



MINUTES

Oakley City Planning Commission
Special Session Meeting
October 1, 2025 6:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting Platform was available

Special Session AGENDA:

1. **Introduction by Chair. Open Meeting.**
2. **Public Comment:** * Public comment is for any matter NOT on the agenda and not the subject of a pending land use application. If you would like to submit written comments to Commission, please email stephanie@oakleyut.gov
3. **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of August 6, 2025, and September 3, 2025.**
4. **Public Hearing and Consideration of Conditional Use Permit for Accessory Building Exceeding 2000 sq ft., located at 5645 N Starr Lane.**
5. **Public Hearing and Consideration of Amended Master Planned Development Application for Oakley City Center.**
6. **Public Hearing and Consideration of Ordinance 2025-XX: An Ordinance Amending Oakley City Code 13-4-19 Pertaining to Text Amendment to Village Mixed Use Zone, Enacting the Permitted Use of a "Gas Station With or Without A Convenience Store."**
7. **Adjourn.**

MINUTES

1. Call to order and roll call:

- a) Planning Commission: Chairman Richard Bliss; Commission Member: Kent Woolstenhulme, Cliff Goldthorpe, Doug Evans, Jan Manning, Steve Maynes
- b) City Staff: Stephanie Woolstenhulme, City Planner; Tristin Leavitt, City Treasurer; Lisa Watts Baskin, City Attorney
- c) Other: Kevin Barker, Charlene Barker, Dick Woolstenhulme, Wade Woolstenhulme, Jeena Woolstenhulme, Con Wadsworth, Jerrie Hansen, Chris Hansen, Tyson Munford, Heidi Smart, Karlee Christiansen, Shad Sorenson, Jon Christenson, Steve Neeley, Jay Tinkler, Rainey Miller, Charles Lawler, Rebecca Roberts, Kelly Edwards,

Goog Beroset, Alisa Quist, Richard Quist, Dave Aplanalp, Joanne Aplanalp, Alyssa Woolstenhulme, Jake Woolstenhulme, Michelle Campbell, Diane Evans, Amy Fiedler, Mona Cotter, Howard Sorensen, Kerbee Leavitt

d) Zoom: Jones iPhone, K Jones, Samsung SM-A426U, Stacey & Susan Arerit, Krista Kelley, Dillman, Jordan Leifson, Karen Maynes, Tom Smart, Marissa Dillman, Meredith Prevot, Anna Hortin, CW, DeAnn

2. **Public Comment:** Public comment is for any matter not on the agenda and not the subject of a pending land use application.

None.

3. **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of August 6, 2025, and September 3, 2025.**

Jan Manning moves that they accept the minutes as recorded for the August 6th and September 3rd meetings.

Cliff Goldthorpe seconds the motion.

All in favor

4. **Public Hearing and Consideration of Conditional Use Permit for Accessory Building Exceeding 2000 sq ft., located at 5645 N Starr Lane.**

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares the following from the Staff Report to Planning Commission:

- Section 13-4-19 of our code calls for any accessory buildings that don't have dwelling over 2,000 square feet are permitted with a Conditional Use Permit.
- The proposed garage at this location is 2,560 square feet.
- 80 x 32 foot garage
- Height is just over 19 feet above grade
- Coming before them for a Conditional Use Permit, which basically means that it is an allowable use. It just gives the city the opportunity to try to mitigate any negative impacts that people may have.
- City has the construction plans and setbacks were all met.
- Owners are planning on building a primary home and then a guest home on the property.
- At this point one driveway to feed all of the buildings – Potentially have an entrance off North Bench Road, which would probably be more of an ag access.
- Water is to the property
- Public Works department will make sure the water line is sufficient for the overall plan.

Jon Christenson shares the following:

- They are 60 feet away from any fence lines – 63 to 68 feet from the neighbor to the north and 60 something feet off of Starr Lane.
- It is just a garage. No living space. No plumbing. Just electrical.

- There will be a frost-free hydrant on the outside
- They will have to tie into the water line when it comes to that point

Alisa Quist (owner) shares that the building color will not be a bright color, it will be more of a tan color.

Planning Commission asks if there have been any complaints from the neighbors. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** states that she did receive a comment right before the meeting stating that it's a large garage and just because a Conditional Use Permit can be granted, doesn't mean that it should.

Chairman Richard Bliss opens up the Public Hearing.

This portion of the meeting (public comment) is taken directly from the transcript of the meeting.

Jay Tinkler 680 W North Bench Road— "I live right next door to this property and I have a couple of questions. What's the size? That's a pretty big piece of property to put a little tractor in, you could plant a Cessna airplane in there. We have concerns about the height as well. My other concern, and maybe this isn't the right time, is that I was told that that's going to be a commercial dog training facility and I was told that by the owner two years ago. That is a residential ag area. How are we supposed to live next door to a dog training facility when I was under the impression that it's a residential area. I just wanted to go on record, because two years ago in August, that's what she told me it was going to be, so I'm just concerned looking forward, that it turns in to be something other than a spot to park a tractor. That's really all I have. Thank you."

Doug Evans asks the owners if it is going to be a dog training facility? **Alisa Quist** responds, "That building no."

Steve Neeley 5735 N Starr Lane — "I have lived on Starr Lane for 20, 25 years now and I have a garage, but that'll be the biggest garage in this whole valley, let alone Wasatch County, if that's really a garage. I think it's commercial and I'm strongly against it. We have a nice quiet lane, residential housing, nice big homes, and a big warehouse. I don't care for it at all."

Doug Evans asks the owner if it is going to be commercial? **Alisa Quist** responds, "No."

Alisa Quist — "Just two double garages with a shop between them. We are building what we can build."

