Waldrip: I move that we replace in that category hotels, motels and bed and breakfast establishments with short term lodging facilities.

Seconded: Commissioner O'Toole

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any further discussion

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

*Photo, art, and craft galleries, retail show rooms

Motion: Commissioner Ream: recreational activity and arts related businesses

Seconded: Commissioner Waldrip

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

Motion: Commissioner Streeter: I move that we accept the permitted and conditional uses in the C-2 and C-3 zones as presented by staff and amended by the Planning Commission with the additional amendment of removing fraternity buildings, clubs and lodges and R-1-7 residential from the commercial zones. All other previously suggested and approved amendments shall be included in this motion including the tourism overlay district.

Planner Henke: For clarification we've looked at a couple of different maps here and we haven't discussed those, there are three maps. The area to the north isn't in the City, but once it is annexed in it falls under the overlay district and then this area would need to be rezoned as C-2.

Commissioners all agreed to choose that map that included the most ground, option 3.

Motion: Commissioner Ream: I make a motion to approve the tourism overlay zone that is the most extensive one. I'm accepting and including Commissioner Streeter's motion with my motion.

Chairman Oksner: To that motion I would add "including any future annexation."

Seconded: Commissioner O'Toole

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any further discussion: There was none

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

ITEM: 3

Gardner and Associates, agent for SN Midway LLC, is requesting Preliminary approval for the Indian Summer Subdivision. The proposal is a large scale subdivision that is 12.91 acres in size and will contain 27 lots. The property is located at 300 East and 200 River

Road in the R-1-9 and R-1-15 zones.

BACKGROUND:

This request is for preliminary approval of a large-scale subdivision on 12.91 acres and will contain 27 lots. The 27 lots proposed in the subdivision will obtain frontage along new roads built within the subdivision. The property is located in an R-1-9 and R-1-15 zones. There are four lots in the R-1-9 zoning district and three of those lots are smaller than the other lots in the subdivision but do comply with the requirements of the code. Besides the three smaller lots, the rest of the lots all comply with the R-1-15 zoning requirements. The code requires 15% open space and the proposal currently has 14.8% open space at 1.88 acres (this will need to be adjusted to 15% for final approval). The density of lots in the proposal is 2.13 units per acre. There is currently one dwelling on the property that will be demolished because the structure is nonconforming regarding its setback from River Road. The area where the dwelling is located will become open space within the development. The City code promotes that open space is located along collector roads wherever possible and the applicant has complied with this request. The property has historically been used mostly as agricultural land except for the one dwelling unit on the property.

LAND USE SUMMARY:

- 12.91-acre parcel
- R-1-9 and R-1-15 zoning
- Proposal contains 27 lots
- Developer is providing 1.88 acres of open space (14.8%) This will need to be 15% for final approval.
- Access from River Road and 300 East
- The lots will connect to the Midway Sanitation District sewer, Midway City's culinary water line, and Midway Irrigation Company's secondary water line

ANALYSIS:

Access – Access will be from River Road and 300 East. The City currently owns a 50' strip of land where 300 East will be located. This strip of land beings at the intersection of 100 North and runs north to the current Clegg property which is part of the development parcel. The developer's engineer and title company have researched the location of the strip of land and have found that it overlaps by 15' onto the Norm George Flag Lot Subdivision. The strip of land was deeded to the City after the original plat was recorded and after the 1st

amendment but before the 2nd amendment was recorded. The City has always planned on 300 East becoming a City road and for that reason pursued acquiring the property. 300 East has been planned since at least 1977 and was also shown on the original plat of Midway from the late 1800s.

Traffic Study – The Traffic Impact Study was prepared by ADH Investments LL (see attached).

Geotechnical Study – The Geotechnical Study was prepared by CMT Engineering Laboratories (see attached).

Water Connection – The lots will connect to water lines that will be built by the developer and connect to the City's water lines along River Road.

Sewer Connection – The lot will connect to Midway Sanitations District's sewer lines located in the area.

Secondary Water Connection – The lots will connect to Midway Irrigation Company's secondary which is already servicing the property. Laterals will be created for all 27 lots. Secondary water meters are required for each lateral.

