

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, June 28, 2012
Cedar Hills Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Cliff Chandler, Chair, Presiding
Commission Members: Donald Steele, Craig Clement, David Driggs, Tonya Edvalson
Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
Trent Augustus, City Council Liaison
Others: Brandon Dyer

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1. This meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed was called to order at 6:23 p.m.
2. Public Comment (6:23 p.m.)
No comments.

David Driggs and Tonya Edvalson were recognized as voting members.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

3. Review/Recommendation on the Final Plan for Bridgestone, Plat C, Located at Approximately 9601 North and 4500 West (6:24 p.m.)

Greg Robinson stated that Perry Homes has worked hard to come up with a design that will fit well in the area. All items from earlier reviews have been addressed. There are apple trees in the area. The City Council discussed the apple trees, but no decision was reached about whether the trees will stay, be cut down, or be relocated. There are a few areas where more evergreens would be nice for year-round screening, particularly in the back. Sidewalk transition for different width sidewalks also needs to be addressed. The existing sidewalk in Bridgestone is 8-feet. They are proposing going to a minimum of a 6-foot sidewalk around the parking stalls. The existing buildings in the HOA are all brick. These proposed building materials are different. Because these buildings are 8-plexes, in their recommendation the Planning Commission needs to make a finding that the buildings do not create a hazard. Hazards would be an unsafe building, not appropriate for the neighborhood, traffic concerns, or other types of hazard that a building of that size may create. The fire chief will look at this, but the plan meets the city's requirements for turning radius, fire lanes, etc.

Brandon Dyer stated that the proposed six-foot sidewalk is due to limited space. The HOA has expressed a desire to have the apple trees removed because it is a burden to spray the trees and pick the fruit. The proposed materials have not changed from what was previously discussed—a combination of Hardi-board, brick and stucco.

C. Driggs is concerned with the 6-foot sidewalk because of its proximity to the elementary school. Given that this is high-density and to remain consistent with the rest of the development, he would favor 8-foot sidewalks.

C. Steele stated that he is not concerned about the sidewalk width. He understands why the HOA would like to get rid of the apple trees. He approves of Hardi-board as a long lasting, good material and feels that the variations will help break up the front of the building. He feels like the design is a long linear mass of building and is out of character with the rest of the community, but hasn't heard any of the residents complain.

C. Clement stated that he is okay with this development. He had to leave early, but before he left he stated that, regarding item 5, he is okay with dispensing with the Planning Commission compensation. When he started on the Planning Commission there was no compensation, and he views it as a public service.

C. Edvalson stated that the building seems big, but it has not been opposed by residents in the HOA.

C. Clement excused (6:41 p.m.)

MOTION: C. Steele—I move that we accept the information that has been presented on the Perry Homes site plan for Bridgestone Plat C, and would recommend that sidewalks be increased to 8 feet so long as it doesn't intrude into setbacks and present additional safety issues. Seconded by C. Driggs.

Further Discussion:

Greg Robinson stated that the motion should require final engineering and a finding that the development does not create any hazards.

AMEND MOTION: C. Steele—To recognize a finding of fact that the development meets section 10-6B-5b and that the project meets final engineering, drainage verification, etc, as contained in the background findings for today's meeting. That the Planning Commission grants a one-time variance based on the findings of facts that the development meets section 10-6D-5b, that it is appropriate for the proper development of the lot and that such an increase will not result in an establishment of a hazardous condition. Accepted by C. Driggs.

Further Discussion:

C. Steele stated that sidewalk widths are arbitrary, but his recommendation of 8-foot sidewalks was based on the fact that residents in that area are older.

Yes - C. Chandler
C. Driggs
C. Edvalson
C. Steele

Motion passes.

4. Discussion Regarding Location of Sheds (6:54 p.m.)

Greg Robinson stated that the City Council has asked that the Planning Commission review the ordinance regarding sheds, looking specifically at setbacks and the allowed location within the yard. Currently for sheds under 120 square feet, an application is required, which is reviewed to ensure it is a portable shed. It can be placed within the back and side setbacks. On corner lots sheds cannot be within the optional enclosure area. Part of the reason for prohibited from the optional enclosure area is to protect sight lines. The Council has questioned whether it is necessary for corner lots to have to push their sheds back as far as required, whether the square footage limits are appropriate, and if applications should be required for small, portable sheds. Jeff Maag has asked for a definition of portable sheds. A non-portable shed would fall under the accessory building ordinance. The current building code defines a shed as being under 200 square feet. The city's ordinance was written when building code defined a shed as under 120 square feet and was not updated when building code increased the size of a shed. It may be helpful to tie the building code to the city's code. A few residents have started building a shed, but were told to stop because the sheds did not meet city ordinance. In defining a portable shed, some items to consider are flooring, how portable, does it need certain elements to allow it to be transported.

Trent Augustus stated that his feeling is that the Planning Commission should look at the current ordinance and make necessary modifications without rewriting the entire ordinance. One of the residents had an issue with a shed being constructed too close to the property line. Both residents that were told to stop building had sheds over 120 square feet.

C. Chandler asked that the two residents' issue be brought to the Planning Commission so they better understand what parts of the code may need to be updated. He doesn't feel like the Commission has enough information to know where to start. He asked that staff come up with some recommendations of specific portions to modify. He feels that more information and time is necessary for a recommendation as well as examples from other cities.

C. Steele stated that he feels the ordinance needs to be written in more detail. He has looked at the Payson City ordinance, and it raises a lot of questions that Cedar Hills' ordinance doesn't begin to address. He would like heights and contents of the shed to be addressed. He thinks it is a worthwhile project for the Planning Commission to address.

C. Driggs stated that as a property rights advocate, he doesn't want to broaden the scope of the ordinance.

5. Discussion on Planning Commission Compensation (7:28 p.m.) 9:32

C. Chandler asked that this be on the agenda. Both he and C. Clement were at a recent City Council meeting when the budget was being discussed. One item that came up was the \$3,200.00 that is set aside for compensation for the Planning Commission. The city isn't so strapped for cash that the small amount the Commissioners are paid would make

a big difference, but because finances are tight for the city, they both felt that they could do without the \$50.00 per meeting. Regardless of what the Commission decides, he is giving up his compensation. He didn't join the Planning Commission for the paycheck. C. Clement feels the same way. He recommended doing away with the Planning Commission compensation so the city can do something else with the money.

C. Driggs stated that when he joined the Commission he was asked for his tax information for payment. At that point he declined to be paid, and has not been getting paid. He sees no reason to be paid. He would suggest that the city budget for compensation, but Planning Commissioners can opt out.

C. Edvalson stated that she serves because she likes Cedar Hills, and does not need to be paid.

C. Steele stated that he has been a Planning Commissioner for over 10 years in several different cities. He was startled and thrilled that Cedar Hills values the contribution of the Commissioners. He joined the Commission to serve, but feels that the Planning Commission is often viewed as second class, without being recognized. The Commission contributes a lot to the city. His reaction when he was first compensated was that it was a really nice thing. He doesn't need the money. His suggestion is that the Council consider another way to compensate or recognize the Commission. If it were up to him he would continue to receive pay.

Trent Augustus stated that he appreciates what the Planning Commission does. No matter what they decide to do about compensation, the Council appreciates the work.

Greg Robinson stated that if the Commissioners would like to opt out, they should contact the finance department.

6. Committee Assignments and Reports (7:40 p.m.)
None.

ADJOURNMENT

7. This meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m. on a motion by C. Edvalson, seconded by C. Driggs and unanimously approved.

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey
Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder

Approved by Commission:
October 25, 2012