Rainey Miller 5675 N Starr Lane— "I'm on the north side where the shop, or garage will be. So, we have a couple of questions. We just want some clarification on the workshop. Like, what is the workshop? We just want to know what it's use will be. We were also told that it was going to eventually be a dog training/boarding facility. We definitely don't want that in our backyard, so I just want to make sure the workshop doesn't turn into a boarding, training, or housing facility for dogs, that it's going to truly be two garages with a workshop. Workshop has so many definitions. It could definitely be meaning that we said it was a workshop, and we're going to use it to train dogs, and teach people how to train dogs. We

just didn't want it to eventually turn into one. So, we're like, go ahead, and then all of a sudden we're like, what have we done? So then questions on some of the pictures. On the one on the front of the garage, those look like garage doors, is that where you are going to access the garage, or are you accessing the garage from the back?" **Alisa Quist** responds, "On the north side." **Rainey Miller** goes on to say, "So you'll access the garage between our shared fence line and the building, which was a little confusing because that looks like where you go in, but then we could see by the gazebo that you wouldn't have room to go in there. So that brings up just making sure that lighting, if that ends up being approved. The size of the building is also a concern. It is really large, but lighting could directly affect us. It would go right in our living room. We were originally thinking that was the front access, but it's not, it's on the back side which brought up that concern. The setback question was answered. I don't think I have any more questions. Thank you."

Shawn Miller 5675 N Starr Lane – "I live north of the property too. They did say a couple of years ago that they were going train dogs. It is what it is. To me, that size of barn is accessive. I don't care what they do in it, but it's huge for whatever they are going to be doing. Based on these plans, a future arena out front and a stadium. I'm just trying to connect the dots on what they are trying to do. If their building falls under code, I understand that. I would like clarification. That is a big barn. I have a big shop and I store hay and a 40 foot live in horse trailer. I don't see them doing the same. Can they say on record that it is not going to be a breeding or boarding facility? Thank you."

Chairman Richard Bliss closes the Public Hearing.

Jan Manning asks what the workshop will be used for and what kind of noise might come from it. **Alisa Quist** responds that it will be a place to fix stuff, keep some tools, and have a workbench. It is not anything commercial. It's not anything noisy. No intention of turning it into commercial further down the road.

No further discussion.

Kent Woolstenhulme makes a motion that they okay the permit for the additional 500 square feet.

Steve Maynes seconds the motion.

All in favor

5. **Public Hearing and Consideration of Amended Master Planned Development Application for Oakley City Center.**

Matt Wirthlin shares the following with Planning Commission:

- They are here tonight seeking a positive recommendation from them to forward the Master Plan Development application for City Center north and south blocks, as well as a recomenation for the text amendment to allow a convenience store, a fuel station in the Village Mixed Use zone. They hope that it will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.
- Shares timeline that City Center has been a topic of discussion
- Post Office

- 181 1. They have had discussions over the past couple of years – Last person they
182 talked to was a Regional Director of Post Office Operations who conveyed
183 the following to them:
184
- 185 • They are aware that the Post Office facility is wholly inadequate,
186 undersized, and old in every respect.
 - 187 • The current lease is in process of either potentially being
188 renewed or ended entirely. There are some legal issues that
189 they aren't going to get into, so he can't give a direct answer
190 right now.
 - 191 • If they can move into a new facility within 500 feet of the
192 existing facility, they do not have to go through a formal RFP
193 process and can enter into a long-term lease that would keep
194 the Post Office here in Oakley.
 - 195 • If it does go to the RFP process, they would then be looking at
196 the whole Kamas Valley situation and it may make more sense
197 for them in the RFP process to have a single facility.
 - 198 • They are not saying this is a guarantee to happen, but as they
199 look at it, they would opt, potentially, for that larger facility that
200 would serve the entire Kamas Valley. Thus, for the potential for
201 Oakley to lose the Post Office.
- 202
- 203 2. They have not been engaged in a lot of discussions or negotiations with the
204 Post Office because they don't have a plan. They can't deal with the Post
205 Office issue and put that to bed and truly save the Post Office for Oakley
206 until they actually have an approved plan.
- 207 3. If anyone is going into the Oakley or Kamas Post Office and asking the
208 people who work there, they aren't the ones who make the decisions, and
209 candidly, they are not going to be informed about Post Office regulations,
210 and how this works, and private negotiations with the use of their facilities.

- 211
- 212 • Continues on to slide show presentation.
- 213

214 **Cliff Goldthorpe** shares that they are asking them to send this on, and they don't even know
215 if it's possible. **Matt Wirthlin** responds that's typically how these work. UDOT isn't going to
216 approve something that they don't have approved plans for.

217

218 **Richard Bliss** asks the City Attorney if these can be done with contingencies based upon
219 approval from UDOT. **City Attorney Lisa Watts Baskin** responds that UDOT will not make a
220 decision until there is a real site plan or some project to respond to. In a Development
221 Agreement you can have language with regard to, UDOT has agreed to X, Y, and Z as part of
222 the language.

223

224 **Chairman Richard Bliss** states that what they are doing today is a Master Plan application,
225 not a Development Agreement.

226

Steve Maynes asks what the process looks like when it transitions from Master Plan to Development Agreement. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** answers that the Development Agreement is more a legislative action. The initiation of a Development Agreement process would be at the discretion of City Council. Ideally, how the process would look is that they recommend, at some point either positively or negatively, the site plan to City Council. City Council then gives the okay to begin the Development Agreement process which is often times done between the Attorneys and staff. Then it comes back to the Planning Commission as a draft so they can review all of the items within the Development Agreement. Once the Planning Commission is comfortable with the draft, then it gets sent to City Council for their review. Both of which require Public Hearings.

Steve Maynes states that actual permitting is not allowed until UDOT has approved it. **Matt Wirthlin** confirms that it cannot be permitted until UDOT has okayed it.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme states that usually the agreements contain language to the extent that they will be bound by whatever UDOT requires. Whenever UDOT decides to enter the game and have a say on things, then whatever is in place at that time usually gives the full authority to UDOT to dictate.

Matt Wirthlin shares that they can't get to that point until they have conceptual plans approved by the city.

Cliff Goldthorpe asks the City Attorney if going through this Development Agreement is in the best interest of Oakley City and protects Oakley City. **City Attorney, Lisa Watts Baskin** responds that Utah Code 10-9A-532 allows you, with a Master Planned Development, to use the Development Agreement process. Because there is a Village Mixed-Use zone and because there are variables that have tried to be handled as a commission, it has created a delay. Normally when projects like this are done, they are started with a Development Agreement. Another part of this that is critical is that this project is tied to lands that are owned by Oakley City and those lands in Oakley City are part of a legislative decision that the City Council must make before this project is viable. Until that bridge has been crossed, what they are doing here is a bit academic. The best approach would be to decide that they are going to use this Development Agreement procedure that is allowed under state code, which spells out all the steps that one needs to take. In that also are all the variables that would come to play, including UDOT.