Trails – The developer has agreed to construct a public trail from 100 North along 300 East northward along the western boundary of the subdivision. This part of the linear park trail the City is pursuing that will eventually connect to Valais Park on Burgi Lane. The developer will also build a public along River Road and some private trails within the subdivision.

Open Space – The Land Use Code requires a minimum of 15% open space for the development and the proposal currently has 14.8% open space at 1.88 acres (this will need to be adjusted to 15% for final approval).

WATER BOARD RECCOMDATION:

The Water Board has recommended that 33.8-acre feet are tendered to the City before the recording of the plat. The 27 lots require 1.3-acre feet each for a total of 35.1 acre feet. The one historic connection for the dwelling that will be demolished will allow for a 1.3-acre foot reduction for a total of 33.8-acre feet. The Water Board also recommended secondary water meters are installed on each lot.

POSSIBLE FINDING:

- The proposal does meet the intent of the General Plan for the R-1-9 and R-1-15 zoning districts

- The proposal does comply with the land use requirements of the R-1-9 and R-1-15 zoning districts
- The trails crossing the property will benefit the community by constructing part of the linear park trail and part of the River Road trail. Which will help with pedestrian safety for members of the community.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

1. Recommendation for Approval (conditional). This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that conditions placed on the approval can resolve any outstanding issues.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Place condition(s)
2. Continuance. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that there are unresolved issues.

Accept staff report

 - a. List accepted findings
 - b. Reasons for continuance
 - i. Unresolved issues that must be addressed
 - c. Date when the item will be heard again
3. Recommendation for Denial. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that the request does not meet the intent of the ordinance.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Reasons for denial

POSSIBLE CONDITIONS:

None recommended.

Discussion topics

- Some commissioners do not like the traffic study, doesn't think that it is very accurate
- Poor visibility
- This traffic study is based off of today's situation not things to come in the future
- Traffic study shows that there are 10 trips per day from each home
- Center turn lane-is not required according to this traffic study
- Discussed the traffic study, turn lane and acceleration and deceleration lane
- Construction traffic be required to use 300 E
- River Road justifies to do another traffic study that is longer to include more days and a weekend

- Possible spring on this property
- Did several test pits and none showed water

Member of the public:

- Scott Loertscher: Swamp land north of Indian Summer Subdivision

Developer

- Dave Gardner: Some will have basements some will not and we will be doing a geological test on the north lots numbers 105-110.

Planner Henke: Regarding the basements we'll have a note on the plat stating specifically on lot numbers 105-110, basements are prohibited unless there is a geological test done on that specific lot.

Motion: Commissioner Waldrip: I move that we recommend preliminary approval of the Indian Summer Subdivision located roughly at 300 East and 200 River Road. We accept the staff report and find that the proposal meets the intent of the General Plan for the R-1-9 and R-1-15 zoning districts as applicable to the subdivision; that the proposal does comply with the land use requirements for the R-1-9 and R-1-15 zoning districts; that the trails crossing the property will benefit the community by constructing part of the linear park trail system for the River Road trail and the associated park, which will help with the pedestrian safety for members of the community; and that we impose two conditions: One, that lots 105-110 not contain basements unless a geotechnical study has been submitted with the request for a building permit and it be evaluated in connection with the issuance of that permit, and two, that an additional traffic count be done for a minimum period of seven (7) days and those results be submitted to the traffic engineer with a request that the traffic engineers report be updated taking into account those figures generated by the supplemental traffic study. Also that we add a requirement that the construction entry for the project be on the new 300 East that will be constructed in connection with this project and that the geotechnical report must include a hydrology study of the lot as a part of the geotechnical report.

Seconded: Commissioner Ream

Chairman Oksner asked if there was any further discussion – There was none

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter, Kohler and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

ITEM: 4

Berg Engineering, agent for Sweet Mango Lane LLC, is requesting Preliminary/Final approval of the Midway Meadows Subdivision. The proposal is a small scale subdivision that is 11.16 acres in size and will contain five lots. The property is located at 1600 North Dutch Canyon Road and is in the RA-1-43 zone.

