

Smithfield City Planning Commission

July 15, 2015

MINUTES

The Planning Commission of Smithfield City, Utah met at the City Council Chambers, 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah at 7:00 p.m. on **Wednesday, July 15, 2015**. The following members were present constituting a quorum:

Chairperson	Jamie Anderson
Commission Members	Bryant McKay
	Curtis Wall
	Pete Krusi
	Doug Archibald
	Steven Teuscher
	Steve Edwards
Engineering Staff	Clay Bodily
Planning Staff	Jon Wells
Deputy Recorder	Char Izatt
Minutes	Stacey DORITY

The notice was provided to the Herald Journal and delivered to each Commission Member and posted at the City Office Building, the Smithfield City Web Page and the Utah Public Meeting Notice web site.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Anderson at 7:00 pm

Opening Ceremonies: Craig Ricks

Visitors: John Krusi, Hollee Krusi, Matt Redd, Craig Ricks, Tracey Ricks, Eric Bingham, Darcy Damstedt, Susan Hyer, Jeff Jackson & Blake Dursteler

Excused: Brent Buttars, Councilman & Jackie Hancock, Commissioner

Workshop session: Speaker: Matt Redd – Owner of Sign Pro and Smithfield Resident

Topic: Signage

Mr. Matt Redd owner of Sign Pro has lived in Smithfield for 18 years. He has reviewed the updates on the temporary signage code he felt he had a unique perspective because he is a sign company owner and a resident of Smithfield. As he reviewed the temporary signage code it

looks like everything is workable and not a hindrance to business owners. He wanted to discuss the mobile wraps which is a big part of his business right now and felt he could address that the best. Vehicle wraps and graphics are a recent development. You can wrap just about anything and it is a great way to advertise especially for small businesses. A business can have between 30-50 thousand impressions in a single day in metropolitan areas. The cost of a thousand impressions is the lowest that he knows of; 15 cents per thousand impressions. Compare that to the cost of billboard or radio which is six dollars and newspapers are almost twelve dollars. Another aspect of car wraps is they advertise 24/7 365 days a year so it totals out to \$2 a day to advertise. The problem with car wraps is when the advertising becomes immobile. As a citizen and business owner he has three concerns. 1) If he drives his sign pro truck home he doesn't want to be told he can't park it in his driveway. 2) He doesn't want someone to park their wrapped vehicle on private property using it as a billboard. 3) He doesn't want someone who abuses the right to ruin it for everyone because it is a great advertising tool. As he has researched how the wraps have been regulated in different states he found the main concept is if it is mobile the DOT (Department of Transportation) and states can't do much about it. When it is immobile and stays in the same place then it is considered a sign and that is how they treat it. The problem is enforcing and defining how long vehicles stay in one area. There are plenty of examples of vehicles sitting in private lots becoming billboards throughout the valley.

Commissioner Wall inquired how many people come to their business for sign wraps.

Mr. Redd explained it is the booming business right now. An electrician came in to have his truck wrapped and then two days later he came back and said it had already paid for itself with a neighbor across the street seeing the sign and offering two more days of work for him. It is very effective tool. As a citizen he felt timing regulations on how long vehicles could sit on lots for advertising would be a good way to control.

Chairperson Anderson replied in essence wraps are an advertisement, a business expense, and a tax right off for that person and a mobile billboard.

Mr. Redd responded the mobile part of it is okay if it is not parked in someone's private property being a billboard. The Cache Valley Transit is now advertising with their buses. He talked about the insurance man in Logan who parked his truck and trailer every day in front of the Tabernacle. It became a nuisance to the city. It is tough to regulate and it probably lost him business because it is obnoxious and taken to far. The school district is also looking at putting advertising on their buses to bring in extra money.

Commissioner Wall had talked with someone at the district and they have talked about putting signs on school buses. They just haven't put it into place.

Mrs. Izatt said the key word is moving.

Commissioner Edwards didn't want to get over regulated with the ordinance. If it is moving it is okay, but if it is left on the side of the road then it does become a problem.

Mr. Redd added based on what he had seen from a DOT standpoint if a vehicle is on a major thoroughfare or state highway it can be regulated.