Kent Woolstenhulme asks why this hasn't hit the City Council's desk first then? Why are they even sitting here today talking about it if they haven't done a Development Agreement. He was under the impression that they were trying to help the City Council with their decision. **City Attorney, Lisa Watts Baskins** responds that they are having this conversation because Planning Commission is the administrative body. Utah Code requires a public hearing. Planning Commission is doing their due diligence, listening to all the concerns that the citizens have. Then you can say that you recommend to the City Council that they approve or that you recommend they deny. Whatever the Planning Commission's recommendation is, it is not binding on the City Council. As the administrative body, they have been tasked to listen to all of the feedback. Planning Commission's role is very important. Now Planning Commission will get "two bites of the apple." You have the Development Agreement which comes back to commission once negotiated.

Steve Maynes shares that he feels not like a Planning Commissioner, but an "Approving Commissioner." The emphasis has been on approve, approve, approve and there hasn't been an opportunity to plan and have foresight 20 or 50 years down the road of what this may evolve into. He knows that from listening to the public, many have expressed concerns about the future vision. It's important to remember the role of planning and not just approving. On the south side, he would like to request some type of title report. That way they can see what kind of encumbrances, conditions, and easements may be on the city-owned property. **City Attorney, Lisa Watts Baskin** responds that a title report would be reasonable on the city-owned property on the south side.

Doug Evans shares what he feels some people have been concerned about is the Sorensen piece for the parking lot for the creamery. We can still approve this plan, but in the Development Agreement you would have a condition that the creamery can't go in until the parking plan is approved.

Matt Wirthlin shares that the city conveyed to them that they were going to go through the approval process first, and then deal with the parcels and exchanges and everything else. It didn't make sense to go through that process before they even had an approved project.

Kent Woolstenhulme states that this is such a big deal for our city, for the citizens, and for all of those on Planning Commission that live here, they have the right to have as many meetings as they want at this level to try to negotiate more what they feel the citizens and Planning Commission would like to see before it goes to City Council. Feels he is being directed and kind of pressured to push this up to the City Council. He would have a really hard time voting for this to go with a positive recommendation to the City Council at this point. **City Attorney, Lisa Watts Baskin** responds that the code provides that once there is a Development Agreement, it has to come back to Planning Commission.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that it was never intended for this meeting to be a carte blanche approval, yes or no. It was more the opportunity to continue to discuss some of the sticky points of the application to see if they could come to enough consensus to send it on.

Tyson Munford states that an approval tonight does not finalize the design or the layout of the plan. It is just for the Development Agreement which is the groundwork and the paperwork of how they put the rest of this project together. They are not doing anything to approve any layout, position, or configuration of parking lots and buildings on this plan. It is just for the agreement to lay the groundwork of how they put the rest of the project together.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that if the Planning Commission only wants to recommend certain parts of this, she feels that's the blessing that they would then proceed with, but she can't know that without their recommendation. She would like the water to be more clear before they enter into a Development Agreement process.

Matt Wirthlin shares that he may have been misunderstood. He is not here to say don't talk about it, approve it right now, and let's all go home. They have been here listening and they

want to make this project better. He hopes that there is discussion. They want Planning Commissions' input.

Cliff Goldthorpe brings up concerns about having a gathering spot/park on the corner of Center Street and SR 32. He would not want to bring kids to that area so close to SR 32 to play. Maybe move the park/gathering area over towards the proposed splash pad and just keep green space on the corner. We do need a park that is a developed park big enough to take care of all of the kids in Oakley. It needs to be substantial enough that it looks like a park.

Chairman Richard Bliss opens up the Public Hearing.

This portion of the meeting (public comment) is taken directly from the transcript of the meeting.

Kevin Barker 612 E Weber Canyon Rd – "I have attended, I think, every planning meeting since this project first came forward, three some odd years ago. First, I'd like to actually put a note of thanks to Deer Meadows for having listened to the citizens, the residents of this community, and changing their plans as time has gone on. I also want to state for the record, that I object to how the public hearing component of this meeting is being done because the documentation that was sent out that I needed to review to comment and give my thoughts on this new revised proposal, was completely unreadable. So this is the first time I'm seeing these changes on this screen, and I don't feel competent to, after 20 minutes, go and say what about this, what about that? You have asked for public hearing commentary, and the information you gave to us to comment on was of no value. Just wanted to put that out there."

Wade Woolstenhulme 4230 N Millrace Rd – "As I look at the plan, I don't like the idea of having apartments, and then a park behind it. It looks like it's a park for the residents in the apartment building. Why can't we move the apartment buildings over on the west side of SR 32 where they own all those houses anyway, and they were going to put a gas station at one time there right? Why can't they move the apartments all over there? Leave this over here to be a good, nice park for everybody to come and play and do whatever they need to do. That way we're not separating the park from the public with apartments. We all know what apartments can turn into. Thank you."

Michelle Campbell 1699 River Lane – "I didn't have a chance to really see the whole plan, and I thought there was going to be a grocery store. Is that still happening? I must have missed that. I guess I have a question of how big is the grocery store? We have Ken's Kash already so is this replacing Ken's Kash in the same spot? How big is it going to be compared to Kamas? That's a good-sized grocery store. Why is there a need to put a pretty good-sized C-Store. I don't think that is necessary. That's 2,500 square feet which is that's pretty big. That's about probably what they have over in Kamas at 7-Eleven. I guess if there's a grocery store there, and if all we need are the gas pumps, why do we need both? Why do we need another little store right there and a grocery store. I don't think that's necessary, but that's not the huge issue. The apartments, why? What's the need for apartments? To house his employees. It's just a lot to have apartments, it's just not something that anyone, I think, here in Oakley really wants. I spoke to a builder the other day that said he could build

