Administrative Offices
4600 So. Weber River Drive
Riverdale, Utah 84405

Minutes of the **Regular Meeting** of the **Riverdale City Planning Commission** held Tuesday, **March 11, 2008** at 6:30 pm at the Riverdale Civic Center, 4600 South Weber Drive.

Members Present:

Don Farr, Chair
Brent Ellis, Member
David Gailey, Member
Blair Jones, Member
Allen Miller, Member
Norm Searle, Member
Bart Stevens, Member

Others Present:

Randy Daily, Community Development Director
Marie Alvord, Planning Commission Secretary
Approximately four (4) Citizens

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Farr welcomed everyone present and noted that all Planning Commission members were present.

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES.
Comments and changes were requested in the preplanning meeting.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to approve the Preplanning and Regular meeting minutes of February 26, 2008 with corrections noted and waive the reading of the minutes. Commissioner Gailey seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC HEARING: REZONE REQUEST FROM R-1-8/RESIDENTIAL TO C-3/COMMERCIAL, LOCATED AT 4250 SOUTH 300 WEST.

Chairman Farr noted that the rezone request was noticed properly and opened the public hearing requesting all comments to be limited to three minutes.

The public hearing was opened.
No comment was given.

Motion: Commissioner Gailey moved to close the public hearing for rezone request from R-1-8/Residential to C-3/Commercial, located at 4250 South 300 West. Commissioner Ellis seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously

4. CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF REZONE REQUEST FROM R-1-8/RESIDENTIAL TO C-3/COMMERCIAL, LOCATED AT 4250 SOUTH 300 WEST.

Mr. Daily referenced the executive summary which states: General Plan Land Use Master Plan Map identifies this area as being Planned Commercial High. Because this property is in a Redevelopment Area the RDA board reviews and approves all proposed use requests, therefore it is staffs recommendation that this property be zoned C-3. Ms. Penny Clements, petitioner, stated that she wants to rezone to allow for a salon. She already owns the piece of property and is currently working on access. Discussion was held on parcel size and access.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to recommend approval of the proposed rezone from R-1-8/Residential to C-3/Commercial located at 4250 South 300 West. Commissioner Searle seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

5. CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN, PARKS RIVERWALK SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT 4345 SOUTH 600 WEST. THIS ITEM WAS TABLED FEBRUARY 12, 2008.

Mr. Daily noted that to discuss a tabled item the Planning Commission must first make a motion to remove it from the table.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to take the preliminary site plan, Parks Riverwalk Subdivision located at 4345 South 600 West from the table for discussion. Commissioner Ellis seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Daily noted that there have been some good changes to the preliminary site plan since the last plan was submitted. He said Mr. Hill and Mr. Parks have accommodated the Planning Commission's requests from the previous meeting, specifically citing the change in open space, detention pond, and hammer head turn around. Mr. Daily stated that in his opinion the site plan meets the requirements and intent of the PRUD ordinance and he recommends that it be approved as a preliminary plan so the developers may submit the plan for engineering review and request approval from the Public Works Department and Fire Department.

Commissioner Gailey noted that he was unable to locate fire hydrants on the preliminary site plan. Mr. Hill reviewed fire hydrant locations. Mr. Daily noted that the Fire Department will review to ensure the appropriate location and number of hydrants will be installed in the development. He also noted that they will be presented on the final site plan. Commissioner Stevens asked if the development will be selling individual lots not just pad sites. It was indicated that individual lots will be sold. Commissioner Stevens also asked if there will be a zero lot line. Mr. Hill noted that there will be a five foot side yard setback. Discussion was held on the aesthetics of the development and CC&R's. Commissioner Searle recommended that the single sidewalk through the community be moved to the other side of the road so that the majority of the residents will not need to cross the street to use the sidewalk. Mr. Hill stated that it would not be difficult to change the location of the sidewalk and that they would look into the change. Discussion was held on the process that would take place if two lots were combined or any other change to the site plan.

Commissioner Miller asked if a time limit has been set for the completion of the PRUD. Mr. Hill stated that the original contract with the City requires the PRUD to be completed in five (5) years. Chairman Farr noted that in his opinion the lots should be lifted above flood level and require a sub-surface drain piped to each individual home. He requested that the engineers look at this issue because there can be a lot of water in the