Mrs. Izatt replied the regulation is 48 hrs. for a vehicle to be moved. Enforcement is the difficult part. As neighborly as Mr. Edwards is to allow his neighbor to have his wrapped car in their driveway each night if there were ten neighbors with wrapped cars parked on the streets and driveway he might reconsider.

Commissioner Wall what do you think we will see in the future as far as signage that we may not be aware of.

Mr. Redd felt the LED screens will be a bigger item. The problem with those is they command attention and distract. They need to have regulations where they are dimmed at certain hours.

Mrs. Izatt questioned Mr. Redd's opinion of putting a big computer monitor in the window as a business with the flashing and scrolling advertising.

Mr. Redd thought it would be considered a sign. He talked about a vinyl that has a tint that you can see through. Looking in through the window it looks solid so that would help the glare and distraction of flashing computer screens. He was happy to be a resource for the commission if needed.

Mrs. Izatt inquired if anyone was going to sit in on the non-conforming webinar. She felt it would be very worthwhile. She informed them that training will be quarterly and she would like topics of what the commission would like to discuss.

Chairperson Anderson thought the master planning was discussed a few months ago so maybe the steps to making a more effective master plan.

Mr. Bodily mentioned Craig Giles, City Manager, is working on getting finances to updating the Master Plan.

Mrs. Izatt explained they updated the plan in 2008. It is worth the cost to update it. Is there any specific area in the General Plan that you would like to discuss? Sewer, water, transportation and land use.

Mr. Bodily wasn't sure if trails would be included however he listed all the other items in the Master Plan. As far as expansion and need for trails do you feel it would be worth visiting the trail plan?

Commissioner Krusi thought the citizens of Smithfield would be very interested in what is happening with the Master Plan.

Mrs. Izatt mentioned anyone could come in and read what is existing now with the trail plan and Mr. Bodily could explain what is outlined now and what we might want to see.

Mr. Bodily explained they could discuss what is planned in the existing plan. There are roads that have been divided to show the bicycle path.

Chairperson Anderson inquired of any other topics for training. He would like to look at the updated land use laws that went through legislation after each Legislative session.

Mrs. Izatt explained they have created a committee to see the impact of how the land use laws have impacted the areas. She could forward the emails to everyone and they could read up on the laws.

Resident Input

No Resident Input

Consideration of Consent Agenda Minutes of June 17, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting

After consideration by the Planning Commission, the Chairperson declared the consent agenda for the June 17, 2015 planning commission meeting minutes as approved.

Public Hearing to consider a rezone request by Rigo Chaparro & Jesse Vega, agents for Gary Hansen, (Parcel No. 08-044-0006, 4.8 acres) located at approximately 700 North Main from A-10 (Agricultural- 10 Acre) to RM (Multiple Family Residential)

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:30 pm

Mr. Rigo Chaparro informed the commission he would like to put apartments on this property. He would like to request a rezone for multi-family. They have looked at a lot of different options for this area but it is not very popular for business so they have decided to go for the multi-family. They have also considered single family residential but the amount you would have

to charge would be higher like something you would purchase on 10th east with a hillside view included. Financially it would be better as apartments or townhomes.

Chairperson Anderson questioned if there was any thought to how many units would be put there.

Mr. Chaparro replied it would hold 11 units or 44 apartments or 11 residential homes would fit there. It is the Gateway to the city and we can break it up with different colors and make it pleasing to the eye. He met with a Council Member who was concerned with not needing more apartments. He has put research into the way you build the apartments and the materials used to make it pleasing to the eye.

Commissioner Teuscher inquired if the only access is on Main Street.

Mr. Chaparro replied yes and he has talked to UDOT about bringing 800 north straight through. He talked with Gary Hansen about taking his street to the west straight through. He also is considering connecting in with 200 west. Smithfield is growing and the farmers may be willing to allow portions to be annexed in.

Commissioner Teuscher was concerned about Main Street being so busy and with the apartments only having one access that would add to the traffic problems.

Commissioner Krusi asked Mr. Wells if that many units would be okay with just one road access to the highway.

Mr. Wells explained once you exceed 30 dwelling units you need to have two ways in and out. That is a fire code issue. If there is a cul-de-sac the maximum distance is 550 ft.

Commissioner Wall remembered the discussion of funneling traffic to Oak Street.

Mr. Chaparro replied if the Gyllenskog family wants to work with him on the access road that would be a possibility.