homes, affordable homes for \$350,000. If we really are trying to do something for Oakley, Oakley people that work in the town, those are other options. Unfortunately everything has been artificially inflated, but that's a whole other story. My biggest concern too, I'm glad to see that gas station is much less than it was, but what about Dutch's? What is happening with his gas station? Does he just get put out of business? That's a landmark of Oakley, and what would make sense is for him to be able to expand a little bit, but Ken's Kash has already been purchased. My concern is that Steve has gone around and purchased land before he's even gotten approval. Not even knowing for sure whether he's gonna do it. He still has properties that are in his plan that he hasn't even convinced to sell yet. I can't understand how someone goes and does that. It looks like we're trying to make this a little resort town and we don't have the infrastructure for that. The streets can't support that. This whole UDOT stuff, that process seems out of whack that they can't see this and then approve it beforehand. The streets aren't large enough. There's already enough traffic now with just the few things that have gone in there. We're going to have all this retail, all these apartments, gas station, everyone coming in from Brown's, it's going to be a mess. In that whole little area, too much traffic. A park shouldn't go next to SR 32 either. One of you, I think it was Steve, brought up that you guys haven't done the planning, the builders come to you, and I guess I'm wondering, is this what the city really wants? Why isn't the city putting a plan together of what they want for our city? This is what's ideal, we want a restaurant that we people can actually eat at, not a steakhouse that's a 5-star that none of us are going to be able to afford. Who the heck is that for? That's for all the people coming in to this little new resort town. We're going to have to live with all of this traffic and increased taxes because the property values just are gonna keep going up. And for those of us that love it here, that doesn't help us because we won't be able to afford to live here. I don't feel like this plan is for Oakley, for what the people want. It feels like it's what the developer, what Steve wants. The other thing is the retail, apartment, mixed use. Do we know if there's going to be chain stores or anything like that. I was just in Zions and they had a huge Subway that was an eyesore. I couldn't believe that was on the Main Street. We already have a Fizz that is a chain. This is a small town and it should have small-town, family owned businesses not owned by one man. It should be called Smithtown after that and this is nothing but a moneymaker. I have one more question, has there been a study of the current traffic that we have? And then how many people this is going to bring, and what that will look like. If not, that should be done before we move forward on anything."

Kerbee Leavitt 4451 N River Rd – "I just want to go on record here and say that I agree with Wade about if we are going to have to get apartments, to have them moved because we've seen what they do just to the town next to us. I'm not really for a hardware store apartment situation. It takes 5.6 miles from here to Kamas to get what we need. So I just kind of ask all of us to really think about why we live here, why we stayed here, why we raised our kids here, why we moved here. Was it for the convenience of things, or was it because we wanted a rural lifestyle that was more low-key, that wasn't the crazy hustle-bustle stuff. I personally want to stay here with my family because it is low-key and I know my neighbors. If we put in all these apartments, we don't know who's coming. We say it's low income or affordable housing, but what is the affordable housing? Do we have a number for that I guess is my question? Because again other little towns next to us have done that and it hasn't been affordable housing. We want that because we want our kids to come back, but then our kids still can't afford it. So affordable housing to one person is probably not the same to the other so I don't love the apartment idea. I don't love two gas stations. I don't

419 know what's going on there and I apologize, I came late, so you guys probably talked about
420 that. I just wanted to go on record and just say to maybe let's think about why we stayed
421 here for so long, or why we moved here. Was it for the convenience of having hardware
422 stores, gas stations, car washes, apartments, or was it because we wanted to raise our kids
423 in a small town?"

424
425 **Con Wadsworth 5660 N Doc's Lane Peoa** – "I live in Peoa, but I have property on Starr Lane
426 and a little bit of property along the border of Oakley here. Been here 25, 30 years. I also
427 have a developing business with my family, and when I look at this, this doesn't even begin
428 to make sense. There is no way there is enough people to make this work. Those stores will
429 fail. There is no way that there is enough income to pay for any part of that, and the only
430 thing that's going to work is that low-income housing, which none of us want. I like Kent's
431 comments, they were all dead on. I think Wade's right, if we have to have apartments, let's
432 put them on the other side of the road. It's the last thing I think people want to see when
433 they drive into town is low-income housing. I'm not sure how you decide who gets to rent
434 and who doesn't. To say that we're going rent to people in Kamas and Oakley and keep Park
435 City people out of here, how would you do that? That'd be impossible. I think this is just too
436 soon for Oakley. We're not ready for this. There's not going to be any name-brand stores
437 here because they are smart enough. They're not going to come here, there's no business in
438 Oakley. There is 1,900 people in town, and maybe 500 more in the summer when they drive
439 in and out of here for two months in July. I'm not for any part of it. I don't envy your
440 position. I would not want to be sitting where you guys are at, because I know it's tough.
441 You hear people like me coming here and bitch, and then the other side will want to sell you
442 a product that doesn't make sense."

443
444 **Rebecca Roberts 5833 Pinion Lane** – "I echo pretty much every single opinion, I guess, and
445 point of view that I've heard here tonight. This doesn't make any sense at all. The
446 apartments, again, affordable for who? I'm not sure who wants to drive in and see that. I
447 agree that the retail people aren't going to be there. We don't have anything to support
448 that. And I agree with Kent. Why are you trying to push this along so quickly when there are
449 so many unanswered questions. Who owns the land? Who doesn't own the land? What
450 about the water? Has anybody talked about the water? Those are sustainable things that we
451 need to be paying attention to. Infrastructure, we don't have that here. We are trying to put
452 Dutch's out of business by operating another gas station. That is not neighborly. That is not
453 being a community of people looking out for each other. Which is what I think Oakley is
454 about. I listened to the last meeting because I couldn't attend it, and the one thing that I
455 heard was that the C-Store is gonna be great because I have a buddy that owns the gas
456 station in Kamas, and that's where he made all of his money. What are you talking about?
457 We don't need a convenience store. Ken's Kash is our convenience store. We need a few
458 more gas pumps, we need a little bit bigger grocery store, we need a place where we can all
459 go and get our mail, and smile at our neighbors and say hello, and feel good about the
460 decision that we made. You need to slow down, do some research, do your due diligence,
461 and really think about how you're serving the people of Oakley. Thank you."