area. Commissioner Miller referenced City ordinance 10-22-5E which requires an escrow on the development and common space to be completed within two years. Mr. Daily noted that the common space will need to be completed at the beginning of the development Discussion was held on completion of the PRUD. Commissioner Miller asked if fencing and accessory buildings will be allowed in the development. Mr. Daily noted that it is required that the entire development will be fenced but as far as fencing around individual lots that would be up to the association which will be dictated in the CC&R's. Discussion was held on accessory buildings. It was noted that the Planning Commission may place a condition of size on the accessory buildings. Chairman Farr noted a concern with the entrance to the PRUD for the curb and gutter. He noted that it ends abruptly and it looks incomplete. He asked who would be responsible for street improvement and who will maintain the area. Mr. Daily noted that this area is a right-of-way easement off the end of the road that has been recorded with Weber County which is outside of the development. He continued to state that Mr. Parks and Mr. Hill have asked about what would happen with the land. Mr. Daily recommended that they allow Mr. Hill and Mr. Parks maintain the land while it remains City owned. Chairman Farr requested that this issue be further discussed and determine who will be financially responsible for the street improvements and maintenance of the area. A general discussion was held on the fence around the perimeter of the PRUD, gate, and road width. Chairman Farr expressed concern for the elevation of lots 13, 14, and 15. He requested that the City Engineer consider those lots specifically in relation to the overall draining of the subdivision.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to approve the preliminary site plan for Parks Riverwalk Subdivision located at 4345 South 600 West with the following set of conditions: accessory buildings to be no larger than 8' by 8', maintain entrance way in from 600 West into the PRUD and that the CCR's depict these conditions. Along with a findings that determine who will maintain property to the east of the roadway between the existing house and entrance to the PRUD. Commissioner Gailey seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

6. CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, CHAPTER 16: SIGN REGULATIONS. THIS ITEM WAS TABLED FEBRUARY 26, 2008.

Motion: Commissioner Ellis moved to take the proposed amendments to Title 10, Chapter 16: Sign Regulations from the table for discussion. Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Daily gave a history of the sign ordinance and noted that it is in need of revising due to Riverdale Road. He continued to state that sign enforcement is not hard for permanent signs but portable signs are more difficult. Mr. Daily noted that all signs require a permit. Chairman Farr asked if the new ordinance will have any effect on the signs that will be affected by the widening of Riverdale Road. Mr. Daily said that it is related to the widening of Riverdale Road and that all signs must comply with the new ordinance. He also noted that the biggest change is the proximity of pole signs to property line. Commissioner Ellis asked if the changes will affect the political signs that are left up after an election. Mr. Daily said Utah State Law regulates political signs in relationship to poling places and safety issues. The City may regulate on city owned property but do not get involved in other areas because it could be viewed as discriminatory. Discussion was held on code followed – ICC and what will make a damaged sign reparable or need to be complete replaced. Commissioner Searle recommended the words "shall be removed, repaired, or replaced" be added to the dialogue.

General discussion was held on code enforcement with not only signage but in all aspects of the City's ordinance. It was noted that a better system should be created for the city and recommendations were made to look at the enforcement policy of St. George, UT.

Motion: Commissioner Searle moved that the Planning Commission forward the proposed amendments to Title 10, Chapter 16: Sign Regulations to the City Council and recommend approval. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

7. CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, CHAPTER 25: COMMERCIAL AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENTS. THIS ITEM WAS TABLED FEBRUARY 28, 2008.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to take the proposed amendments to Title 10, Chapter 25: Commercial and Manufacturing Developments from the table for discussion. Commissioner Gailey seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Daily noted that the residential subdivision ordinance is lacking in some development standards and by changing chapter 25 to include residential along with commercial and manufacturing the residential development standards will be more inclusive. Chairman Farr asked if the City is protected from storage unit developments. Mr. Daily noted that in Senate Bill 60 it dictates that any use that is not specified in the ordinance is not an allowable use in the zone. The City does not have storage units within any of the zones and therefore is not an allowable use within the City. Commissioner Searle noted that any proposed developments should be in the best interest of the public and feel this is a positive change to include residential to chapter 25, citing Item B.

Motion: Commissioner Miller moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Title 10, Chapter 25: Commercial and Manufacturing Developments. Commissioner Searle seconded the motion.

Call the Question:
The motion passed unanimously.

8. DISCRETIONARY BUSINESS

Commissioner Gailey noted concern for the housing and building market. He asked what options the City has if new developments remain vacant or subdivisions unfinished. Mr. Daily said he is also concerned and noted that he has spoke with the City Administrator specifically about vacant commercial buildings, Toys R US and Macy's. He said he is uncertain on what power cities have and hopes that developers will look at the market before they dive into something that cannot be completed. Commissioner Gailey specifically voiced concern for the proposed PRUD's and noted that it is a matter for concern.

Commissioner Searle noted that he is uncomfortable with the current PRUD Ordinance and would like to review the ordinance. Mr. Daily stated that no ordinance is perfect and if the Planning Commission sees need for additions or changes then it should be reviewed. Chairman Farr said he does not like PRUD's that are similar to small subdivisions with designated property lines. Mr. Daily asked if the Planning Commission felt the ordinance needs to be changed and made more specific. It was noted that further revision is needed for the PRUD Ordinance.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Commissioner Miller moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Gailey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:09 pm.

Attest:

_____

Marie Alvord,
Planning Commission Secretary

Approved:

_____

Don Farr, Chair