

11/17/22 Action Summary (approved 04/13/23)

#1 Updated Zoning Maps	Tabled
#2 Chapter 25 – Accessory Dwelling Units	Recommend approval with noted wording changes: Sent to CC
#3 Chapter 2 – Definitions of Waterwise Landscaping	Recommend approval: Sent to CC
#4 Chapter 19 – Sensitive Area District Overlay	Recommend approval: Sent to CC
#5 Alington Subdivision Prelim PUD	Discussion
#6 Development Agreement for Springfield Estates	Discussion: moved to Action Recommend approval: sent to CC
#7 Development Agreement for Willow Fields	Discussion: moved to Action Recommend approval: sent to CC
#8 Deseret Commons Subdivision - Discussion	Discussion

**MINUTES OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD 11/17/22.
THE MEETING WAS HELD IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL AT 429 EAST MAIN
STREET AND ON ZOOM.**

Commission Members Present: Brian Pattee, Jaime Topham, Gary Pinkham, John Limburg, Rick Barchers

Appointed Officers and Employees Present: Mayor Critchlow, City Manager Jesse Wilson, City Attorney Brett Coombs, Public Works Deputy Director Christy Montierth, City Engineer Dan England, Consultant Shay Stark, City Planning and Zoning Administrator Cavett Eaton, Planning and Zoning Administrative Assistant Lanise Thompson

Citizens and Guests Present: Barry Bunderson

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**COMMISSION CHAIR BRIAN PATTEE OFICIALLY CALLED THE MEETING TO
ORDER AT 7:05 PM**

PUBLIC HEARING:

- a. **PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE GRANTSVILLE CITY LAND USE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CODE BY ADOPTING UPDATED ZONING MAPS**
No comments
- b. **PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE GRANTSVILLE CITY LAND USE MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CODE BY ADOPTING CHAPTER 25 – ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT**
No comments
- c. **PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 2 DEFINITIONS OF XERISCAPE and WATERWISE LANDSCAPING IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY LAND USE CODE**
No comments

Approved 04/13/23

d. PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 19 SENSITIVE AREA DISTRICT OVERLAY IN THE GRANTSVILLE CITY LAND USE CODE

No comments

AGENDA:

1. Consideration to recommend approval of the Updated Zoning Maps

Shay Stark was present to explain the details and how the new maps were created. He expressed concern about the smaller 1 ½ acres with split zoning. If it doesn't have a clear purpose such as some lots on main with commercial and residential, he feels that we should try to clean these up.

Jaime agreed that it would be advisable.

Shay showed some examples. Many had the back 10 to 20 feet zoned A-10, which makes no sense. There was discussion on which zoning those lots should switch to and the need for public comment as well as working with the owners of said lots.

Brian wanted to know if this is for approval tonight or is this an ongoing project

Shay explained there are a few lots that have split zoning and is still working on these

Gary made mention of sending out notices to these owners letting them know they have a split zone lot.

Shay affirmed that we would need to do a public hearing for this. He would like to address all these before we approve these new maps.

Rick agreed with Gary's idea of sending out letter notices.

Brian clarified that the recommendation at this time is to wait on recommending approval until Shay has had time to properly address the split lot zoning issue.

Shay commented on past efforts to make the language in the General Plan, Land Use Codes and Zoning Maps all match. Special effort needs to be paid to MU, mixed use. Our small descriptions on the Zoning Map as sometimes too simplified and does not truly reflect the language of the code.

Gary agreed that is problematic to have the code or portions of the code in several places. He also pointed out that inevitably it gets changed in one place but not all the others.

Jaime asked if we can just list the titles and reference the code so we don't have to worry about making them match.

Rick had questions about the code for PUD.

Approved 04/13/23

Shay explained that PUD is not an actual zoning definition. Some of these odd zoning anomalies in new areas that were recently annexed are carry overs from county zoning. Most of these areas are in the North West FLUX area. He then talked a bit about “performance zoning”

Rick restated Shay’s explanation that we don’t have a PUD designation in our code

Gary asked that maybe we can get rid of the PUD on the map when we clean up the split zone lots

Shay explained that a lot of this will be resolved if the 6 -mile annexation goes through

Brian asked if this should be table at this time until after the split zoned lots are resolved and the 6-mile annexation goes through. Also look at removing definitions from the map and just reference the code sections

Gary agreed with the idea of fixing the split zoned lots and also suggested removing the PUD from the maps

Jaime asked if they should pass this with just a description change?

Jaime Topham made a motion to table this item until more work can be done. John Limburg seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously

2. Consideration to recommend approval of the Adoption of Chapter 25 – Accessory Dwelling Units

Shay again was present to explain and answer questions

Rick had a question about: 25.2.2 “Either the primary dwelling or the ADU must be occupied by the primary dwelling owner of record.” He thought the ADU had to be occupied by the non-owner.

Shay said the wording is straight from state law

Rick asked in 25.2.11 what is a DRC?

Shay explained that it is the Design Review Committee which is made up of city staff. All the development projects go through a DRC review prior to coming to the Planning Commission.

Rick – 25.2.12 .2 Question: “ADUs shall be limited in the multi-family (MR) zoning districts to single family dwelling lots.” So, any ADU in a MR zoning has to be on a lot that is for a single-family dwelling?

Shay – This again jives with state law

Rick had an “appeals process” question. Why not just go to Board of Adjustment and by pass Planning Commission?

Approved 04/13/23

Shay – the board will just laugh you out of the meeting. They have strict criteria

Brett – The board is the last word. If they deny the request it's done.