462
463 **Howard Sorenson 1211 Cow Alley** – "I've loved living there for 32 years. I grew up down in
464 Salt Lake City and it got a little big for me. I used to go pheasant hunting out in West Jordan
465 and that's not going to happen anymore so I moved up to Pinebrook. When we moved to
466 Pinebrook, they said, these are all going to be little ranchettes all the way to Park City, and

your going to have lots of open space, and I watched that just fill in just so fast that Lisa and I went a little further, and that was out to Oakley. I think all of us would love to shut the door, right? It's not something you can do. They'd love to have done that in West Jordan. They'd love to have done that in Park City. I'm turning 70 next year, and I've watched how communities grow and I'm watching how the south side of our valley is growing. Every time I drive across the valley, I'm so grateful to live in Oakley because I think we have had people that have served for many years that have made some great decisions on keeping some open space and things that, as growth comes, this will be a very desired town to live in because of those decisions. I've worked with 8 years with Doug and Tom Smart on just trying to preserve a string of pearls up the Weber River. It's been thousands of hours of work. I'll tell you what, as that growth comes, and it will, we can't stop it. It will come. I'm grateful that we have preserved that open space. Now, how I'm tying that into this is, I've watched some of the small towns grow piecemeal...and wow, have they lost their personalities. They have just got all sorts of different themes and construction, and to where it has no personality in the town. I'm not going to name towns, but you probably can think of a few in Wasatch and Summit County, and you can probably think of some that have done a good job with that. I, for one, will just say that I know Steve Smith personally. I have watched him invest into this valley very heavily on things that do not give him any profit. I have seen it with the Trail Foundation, I have seen it with the education at South Summit, I have seen it in many places that he has just given money to try to better this valley. So I don't look at him as a developer that's coming in here to just take advantage. He grew up here, he has roots here, and so I am speaking up for Steve, just in the sense that I think he really cares. I have been very impressed how he has listened to the community and really massaged this thing. Do you realize the two most valuable commercial corners are the two that he puts parks on. Any commercial developer would say, are you kidding me? I own commercial real estate down in Heber City and I would not give away our corner for all the tea in China. I just go, that is a very valuable spot, because it's on that corner of Main Street and Highway 40. So I look at it, and I go, he has really tried. Now it it perfect? Heavens no. And is there a perfect design? No there's not. It's gray. You have got to move things around and make decisions. I if had one thing I would agree with Wade that I would love to see, if it were possible, to put the apartments on the west side of SR 32. Maybe not against the street, but back off the street. I do think that would give the downtown area much more of an appealing feel, and I don't know if that's even possible. I don't know if the zoning is there, if that's even an option. I do think if that were possible, I think you could then do some of the things you have talked about as far as for the public to gather. That's such a valuable thing. Some of the cities that have done that and done good accessibility with trails to a gathering place for the city. Someone said how we love to gather at the post office. I love going to the post office to see neighbors and meet people. Wouldn't that be great to have that? Maybe by the splash pad or something that we had a little more substantial park there. I realize this has been massaged to great expense, and so I'm even hesitant to bring that up, but I will just say I'm supportive of having somebody that has the funds to do a good job with it, to have some consistency in the construction, and the feel of the city that I trust pretty highly. I have watched him for many, many years invest into this community and those would be my suggestions. The one question I did have, I thought the two apartments there, could we put retail under those? The first floor was going to be half underground. If that was retail, that would be up to ground level right? And so, would that be two stories above that, or one story above? I would be concerned with that height, just what that would look like downtown. That's my two cents. Thanks for all the work you do."

515
516 **Anyssa Henry 1368 Weber Wild Road** – “I have a few things that I want to add to everybody
517 else. The residential and the commercial intertwined zoning for that, has it all been
518 approved already? I don’t agree with any of this. I think that it’s growing too fast. I worked
519 for Steve Smith at one of his establishments and there was an opportunity for him to be
520 good to his employees, and he missed paychecks two weeks. Two paychecks in a row, and
521 nobody probably knows that because nobody will really say anything about it, but I’m here
522 to say it. I did talk to him, and he apologized profusely, but my fear is if he can’t afford to
523 pay his Oakley Diner people and his Ken’s Kash people because he is growing so fast, which
524 was the excuse that I got. He grew too fast, he didn’t have enough money, he was having to
525 use his personal money to pay his employees. It only happened a couple of times, but taking
526 care of his employees was not what happened. He actually came in, looked at us straight in
527 the eye, didn’t offer to pay, just kept going. These people, some of the people that worked
528 there, which are from here, wound up getting overdraft fees. To me, that’s not taking care
529 of your community, that’s taking care of yourself. This is all for Steve Smith. I think that he
530 has the money, he came in here, he thinks he’s gonna take it over. So if you have retail, I’m
531 from retail, I have retail background. First of all, the convenient store and the grocery store
532 together, who’s gonna spend enough money to sustain that? When, right now, we can
533 barely sustain Ken’s Kash. It’s just growing because they’ve added stuff to it and they could
534 probably be ok with just Ken’s Kash, but where they make their money is on fuel. Remember
535 that. Like, that’s not an inside thing. They make their money on their gas prices, so how high
536 are they gonna put their gas prices, for us locally, to have to pay for them having their fuel
537 there? I don’t love that they are putting Dutch’s out of business because that’s exactly what
538 will happen. You can’t have two gas stations. I feel like he’s the only thing that’s left that is
539 part of the original part of what is around here. Not knowing what’s gonna happen to him is
540 also a big concern. That’s not us being concerned about humans here, it’s being concerned
541 about the money that’s coming in. I get we need to grow. I get that taxes are high
542 residential taxes, everything is going up, but the way he is doing this is not right. To me, it’s
543 all about him. It’s what he wants, and not what the city wants. Everybody loves Steve Smith
544 because he’s got money. I get that, but is it the right person to do business with in the city?
545 Like, there are other developers that may be given the opportunity would love to take part
546 of those. Have we talked to other developers? Have we said, hey as a city, this is what we
547 want. Can you come in and develop a little store here, and this is what we want in the city,
548 this is what we want in Oakley, but no, we’re just giving it all to him. As far as retail goes, we
549 do not have the infrastructure to sustain any of that unless you’re bringing everybody in
550 from Park City and all the other places was what you don’t want to do. As far as the roads
551 go, I don’t know how you’re gonna do an ingress on some of these places, how are you
552 going to do that? You’re gonna have to do turning lanes. Have they planned that in their
553 development. Is there room for that growth of that road into the property line of what
554 they’re building? Do we know? That’s it.”