BACKGROUND:

This request is for preliminary/final approval of a small-scale subdivision on 11.16 acres and will contain five lots. The five lots proposed in the subdivision will obtain frontage along Dutch

Canyon Road and Dutch Trail Road which is currently under construction. The property is located in an RA-1-43 zoning district which requires at least an acre for each lot less than the percent of open space which in this case is 20%. The lots all comply with this requirement and are 0.8, 0.82, 0.89, 0.96, and 6.01-acres in size. The property has no structures and has been used as agricultural land.

The property of for this proposed development was annexed into the City in 2006. The annexation was called the Dutch Hollow Annexation. With the annexation of the property the petitioner and City entered into an agreement regarding City obligations and developer obligations regarding the property. The agreement runs with the land so any owner that wishes to develop the property is required to comply with the requirements of the agreement. Some of the obligations are the following:

- Build a City standard road from the northwest corner of the development through to Dutch Canyon Road that will allow for access from neighboring properties.
- Improve Dutch Canyon Road to City standards from development parcel to the River Road.
- Build a public trail across the property to match the City's Trail Map.
- Build a public trail connection to the State Park.
- Build a public trail along Dutch Canyon Road.
- Pay a park annexation fee of \$6,379 (paid in 2006)
- Build a development of no more than 16 units

One of the above requirements has been finalized, some are in the process of construction because of the Dutch Canyon Subdivision to the west, and the rest are requirements of this proposal.

LAND USE SUMMARY:

- 11.16-acre parcel
- RA-1-43 zoning
- Proposal contains five lots
- Developer is providing 2.23 acres of open space (20%)
- Frontage along Dutch Canyon Road and Dutch Trail Road
- The lots will connect to the Midway Sanitation District sewer, Midway City's culinary water line, and Midway Irrigation Company's secondary water line

ANALYSIS:

Access – Access will be from Dutch Canyon Road and Dutch Trail Road which are both public roads

Water Connection – The lots will connect to water lines currently under construction in the Dutch Canyon subdivision.

Sewer Connection – The lot will connect to Midway Sanitations District's sewer lines currently under construction in the Dutch Canyon subdivision.

Secondary Water Connection – The lots will connect to Midway Irrigation Company's secondary which is already servicing the property. Laterals will be created for all five lots. Secondary water meters are required for each lateral.

Trails – There are two public trails on the City's Master Trail Plan that cross the property. One is required along Dutch Trail Road and is being constructed by Watts Development. The second is a trail along Dutch Canyon Road and will be constructed as part of this proposal. The trail will be an 8' wide paved trail and will connect to the Dutch Fields portion of the same trail.

Animal Rights – All five lots will have animal rights based on the standards of the RA-1-43 zone.

Open Space – The Land Use Code requires a minimum of 15% open space for the development. The developer is providing 20% which will be designated within the boundaries of lot 5. This open space will need to remain free of any structures. Because the developer is providing 20% open space the size of the lots and the frontage requirement are allowed to reduce proportionally in size.

WATER BOARD RECCOMDATION:

The Water Board has recommended that 29 acre feet are tendered to the City before the recording of the plat. Lots 1-4 require 11.2 acre feet (2.8 acre feet each) and lot 5 requires 17.8 acre feet (2.8 for the dwelling and the one acre on which its located + 15 which is 3 acre feet for each agricultural acre). The Water Board also recommended secondary water meters are installed on each lot.

POSSIBLE FINDING:

- The proposal does meet the intent of the General Plan for the RA-1-43 zoning district
- The proposal does comply with the land use requirements of the RA-1-43 zoning district

- The two trails crossing the property will increase accessibility to the State Park for area residents and will help complete the City's trail plan for the area

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS:

4. Recommendation for Approval (conditional). This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that conditions placed on the approval can resolve any outstanding issues.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Place condition(s)
5. Continuance. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that there are unresolved issues.