Ms. Judy Mitton informed the commission she owns the property to the north of this property. She thinks she speaks for almost everyone in that area. They don't want apartments in there. It is using a lot of the city resources for not much in return. You will have sewer, water and police needs for just a few units that don't create a lot of taxes. The traffic issue will be a problem, she is the one that could give some property for another access street but she is not willing if it is multi-family. Single residents are more pleasing because they blend in with the residents to the south. Oak Street has a lot of children on that street and additional traffic would be a danger to

those children. The storage units that were first proposed would be okay but it isn't very pleasing to the gateway. It might be wise to use it for business. There are already so many apartments and condos in the city already. When you look behind Lee's it is just ugly with all the apartments there. She felt this isn't a benefit to the city only to the developer. She looked on the web for Real Estate today and found the condos are the big thing going right now. It would be a shame to put in 44 more units and 4 people per unit that would be a lot of people for such a small area.

Mr. Eric Bingham lives on Oak Street. He counted 25 children that are out every day on the sidewalks in the area that the street would be coming through. It is one of the access points for all those homes. The town homes across the street have 11 for sale signs and a rental signs. They don't resale so they rent out and building more town homes will just make that a bigger problem.

Mr. Chad Brown lives on Oak Street the property in question is in his backyard. He is concerned with property value with the apartments there. He agrees this is not pleasing aesthetically as you come into the city. Single family homes would be a better idea. He would like to see the land left alone so he could enjoy his view and have privacy; that is why he bought the area. He knew there was a potential to grow but he feels apartments are degrading. Commercial would be a second alternative to the single family.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:47 pm

Commissioner Archibald would like to see it stay a nice commercial piece of property. Cantwell Lumber is gone and headed into the multi-family zone now.

Commissioner Edwards was concerned with the traffic going onto Main Street or Oak Street. There isn't a benefit to the families there. UDOT giving them access on to the highway doesn't seem possible.

Commissioner Krusi was concerned with access as well.

Mr. Bodily explained UDOT did allow access at one point on the property almost in line with the Rocky Mountain Power. The lane would require a traffic study if it is commercial or a deceleration lane depending on how many units were built. It is not a road that we have planned for in our transportation plan so it would be up to UDOT as far as what the use was.

Commissioner McKay inquired if there was discussion about 800 North as an access.

Mr. Bodily referred to the map and showed utilities that were already there and said it wasn't considered that strongly.

Chairperson Anderson summarized as a commission they have to consider the rights of the land owners. Property values aren't something they can disregard an item for. He explained this property has been annexed into Smithfield. Options for a motion are to approve the rezone to multi-family or to deny it with the reasons being stated for why it is being denied.

Mrs. Izatt explained on a land use rezone if the commission does not act within 30 days it will clear as an approval.

Commissioner Krusi disclosed his brother lives on Oak Street.

Commissioner Wall wanted to clarify. If they approve the motion they can rezone it to multi-family and have 30 apartments with one access or find another access and create more units.

Mr. Wells mentioned they allow up to 10 units per acre. He could put 48 units on his acreage. As far as homes that depends on roads and lot sizes, potentially 15 single family homes.

Commissioner Edwards felt they had to make sure Mr. Chaparro could fulfill what he would like to do before they approve the rezone. He didn't want to put him in a position where he was stuck with the property and not able to do anything with it.

Chairperson Anderson reminded the commission that would be taken care of at the preliminary plat approval when Mr. Chaparro would bring in a concept plan of what he would like to do.

Mrs. Izatt explained there aren't a lot of choices. Commercial is not a draw for this area. Once they do the General Plan their will be discussion on this area. Did we ever discuss the opportunity of putting storage units there?

Chairperson Anderson replied yes we talked about those two months ago. Due to the ordinance of how far they had to be set back off the highway that was okay and there was going to be a commercial building in front of that and his proposed tenant fell through so they are looking for an alternative because they don't have someone that would use the commercial space.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Wall to deny a rezone request by Rigo Chaparro & Jesse Vega, agents for Gary Hansen, (Parcel No. 08-044-0006, 4.8 acres) located at approximately 700 North Main from A-10 (Agricultural- 10 Acre) to RM (Multiple Family Residential) the reason for denial is not wanting Multi-family in that Gateway area.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKay. A roll call vote was taken.