Jamie – 25.2.9 – why do they have to have a business license just to own it?

Brett – I don't think they need a business license just to own it, only need one if they market or rent the ADU.

Shay – We can just take out “to owe” and just have the “to rent”

Jamie Topham made a motion to recommend approval of the Adoption of Chapter 25 – Accessory Dwelling Units, with the change in 25.2.9 to read “The owner of an ADU shall be required to obtain a city business license to market or rent the ADU.” Gary Pinkham seconded the motion All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously

3. Consideration to recommend approval of the Proposed Amendment of Chapter 2 Definitions of Xeriscape and Waterwise Landscaping

Cavett was present to answer questions and explain the definitions as needed. He started with the addition of the Black flow preventer which is a new item added since that commissions last discussion.

Jaime Topham made a motion to recommend approval of the Proposed Amendment of Chapter 2 Definitions of Xeriscape and Waterwise Landscaping. Gary Pinkham seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Cavett mentioned the future need to address enforcement and creation of a definition of front lawn

4. Consideration to recommend approval of the Proposed Amendment of Chapter 19 – Sensitive Area District Overlay

Gary confirmed that the map matches the written description

Rick asked if 6-mile annexation is covered into this. Gary confirmed that yes, he is correct, this does not cover 6-mile annexation.

Jaime Topham made a motion to recommend approval of the Proposed Amendment of Chapter 19 – Sensitive Area District Overlay. Rick Barchers seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion of Preliminary Plat for Alington Subdivision PUD

Todd Castagno was unable to be present but was going to try to join on Zoom. He was unable to do so.

Approved 04/13/23

Gary said all of his concerns have been addressed.

Brian said since this was for discussion only they would continue without Todd.

Rick asked how much increase in commercial would satisfy you Jaime.

Dan said he thought the commercial was about 10% of the overall project. There has been discussion about possible more but because of where the sewer line for Desert Commons came through the property they wanted the street to follow that which limited the commercial area.

Since Todd was unable to answer any other question the discussion was closed.

6. Discussion of the Development Agreement for Springfield Estates

Barry Bunderson was present to represent Shane Watson

Gary had a question concerning number of units. Why is there just five (5)?

Brett explained that we can leave it at five (5). If we change it to all 30+ lots you would be approving all those lots in advance. This is a Master Agreement. When Mr. Watson is ready to continue with the other lots we can add an addendum.

Jaime found an error in the labeling of the exhibits to the addendum.

Jaime Topham made a motion to move the Development Agreement for Springfield Estates to an action item. Gary Pinkham seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Jaime Topham made a motion to recommend approval of the Development Agreement for Springfield Estates with correct labels of the exhibits to the addendum. Gary Pinkham seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

7. Discussion of Development Agreement for Willow Fields

Rick asked for an approximate location of where this is in the city.

Jaime Topham made a motion to move the Development Agreement for Willow Fields to an action item. Gary Pinkham seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Jaime Topham made a motion to recommend approval of the Development Agreement for Willow Fields with the address added. John Limburg seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion of Concept Plan for Deseret Commons Subdivision (re-designed)

Jeff explained that they have focused on the comments. Most were concerning open space. Rather than townhomes and apartment we have shifted to smaller home lots. City won't have to maintain the open space as this will be HOA maintained. There are trails between the different parks. They have different types of parks, some with playground equipment, others with a more tranquil place to sit. Road we will remove the park strip but maintain the 35' asphalt. Made changes for Fire vehicles. Their goal was to increase open space, snow storage, fire vehicle room.

The parks will be under a PID. They have continued to work with UDOT on access to SR112.

Brian asked if the pictures are the same as what is being proposed?

Jeff explained that samples in these pictures have smaller roads. All the roads are 25'

Rick asked how do residences get to the starts of the trails? Is there on street parking?

Jeff explained that the private narrower roads will not have on street parking. All public streets will have on street parking.

Rick explained that he understands this is a PUD but one of the reasons our codes with regard to setback are written the way they are is to mitigate concerns about parking.

Gary had concerns about snow removal.

Lisa explained that on the private street they have set aside locations for the snow to be piled up. Secondly, they will widen SR 112 and use the swell to store the snow. They majority of these are south facing so they will melt faster. They can also stock pile snow in the parks.

Brian asked about entrances. Are there two (2) entrances from SR 112? Will Lambs Lane will one day have a light?

Lisa confirmed that yes there will be two (2) entrances

Lisa returned to the discussion of the setbacks. They will look at the set back again.

Brian was concerned that with small setbacks that a truck will stick out over the sidewalk.

Jeff clarified that all street that are under the 38' of asphalt are not public roads. Those that are 38' or more will be public roads, more open space.

Approved 04/13/23

Jeff explained they feel that they will be providing a superior product by changes to detached single homes, more open space, HOA maintained parks.

Jeff stated they currently planning for 841

Rick stated that he is not super concerned with the density. He is more concerned with the setbacks.

Gary stated that he feels the lots are significantly smaller than what the zoning allows.

Jaime stated that her main concern is, "I know you are trying to create a place where people stay in this development their whole life. I am interested in more rental. We need more apartments."

Rick asked where do the kids play?

Jaime made some observations that there are a few errors on their chart.

9. Report from City Council liaison Mayor Critchlow

Please get with Gina Francom about the Christmas party

Xeriscape is a good addition

10. Adjourn

Jaime Topham made a motion to adjourn the meeting. John Limburg seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 PM