Accept staff report

 - a. List accepted findings
 - b. Reasons for continuance
 - i. Unresolved issues that must be addressed
 - c. Date when the item will be heard again
6. Recommendation for Denial. This action can be taken if the Planning Commission feels that the request does not meet the intent of the ordinance.
 - a. Accept staff report
 - b. List accepted findings
 - c. Reasons for denial

POSSIBLE CONDITIONS:

None recommended.

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any questions from the commissioners

Commissioner Ream: Will Dutch Canyon Road have to be closed during construction?

Wes Johnson: Only during paving.

Motion: Commissioner Streeter: I move that we recommend approval for the preliminary and final approval of The Meadows at Dutch Canyon Subdivision. The proposal is a small scale subdivision 11.16 acres in size and there will be five (5) lots. There will be no conditions on the approval and we will accept all findings by staff.

Seconded: Commissioner O'Toole

Chairman Oksner asked if there were any further discussion from the commissioners

There was none

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

ITEM: 5

Concept plan review for a proposed 19 lot subdivision to be called Memorial Ridge located at 98 North River Road. The property is 14.85 acres and is located in the R-1-9, R-1-11 and the R-1-22 zones.

Commissioners: As part of the vision plan we need to stick with the overlay that we've been trying very hard to reconcile and this plan does not fit in with that at all. It would violate what we are trying to accomplish on the parcel of land.

Paul Berg: When we came here two months ago we got some very discouraging comments about a 36 lot PUD so now we are proposing a 19 lot subdivision that does meet the zoning. Tonight is the first time that the overlay zone was presented in a public meeting, it makes it hard to meet your new standards if they haven't been made public.

Chairman Oksner: The intention was not to create confusion, what we are trying to do here is to create a tourist zone. That was the discussion tonight and before tonight it wasn't approved, because we just voted on it. We have designs for this property for the community that we think are very vital to our economic development.

Paul Berg: Had the applicant known that this was going to be rezoned commercial he would have submitted a different plan.

Commissioner Waldrip: This is a pretty good example where the friction we often see as communities develop is similar to the friction between the historical residential uses in the commercial zone and the commercial development in that zone. The City Fathers and Mothers hopefully wisely try to create a pattern or a philosophy or a plan of development for the City that will meet the long-term needs and desires of the entire community on a long-term basis. That sometimes collides with other people's ideas of what should happen in particular areas. This is a good example of that, and while it does cause heartburn for developers who invest in a concept that they hope will work, sometimes it doesn't work and this is one of those times where I don't think it is going to work and the developer has to man up and say we just got involved in something that didn't work out. I think that it is pretty clear that the City's Fathers and Mothers' plan is really different from the developers plan for this particular area. In my mind there is almost no chance that the City is going to annex that property north of the City boundary in a manner that would be consistent with this development plan.

Discussion by: Applicant; Jeremy Clark, Planner Henke & Commissioners:

They discussed the minimum requirements of commercial space with a mixed use development and that the residential either would have to be above or below the commercial space and not beside or adjacent. We have designs for this property that we would like to pursue and it is a part of a larger plan to keep the community flush with money, it's part of a tourism related development that we are trying to develop in the City and this is a key piece of that puzzle. We are going to try to keep this open for tourism.

No motion on this presentation of a concept plan for comment.

ITEM: 6

Review and possible recommendation of approval for six chapters in the General Plan which includes Community Vision, Land Use, Economic Development and Resorts, Transportation, Main Street, and Parks Trails and Recreation.

Commissioners and Planner Henke discussed the following remaining six chapters in the General Plan

*Community Vision

*Transportation

*Land Use

*Main Street

*Economic Development and Resorts

*Parks Trails and Recreation

Motion: Commissioner Waldrip: I move that we approve the chapters that we have discussed tonight.

Seconded: Commissioner O'Toole

Ayes: Commissioners Ream, Waldrip, Streeter, Kohler and O'Toole

Nays: None

Motion: Passed

ITEM: 7

Adjournment

Motion: Commissioner Streeter: I move to adjourn

Meeting end time: 10:30 pm


Co-Chairman – Steve Nichols


Admin. Assistant – Lindy Rodabough