McKay – Yes; multiple resident will not fit there as a Gateway entrance

Wall – Yes, Gateway

Krusi – Yes; traffic issues

Anderson – No

Archibald – Yes; should be commercial

Teuscher – Yes; traffic issues

Edwards – Yes; traffic and access

Chairperson Anderson explained the rezone request was denied the options are an appeal to the City Council and Mrs. Izatt can help you through that process.

Public Hearing to consider a Conditional Use Permit application from Craig H. Ricks, agent for CTR LLC, to allow a four (4) lot minor subdivision/intrablock development located at 354 North & 358 North 100 East. Zoned R-1-10.

The Public Hearing opened at 8:04 pm.

Mr. Craig Ricks explained they have had the property since the mid 70's and for about seven years they have not had horses on the property. It has been a maintenance nightmare so they have debated for the last eight years of what would be the best use of the property. They would like to have two intrablock lots; each lot being 0.4 acres. He feels it is consistent with the blocks around and it would be a good use of the property for their benefit and the city's tax base. They have had professionals look at it and show how it would be used.

Chairperson Anderson was confused of where the access point would be.

Mr. Ricks explained in between the two existing homes of lots one and two have enough frontage space to grant an easement to allow access into lots three and four. He owns the property right now.

Commissioner Krusi asked does the road go to a T or does it have to have a turn around?

Mr. Wells explained Mr. Ricks has decided on a hammerhead. It is considered a driveway instead of a public road.

Chairperson Anderson invited anyone from the audience that would like to discuss this petition.

There was no audience comment.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:08 pm

Commissioner Edwards assessed if all the city requirements had been met.

Mr. Bodily replied yes they have looked at the area with their subdivision review committee and everything was in compliance.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Krusi to approve a Conditional Use Permit application for Craig H. Ricks, agent for CTR LLC, to allow a four (4) lot minor subdivision/intrablock development located at 354 North & 358 North 100 East. Zoned R-1-10.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tuescher. The voting was unanimous.

Commissioners voting in favor: McKay, Wall, Krusi, Anderson, Archibald, Teuscher, Edwards.

Brett Robinson has requested discussion with the Commission in regards to a proposed rezone of property currently zoned RA-1 (Residential Agricultural-1 Acre) to RM (Multiple Family Residential), the property (.36 acre is located approximately on 257 North 300 East.

Mr. Brett Robinson explained this property is .36 acres located across the street from Jack Parson's ready mix. It has been in his uncle's name for many years. The piece on the corner was rezoned to multi-family. They are exploring the possibilities for this land. It has a slope so he thought maybe duplex or triplex units would be best. There are eight units on the piece next to it which is twice as big as this lot. He felt he could physically get two or three units on this area. He would like to know how the public and commission feel about it. His initial thought was to use a duplex with three to five bedrooms. He would like feedback before they head into a public hearing.

Commissioner Krusi questioned what the maximum units would be for this space.

Mr. Wells explained three units would be his maximum.

Commissioner Archibald was concerned with the access that would be off to the east. He asked Mr. Robinson if he had considered the snow conditions?

Mr. Robinson responded if he did a duplex he would face it towards the street with a triplex it would have to be sideways.

Commissioner Archibald encouraged him to come by the property at 7:00 am and see how noisy it is with the trucks starting up and the Parson's Company getting started in the morning and also late at night. It is something to be considered as you rent.

Mrs. Izatt explained the next step would be an application for a rezone and that would require a public hearing.

Mr. Robinson thanked the commission for their time.

Jeff Jackson, Ironwood Development Group, LC, agent for Jessica Tams Quinton, property owner, has requested approval of Phase 2 of the Final Plat for Smithfield Heights Subdivision (9 lots) located at approximately 730 East and 550 North. Zoned R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 sf)

Jeff Jackson explained this is part of a three phase subdivision they did in the spring. The overall concept was approved in the spring and they are here for the final plat of phase two. They have addressed all the engineering departments concerns.

Chairperson Anderson inquired if city staff was happy.

Mr. Bodily replied yes.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Krusi to approve the request by Jeff Jackson, Ironwood Development Group, LC, agent for Jessica Tams Quinton, property owner, to approve Phase 2 of the Final Plat for Smithfield Heights Subdivision (9 lots) located at approximately 730 East and 550 North. Zoned R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 sf)

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Edwards. The voting was unanimous.