555
556 **Kelly Edwards 246 W 4400 N** – “I have been watching this process, and I have a pretty
557 serious concern over the last few days. If we could look at my corner, Dutch’s gas station, I
558 own the property. I go back with Tim, the family, quite many years. Do you see where it says
559 TBD? My concern is, why isn’t it that Oakley City’s properties say TBD? Is there a reason for
560 that? I mean, here is what’s happening, and my adrenaline’s going pretty tough because I
561 have an opportunity to squeeze a trigger and sell somebody that does...will never sell that
562 corner. I’m a little bit pressured for a minute here, but more importantly, I want to do a

special for Oakley City. I'm invested heavily in Oakley. I love the people, I love the community. That corner is getting tired, and yes it does need to grow. We need to have a bigger station. I'm not going to dispute anything that's going on other than a lot of things happening before, the cart before the horse. When Oakley City, if they do approve, the TBD will still be there and my concern was with the City Council, this was a public meeting I addressed that to the Mayor a couple of weeks ago. I said. What if what happens? He goes, Kelly, he says. I said, what happens if I don't sell? I've put a lot of money into that station with the EPA. They made me put in new testing systems. Very expensive. To make a long story short, the Mayor looked at me, and he said, well, the only thing that we could possibly do is we can impose eminent domain. It pretty made me a little bit nervous that the mayor said that to me. I consulted with a very successful real estate attorney about that and I won't go into detail, but Oakley City would have a hell of a time trying to make me move out of that corner. So, my point of coming up here is, Mr. Steve Smith granted, he...I'm not gonna say he's put me off for a reason, but I think there's something behind this if he gets going, and that corner can stay there, possibly, and get me pressured. Yes, it needs to be cleaned up. I'm really working hard on making sure the cars are taken home at night. I'm working hard on keeping it clean. It employs 6 people, and it's a business, and we're flying some wood, knock on wood, but it's been very good to us. You know, great people in this valley, great community. We got a very good clientele that's been that corner has been servicing automobiles and things for 60 years. I mean, a long time. A station's been there for a long time, and again the EPA was leaning on me to get them testing systems in the ground, and them testing systems I put in there. They're good for 20 years as long as I keep passing my EPA test and standards. I'm good to go whether I have just a couple pumps to service or whatever, I'm not going out of business. I'm not going to be pushed out of business, because it's a business that I acquired, but I think there should be something more with the TBD, with Oakley City, to find out what takes place on other properties, and be more forward, because to me, I'm not understanding if I'm gonna do it or not, or should I just squeeze the trigger, but I made a commitment to Mr. Smith that I would talk to him and I'm gonna stick with that, and it's just gotta work first before there can be any kind of votes, I think, because that's a critical corner for this development. That's it, thank you."

Amy Fiedler 802 Bridal Way – "I had noticed that there's potentially a pizzeria, we have a diner, there is talk of a steakhouse, and I don't think, like someone mentioned, Oakley's residents can support all of these businesses and the retail. That just seems to me that's gonna have people coming in from elsewhere to use our businesses, which is fine, and be customers of the businesses, but I don't think that we moved here so that a lot of other people could come and pass through. It seems like a lot for the size of town that we are, and that I hope we will continue to be. Thank you."

Jerrie Hansen 5434 N Oakley Downs Road – "I really just have a question. Have we considered the sewer? With all those houses, 36 houses plus over retail, what will that do to our sewer? Are you considering that? That's my question that I would like answered."

Goog Beroset 6021 Pinion Lane – "I don't know how you can make a decision on this, it's kind of a cluster. You have city-owned property, you have property that's owned privately. You don't know what's going to happen to that property, nothing has been determined yet. I think they should just concentrate on what they actually could develop and not go everywhere. I appreciate what you guys are up against. I really do. I'm glad I'm not there,

but I just don't know how in the world, like Con said, that this would be successful. I mean, the grocery store is not going to be successful. There is not enough people here, 1,500, 1,900 people. There is too many things that are a problem. I'm not an architect, but I guarantee I could take this plan and revise it, and you might like it. I would take the exits and entry off the 32, the two additional ones, they're not going to pay us anyhow, and how many feet is that? You would have the Weber Canyon Road, you would have four ingress and egress off of the 32. It's not going to happen. Who's doing these plans? Why don't they look at it and make something that makes sense. They have listened, they have done a better job, but as far as the phasing, I don't agree with signing any Development Agreement that includes the whole thing. I know that's what some of us want, but I don't understand why we have to do that. If I was going to phase it, I'd say the post office and a park. If we looked at the questionnaire that was sent to everybody in Oakley, was attainable housing in the top 10? I don't think so. It wasn't that high. It was open space, community gathering place. It didn't have anything to do with apartments, skating pond, or whatever the heck that is. I don't know what that is. I won't be there. But anyhow, I just don't get it. I mean, there's no conceivable way that you could make a decision on what this stands at right now. There's just no way. It just doesn't make any sense. That's all I got to say."

Richard Bliss closes the Public Hearing.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that based on conversation and public input, she has come up with a pretty concise list that she feels they should use to start discussion pertaining to items and sticky points on the application. Feels it is important to note at this point that they can say what they do or don't like, what they do or don't recommend, if there is changes they would like to see. They need to get specific so that the funnel can narrow a little bit as far as an application goes.

Chairman Richard Bliss goes through the list with the Planning Commission.

- Concerns with UDOT Access

Question from **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** – Are they trying to encourage no further UDOT accesses? Is the Planning Commission only wanting Weber Canyon and Center Street as the access to City Center? **Cliff Goldthorpe** responds with yes, due to dangerous conditions. You have 4 entrances on a hill that is near to a blind corner.

Kent Woolstenhulme feels that there should not be 5 exits into City Center and thinks that the proposed entrance into City Center north of Center Street on SR 32, is staying because of the drive-thru.

- Drive-thru

Kent Woolstenhulme has concerns with a drive-thru in the middle of City Center. It brings people into your City Center for one purpose only and that's Fizz. It adds congestion, danger, and he doesn't feel it needs to be there. Has never liked it and never will.