Commissioners voting in favor: McKay, Wall, Krusi, Anderson, Archibald, Teuscher, Edwards.

Blake Dursteler & Ryan Reeves, agents for VEFINA LLC, have requested approval of a two (2) lot minor subdivision located at approximately 600 South 100 East. Zoned CC (Community Commercial) & RM (Multiple Family Residential)

Blake Dursteler explained this is the Cantwell Lumber piece and they are trying to get two lots on this property so they can begin the design and engineering. The anticipation is there would be separate owners on the front parcel and the back parcel based on the interest currently. Their desire is to petition for a minor subdivision that would be lot two which is the multi-family and lot one which would stay as the commercial piece on Main Street.

Chairperson Anderson inquired if that was the multi-family that they did about seven years ago.

Mr. Dursteler explained Mr. Champlin's property is to the west of the one we are discussing. The piece they are discussing is 8.94 acres and the commercial piece is over 1 ¾ acres and the balance is lot 2 which is the multi-family piece which touches 100 east.

Chairperson Anderson clarified this basically gives you access to start doing things on this property.

Mr. Dursteler replied yes it allows us to separate the multi-family from the commercial given the different interests that would be there and allow them to begin the engineering jointly with the parties that have interest on the back and front of the said properties.

Mr. Bodily wanted to comment that during the subdivision process is when they get the infrastructure. When the subdivision is approved you are approving it on the condition that they put in the part of first east not the sidewalk but the balance of the road with curb and gutter. The little grey piece is owned by Craig Champlin and he has entertained the idea of giving it to the city. They are in discussion with Mr. Champlin to see if they can get the dog leg section out of there.

Chairperson Anderson summarized they need to put in curb, gutter and sidewalk on the west side of 100 east and curb and gutter on the east of 100 east up to where the property ends at the Krusi property.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Wall for Blake Dursteler & Ryan Reeves, agents for VEFINA LLC, to approve a two (2) lot minor subdivision located at approximately 600 South 100 East. Zoned CC (Community Commercial) & RM (Multiple Family Residential) including sidewalk, curb, gutter on the west side and curb and gutter on the east side of 100 east.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKay. The voting was unanimous.

Commissioners voting in favor: McKay, Wall, Krusi, Anderson, Archibald, Teuscher, Edwards.

Susan Hyer has requested approval for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a home based beauty salon to be located at 496 North 600 East. Zoned R-1-12.

Mrs. Susan Hyer explained her home is under construction with an access from the garage or outside entrance there is not another entrance from inside the house.

Chairperson Anderson inquired how many customers she would have at any given time and if the parking is adequate.

Mrs. Hyer explained possibly two customers at a time and she has a three car garage.

Chairperson Anderson inquired if there will be a cement pad to the garage with a sidewalk to the salon.

Mrs. Hyer replied yes and the hours of operation would be 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 pm. Monday – Thursday.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Teuscher to approve the request by Susan Hyer for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a home based beauty salon to be located at 496 North 600 East. Zoned R-1-12; with the hours being 9:00 am – 7:00 pm, Monday – Thursday.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Krusi. The voting was unanimous.

Commissioners voting in favor: McKay, Wall, Krusi, Anderson, Archibald, Teuscher, Edwards.

The Commission will review & discuss Ordinance #125-14 which amends the Smithfield City Subdivision Regulations, Title 16 in particular Chapters 16.05 “Concept Plans”; 16.06 “Minor Subdivisions”; 16.09 “Preliminary Plats”; and amending the Smithfield City Zoning regulations, Title 17 in particular Chapter 17.84 “Intrablock Development”.

Chairperson Anderson began at the concept plan submittal and stated we are asking for electronic format. He considered if we want to specify the format such as pdf or does it matter.

Mr. Bodily replied as long as it was the most popular formats we can display and print them all. If we specify too much and some new technology comes in we will have to change the ordinance.

Mr. Wells mentioned we can put it in a policy and tell them how they want it submitted and then if it is changed we don't have to request the change from the commission.

Chairperson Anderson was curious as to why they are striking the timing of this where it says fifteen days prior to the planning commission meeting.