- Gas Station

Kent Woolstenhulme is super concerned about the gas station. Feels we do not need two gas stations in the city. We already have one and it doesn't matter who owns it. It has been there for a long, long time. Believes that they will get this conversation going a little bit longer down the road when it gets resolved, or never gets resolved, and Dutch's stays exactly where it is and has every right to as long as it keeps doing what it's doing. They have no right to force them out. The city is too small to put in another gas station and we are too good of a city, individually, and people to do that to individuals also. He is not opposed to the location of the proposed gas station, he is opposed to having two gas stations. Has a hard time believing that UDOT is going to allow access where the proposed gas station is. Feels there is no reason to have a gas station there or to even have one on the plan if we still have one in the city.

- Phasing Plan

Cliff Goldthorpe feels that some of the things that the public wanted, like the park, and a few other things need to be in Phase 1. One of the other biggest issues that has been brought up by them and the community is throwing all the eggs in one basket immediately, and then they sit and wait for 10, 15 years for the whole thing to come to fruition, and if it doesn't, Oakley can't take the property back and offer it to somebody else. Steve Smith could sell it to somebody else. He wonders if in the phasing plan, if the sale of property can somehow be phased.

Richard Bliss asks if they could make a contingency plan? He knows that it has to go to the City Council, because they determine disposition or acquisition of properties. Feels it would be better if it was done in parcels and prioritizing Phase 1 to be the northern parcel and Phase 2 being the southern parcel. **Kent Woolstenhulme** feels that if we move forward with any of it, it needs to be done that way. The phasing plan does affect the Planning Commission, the sell of property does not. He understands that all of the property could be sold to Steve Smith and the Planning Commission cannot stop that from happening, but they can help make a decision to phase it.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme states that whether City Council wants to do a phasing plan or if that's even a possibility in conjunction with that development will be their prerogative to undertake. Planning Commission can certainly make recommendations and have negotiation conversations about the phasing plan itself. **Chairman Richard Bliss** shares that the recommendation would be to try to localize Phase 1 to a specific area, rather than hopscotching back and forth. **Cliff Goldthorpe** would like to recommend to City Council not to sell the whole city. He feels that the sell of property also needs to be phased.

Steve Maynes concurs with the other commissioners that it needs to be a component phase rather than split up. Feels that it makes sense to focus on the north side as opposed to the south side and incrementally build that out. Reiterates that on the south side, he feels it behooves them as commissioners, and others, to just receive the title report on the city-owned property. Feels it is not unreasonable

to find out if there are any encumbrances, conditions, or easements that they don't know about or that have not been articulated on the city-owned property on the south side. He thanks Steve Smith's team for having the neighborhood meetings and the open house. Feels that they would be having a very different discussion today it that would have been done two years ago. Would like to see a Microsoft Project or a Gantt chart that can show them the planning, knowing that stuff will change, and it will be flexible but visually, graphically, instead of just saying 2 to 15 years. But then they can also articulate the phasing in that plan.

- Boundary Adjustment on South Side

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that they already spoke to this.

- Additional Square Footage

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that there was a big jump in added square footage on this application compared to the last. Overall, a lot of retail. Part of it came in the form of retail going on the bottom level of the apartments.

Steve Maynes shares that if you focus on the north and on the very top east side, where you have the retail space, if that was considered apartments, then you are getting some housing in that component. Rather than having to put that on the south while that is phased out. Also, possibly using what is currently zoned residential on the west side of SR 32 and putting the apartments over there. Feels it is worthy of a conversation and would probably get the community behind that idea a lot faster. **Doug Evans** shares that there is a zoning issue with that. It's not zoned for apartments. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** says she will research if it is a zoning change that would be required or just a CUP for the apartments to be on the west side of SR 32.

- Additional Parking

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme questions why the increase in parking spaces so far beyond what is required by code? Plus or minus, her calculations on the required parking spots is 280. The last proposal there was 398 parking spaces, so they are looking at a fairly significant increase. It was not her intent to say that's not right, but to better understand the context of why that decision was made.

Jan Manning feels like it is a lot of parking and asphalt. She understands the calculation made, but it is worried about the amount of retail space as well. She would much rather have businesses on a waiting list to get into Oakley, rather than seeing empty storefronts. Feels that having the retail phased would be a smarter idea.

Kent Woolstenhulme feels that the retail space is too much. One way to get more green space is to eliminate the retail and then bare minimum of parking. Not allowing more than our code allows. His suggestion on this would be to minimize, minimize, minimize and put more green out there.

- Building Heights (especially near Center Street)

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme would like clarification from the Planning Commission on what building height they are looking to hit.

Kent Woolstenhulme shares that they all agreed at one point that nothing in City Center would be taller than City Hall, which is not 45 feet. He is still proposing that there in never a three-story building in City Center, no matter what it is, and definitely not against Center Street. He is still against apartments in City Center at all. He is not opposed to a little mixed-use, but townhomes is a little bit different. There was also talk about where they would like to see those go and it was where Cattleman's Hall currently is, but that didn't happen on this plan. That forces all of the parking to a certain area and all of the green space is forced behind everything. He does not want to see anything close to a 40-foot building out on the main Center Street road. Would like to keep buildings to two-story.

- Number of Gas Stations

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme asks if it is the take of Planning Commission that they are open to a new gas station, but they only want one?

Steve Maynes shares that when Mr. Edwards spoke, he mentioned something important and that's the EPA regulations on all of this. If they relocate Dutch's or a gas station to the other location, to clean that up to use as a public, usable green space, it's not easy. Even when it has been passed off as enviornmentally clean, there can always be a resurgence and an annual inspection required on the enviornmental condition of that property. He's not saying no either way, he is just saying realize that it's a long-term commitment enviornmentally when you make that kind of decision. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** asks for clarification on if Commissioner Maynes is proposing that we keep all EPA regulation in the current spot, or just for everyone to understand the undertaking if they move it to a different location? **Commissioner Maynes** responds with both. We are already meeting some level of EPA acceptance where it is at now, but if they are going to move it you would have to remediate. He has no idea, as long as the gas station has been there, what it would take to completly remediate that. You would also be hard pressed to put anything else on the spot because of the enviornmental issues.

- Post Office – Addressed by Matt Wirthlin earlier in meeting
- Utilities – Sewer

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that the city has been working with Aqua Enviornmental to handle both our water and wastewater systems. The city is currently in the following processes with them right now:

1. **Capital Improvement Plan:** Outlines the city based on percentages of growth and proposed projects. What does the impact to city

infrastructure look like, and how can we amortize the upkeep of that infrastructure over a great period of years.