Mr. Bodily responded it still has to come in to the subdivision review committee. It shouldn't take extra time for the commission to respond to it.

Mr. Wells explained they are trying to streamline the process for the commission. Based on the training we are going to over the last 20 years, the commission should do more planning and ordinance changes rather than all the technical things that have to be done when the developers come in. This committee would take a look at everything first before it is brought to the commission.

Chairperson Anderson inquired who was involved with the committee.

Mr. Bodily explained the committee consists of the fire department, public works, engineering department and Mrs. Izatt and a building official. We would like to invite someone from the planning commission to come but they meet during the day. That is why the sentence is being taken out because if it is fifteen days before you meet it doesn't coincide with the subdivision review committee. It is still fifteen days but not necessarily before the day you meet. It is a little more informal and each person has their specialty to find any hidden problems that may need to be addressed. As you go through the ordinance it streamlines the minor subdivisions, so if there is no engineering involved they basically submit a record survey.

Commissioner Teuscher summarized the committee would take care of the technical details and the commission could see where it is and what is being proposed and go from there.

Mr. Bodily replied yes. There was a preliminary plat that came in and he had asked them several times to put in the improvements on the street on their preliminary plat and they didn't. The commission was faced with an uncomfortable situation trying to determine if it should be approved with those conditions. It turned out to be to the advantage of the people who were doing the preliminary that it wasn't approved because they would have had to change it. If they don't do those improvements then the subdivision review committee will stop it there and it will not come to the planning commission.

Commissioner Wall inquired how often the review committee meets.

Mr. Bodily replied the meetings were held twice a month. It is a review for the planning commission and the council. It helps the committee foresee problems before it gets to the commission and council.

Mrs. Izatt explained they meet regularly on the first and third Wednesdays at 8:00 a.m. if any of the commission wanted to attend they would be welcome.

Mr. Bodily added the meetings are a lot more informative and they look at things very critically. The city recorder has entertained the idea to give commissioners a key if the change is made to have you come and pick up your mail for the meetings.

Chairperson Anderson had another question on ordinance 16.05.040 where it says a complete concept application must be received and accepted by the city prior to a date approximately one month to the STRC meeting in which the applicant desires the project be discussed.

Mr. Bodily explained even if it wasn't a month before our meeting if the engineering department or Mrs. Izatt saw anything that was a problem we would try to get that fixed before the review committee took a look at it. The month isn't much different from the time before.

Chairperson Anderson was concerned with pushback from developers.

Mr. Bodily answered we always have pushback from developers.

Mr. Wells added we are trying to streamline the process for the commission not the developers.

Chairperson had another question under required conditions and improvements on page two. It says the infrastructure to be installed does not require engineering if the water storm sewer and curb are exclusively controlled by the building code or not considered to be under the city's stewardship after installation. When wouldn't it be under the city's stewardship?

Mr. Wells explained if you are looking at a commercial development like O'Reilly's Auto Parts they wouldn't necessarily have to do engineering on that curb and gutter but they will have to figure out a way to take care of their storm water. It will be a rare instance that there is not going to be engineering involved.

Mr. Bodily used an example from the Roger Cantwell and Don Barringer discussions where they had their personal sewer but it wasn't a sewer main and there wasn't any engineering involved; they would apply. The Cantwell Co. is just a two lot split so they could have gotten away with a record survey but they had to do engineering and put in the infrastructure. It would eliminate them from just having a record survey. Theirs would have engineering where the Barringers and Roger Cantwells would not.

Mr. Wells commented it was engineering for a sewer lateral and didn't have anything to do with any other infrastructure.

Mr. Bodily explained the sewer lateral was controlled by the building code. It had to be 2%. Roger Cantwells was controlled by the building code.

Chairperson Anderson looked at page 3 paragraph C if it read right. Prior to reviewing the final plat or record survey in the recommendation to the planning committee the city council shall

present the final plat or record survey to the culinary water and sanitary sewer authority for review; upon receiving approval from the STRC. Wouldn't it be the sanitary sewer authority approving it or is it the STRC?

Mr. Bodily said the sanitary sewer authority would be part of the STRC. Doug Petersen meets with the committee. He felt it was saying because the public works director and sanitary, sewer and culinary water is part of the review committee. It wouldn't have to have that wording.