2. **Impact Study:** Makes it so the city can appropriately pass along those costs to new development so the current citizens of Oakley aren't carrying the burden of that.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme goes on to mention that Aqua has also been given the exact square footage on this specific project so the city can better understand the impacts on city infrastructure just from the City Center application. The city does not have those numbers yet, but will very soon be understanding these impacts. It has been implied that the city is turning a blind eye or putting their head in the sand regarding impacts on city infrastructure and that is not the case. The city does have a lot of aging infrastructure in the ground and the city is looking at a lot of cost to bring those up to par. Some of the important parts about considering commercial spaces in Oakley, is offsetting income for the city from those properties. Based on the city's outlook of capital improvements in the city, something has to be considered or it will run a lot of people out of town based on property tax values alone.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme asks Planning Commission if they would like to make specific recommendations about changes to this specific application, beyond what they have already talked about.

Doug Evans would still like to see in the Development Agreement, an Architectural Review Committee. It would have a representative of the developer, City Planner, and a couple of professionals. Make sure that all sides can be represented fairly, including the public.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares her understanding that the Development Agreement would contain a general idea of renderings, feel, and theme of the subdivision, and then the Architectural Review Committee would, at the time of the building permit, make sure it fits within those parameters and offer opinions about the specific architectural design.

Cliff Goldthorpe adds that the Architectural Review Committee needs to carry more weight so they can not be pushed aside by City Council.

Doug Evans shares that the city has enough water for City Center. The sewer system is really old. There is infiltration that comes from leaking pipes and irrigation. There is grease going in the sewer system and needs determined where that is coming from. A couple of sump pumps could equal the entire wastewater from the City Center. The water going into the sewer plant needs to be dirty, or it is tough to treat. There will be adequate impact fees to make sure everybody pays their fair share. Has a little issue with the apartment building by Cattleman's Hall and moved to the north side and put above the commercial building. Not much of a problem with the building height. If they could get it down to 30 to 32 feet feels it would be better. Attainable housing is cheaper to go up rather than out. This is not low income housing it is attainable housing. You can say that first choice goes to people who work here. He feels it needs to leave their hands and go to City Council so it can move to the next phase.

Kent Woolstenhulme feels that they will never get it right again if they don't work through some more stuff before passing it onto City Council.

Doug Evans makes a motion that they pass to the City Council with all the comments that have come in front of the commission tonight. And that they move this project, that it complies with the City Codes and with the General Plan, which they have spent many years developing, and they move it on to them.

Jan Manning seconds the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Jan Manning	Nay
Kent Woolstenhulme	Nay
Cliff Goldthorpe	Nay
Doug Evans	Aye
Steve Maynes	Nay

Motion does not pass 4-1

Jan Manning recommends tabling passing this on and having more discussion in a work session with City Council.

Steve Maynes makes a motion to move to City Council for evaluation enumerating the considerations that have been articulated by the Planning Commission.

Cliff Goldthorpe seconds the motion

Roll Call Vote:

Jan Manning	Aye
Kent Woolstenhulme	Nay
Cliff Goldthorpe	Aye
Doug Evans	Aye
Steve Maynes	Aye

Motion passes 4-1

6. Public Hearing and Consideration of Ordinance 2025-XX: An Ordinance Amending Oakley City Code 13-4-19 Pertaining to Text Amendment to Village Mixed Use Zone, Enacting the Permitted Use of a "Gas Station With or Without A Convenience Store."

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that when the proposed gas station moved from across the street to City Center, in the Village Mixed Use currently a gas station is not an allowable use.

The following pathways are being proposed in order to consider or ultimately approve a gas station in City Center:

- a. Request a zoning change for the specific plat of land that the gas station would be on to commercial, and then it would be a Conditional Use Permit after that.

- b. Their proposal is to do a text amendment to the Land Use Matrix which would make a gas station an allowable use within Village Mixed Use.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme adds clarification that if they don't vote it through, it does not mean that Dutch's is out. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** asks the City Attorney if this does get voted in and Dutch's remains where it is, could this get repealed so that no further gas stations could be considered within the Village Mixed Use Zone? **City Attorney Lisa Watts Baskin** responds that any use table that gets amended can be repealed. If you decide down the road that you don't need a gasoline station with or without a convenience store, you can take it out and not have it be a permitted use. Whatever was the code, the law, when the applicant submits the application, that is what governs.

Chairman Richard Bliss opens up the Public Hearing.

This portion of the meeting (public comment) is taken directly from the transcript of the meeting.

Kevin Barker – "I have a question and then a comment. My question is, the existing gas station, does that reside within the Village Mixed Use area from code perspective? Planning Commission responds, "Yes." Okay, that's what I thought. Then, this is a bit of the elephant in the room, but can the code be amended to allow a gas station within the Village Mixed Use area, but limit the number of gas stations to one? That's my question." **City Attorney Lisa Watts Baskin** responds, "I cannot answer that question without doing research on that. It's a good question, but I don't know the answer to that. I'm sorry."

Rebecca Roberts – "I don't think that this should get passed through until the Attorney does research."

Michelle Campbell – "We already have the Dutch's and we have a total of 5 gas stations between here and Kamas and I think we should only have one gas station in City Center."

Chairman Richard Bliss closes the Public Hearing.

Chairman Richard Bliss shares that he needs a recommendation to either table this, move forward with an approval, or denial.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares for added clarification, this is coming from Planning Commission as a recommendation to City Council. City Council is actually the determining body and the body that actually decides on this. If they pass this, it is not a done deal. They can make a recommendation, but it does have to hit City Council before it is adopted because it is an ordinance.

Kent Woolstenhulme makes a motion to recommend to not amend the text to allow a gas station with or without a convenience store in the Village Mixed Use.
Cliff Goldthorpe seconds the motion.

No further discussion.

Roll Call Vote:

Steve Maynes	Aye
Doug Evans	Nay
Cliff Goldthorpe	Aye
Kent Woolstenhulme	Aye
Jan Manning	Aye

Motion Passes 4-1**7. Adjourn****Kent Woolstenhulme** makes a motion to adjourn.Minutes accepted as to form this 3rd day of DEC 2025.

Richard Bliss, Chair

Tristin Leavitt
Oakley City Treasurer