Mr. Wells felt they basically eliminated one thing in that sentence where it talks about the culinary water and sanitary sewer authority twice. We have only eliminated it once from the sentence and we should have eliminated it twice.

Chairperson Anderson liked how it read leaving it the STRC.

Mr. Wells explained they should have replaced the culinary water and sanitary sewer authority with the acronym STRC twice.

Chairperson Anderson moved onto page 4 under paragraph D "Provisions" except private right a ways made up to 50% of the required side yard. He wasn't sure if they were allowing those anymore.

Mrs. Izatt stated we are going back to how the old ordinance had it because we have many lots that are 66 ½ ft. wide and they have big yards in the back and they can't do a thing with them. They opted to go back to including ½ acre parcels so they can get rid of the blight. The purpose of an intrablock is to infill and to get rid of blight. There are many lots that size throughout the intrablock platted section of Smithfield.

Commissioner Teuscher shared an example of his home being appraised and when the appraiser came from Salt Lake he took off about \$15,000 because of the non-use area.

Mrs. Izatt explained that it never harmed anything. There was one in the very beginning that was affected by not having some protection and we have learned since then. Her concern is how many there are out there and they should have the same opportunity, if it is doable, as a larger lot would.

Chairperson Anderson continued with one more question under the development plan on the very last paragraph where it reads; will provide the following information with a colon and then there is nothing below that, is it because nothing has changed below that. He didn't want to miss any information.

Mrs. Izatt replied yes she has to put in exact. She could email the rest of it if he wanted to read it. If you think of anything else let her know because it will be back for public hearing next month.

The Commission will continue review & discussion of the Sign Ordinance: Sections 17.36.100; 17.36.110; 17.36.120; 17.36.125; 17.36.130; 17.36.135; 17.36.140 & 17.36.150.

Commissioner Krusi was concerned with the wattage on the bulbs where everything is going LED. Do we want to change it where it is not relevant anymore? The more they develop the bulbs the 7.5 could be a lot brighter than it used to be.

Commissioner Wall thought that was a question for Matt Redd.

Mrs. Izatt mentioned they already require dimming on the EMDs. It has been about three years since they took a tour of YESCO and that was very informative but times are changing and that is why it was good to have Mr. Redd available to us.

Chairperson Anderson asked for questions or comments on 17.36.110.

Commissioner Krusi wanted explanation on what it means when it says signs or letters shall have no relief.

Chairperson Anderson replied whether embossed or debossed.

Commissioner Wall explained it isn't raised.

Chairperson Anderson moved to section 120 which is straight forward and then onto section 125.

Mrs. Izatt informed the commission that the only one of the suggested changes the staff disagreed with was on the wheeled sign which is section 150 and the rest that was incorporated in there. She wanted to make sure how the commission was feeling on that paragraph since it has been awhile since the changes have been discussed. When they get to section 150 she feels three months is plenty of time for someone to put a permanent sign in.

Mr. Wells thought 90 days was way too much.

Commissioner Krusi wanted to leave it at 90 days especially for small businesses where it takes a lot to get going and may need some time to get a permanent sign. He wouldn't go less than that. He also asked for clarification on the wind signs where it states they are only permitted in the day time.

Mr. Wells assessed the ordinance was written before the wind signs were even invented.

Chairperson Anderson would like to strike it where it states they are not permitted for longer than a daytime period.

Commissioner Krusi further added he would keep the six times per year with fourteen day intervals but strike the daytime period.

Chairperson Anderson inquired if they need to go back to section 125 temporary signs and state we are going to adopt the separation from Hanukkah from Christmas and New Year's.

Mrs. Izatt responded since the dates were mentioned on the Holidays she pulled the information sheet and tried to figure out the best way to deal with it because it is important.

Chairperson Anderson was fine by pulling it up by 10 days.

Mr. Wells clarified he was okay with increasing the five days to seven days?

Mrs. Izatt was happy that Mr. Redd's comments were in favor as a resident and thought the time was more than adequate.

Commissioner Krusi inquired where the wrapped vehicle information was listed.

Mrs. Izatt referred him to the section. She stated the city hasn't had any issues with the wrapped vehicles they just have to follow the ordinance. If you don't have some control you will have a wrapped vehicle everywhere.

Mr. Wells read section 17.36.070 where the ordinance states no person shall park any vehicle or trailers so as to be visible from a public right away which has attached thereto or thereon any sign or advertising device for the basic purpose of providing advertisement or products or directing people to a business or activity located on the same or nearby property or any motor vehicles or advertising on buses. If you're parking for the purpose of advertising and someone has to make the decision.

Mrs. Izatt commented you really have to look at the whole picture from any situation that could happen.

Commissioner Edwards felt you could read intent into where people are parked.

Mrs. Izatt summarized most of your ordinances refer to a reasonable person.

Mr. Wells added we need to take a close look at how we are treating electronic signs.

MOTION: A motion was made by Commissioner Edwards to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 pm. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McKay. The voting was unanimous.

Commissioners voting in favor: McKay, Wall, Krusi, Anderson, Archibald, Teuscher, Edwards.

Jamie Anderson, Chairperson

Attested:

Charlene Izatt, Deputy Recorder

**SMITHFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION
Smithfield City Council Chambers
96 South Main
Smithfield UT 84335**

CORRECTED COPY

NOTICE and AGENDA

Public Notice is hereby given that the Smithfield Planning Commission will hold a regular Planning Commission Meeting at 7:00 p.m. on **Wednesday, July 15, 2015** in the **Smithfield City Council Chambers, 96 South Main**, Smithfield, Utah.

7:00 p.m. Opening Ceremonies

Workshop session: Speaker: Matt Redd – Owner of Sign Pro and Smithfield resident

Topic: “Signage”

Agenda items:

1. 7:24 p.m. Resident Input
2. 7:29 p.m. Consideration of Consent Agenda
Minutes of the June 17, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting
3. 7:30 p.m. **Public Hearing** to consider a rezone request by Rigo Chaparro & Jesse Vega, agents for Gary Hansen, (Parcel No. 08-044-0006, 4.8 acres) located at approximately 700 North Main from A-10 (Agricultural - 10 Acre) to RM (Multiple Family Residential)
4. 7:40 p.m. **Public Hearing** to consider a Conditional Use Permit application from Craig H. Ricks, agent for CTR LLC, to allow a four (4) lot minor subdivision/intrablock development located at 354 North & 358 North 100 East. Zoned R-1-10
5. 7:50 p.m. Brett Robinson has requested discussion with the Commission in regards to a proposed rezone of property currently zoned RA-1 (Residential Agricultural-1 Acre) to RM (Multiple Family Residential), the property (.36 acre) is located approximately on **257** North 300 East.

6. 8:00 p.m. Jeff Jackson, Ironwood Development Group, LC, agent for Jessica Tams Quinton, property owner, has requested approval of Phase 2 of the Final Plat for Smithfield Heights Subdivision (9 lots) located at approximately 730 East and 550 North. Zoned R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 sf)
7. 8:10 p.m. Blake Dursteler & Ryan Reeves, agents for VEFINA LLC, have requested approval of a two (2) lot minor subdivision located at approximately 600 South 100 East. Zoned CC (Community Commercial) & RM (Multiple Family Residential)
8. 8:20 p.m. Susan Hyer has requested approval for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a home based beauty salon to be located at 496 North 600 East. Zoned R-1-12
9. 8:30 p.m. The Commission will review & discuss Ordinance #15-14 which amends the Smithfield City Subdivision Regulations, Title 16 in particular Chapters 16.05 “Concept Plans”; 16.06 “Minor Subdivisions”; 16.09 “Preliminary Plats”; and amending the Smithfield City Zoning regulations, Title 17 in particular Chapter 17.84 “Intrablock Development”.
10. 8:45 p.m. The Commission will continue review & discussion of the Sign Ordinance: Sections 17.36.100; 17.36.110; 17.36.120; 17.36.125 17.36.130; 17.36.135; 17.36.140 & 17.36.150
11. 9:00 p.m. **ADJOURNMENT**

Posted this 10th day of July 2015 at the Smithfield City Offices, City Web Page and the Utah Public Meeting Notice web site. Notice provided to The Herald Journal this 10th day of July 2015.

Charlene Izatt, Deputy Recorder

ITEMS ON THE AGENDA MAY BE CONSIDERED EARLIER THAN SHOWN ON THE AGENDA.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Charlene Izatt, Smithfield City Offices, at 435-792-7989 at least three working days prior to the meeting.