

**SMITHFIELD CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**April 20, 2011**  
**MINUTES**

The Planning Commission of Smithfield City, Utah met at the City Council Chambers, 96 S Main, Smithfield, Utah at 7:00 p.m. on **April 20, 2011**. The following members were present constituting a quorum:

Chairperson	Rik Vernon
Commission Members	Richard Jewkes Roger Douglas David Price
City Staff	Brenda Smith
Deputy Recorder	Char Izatt
Planning Staff	Clay Bodily
City Council Member	John Wells Brent Buttars

**Excused:** Planning Commissioners: Michael Paskett, Jamie Anderson, and Bryant McKay

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 Vernon at 7:02 p.m.  
Opening Ceremonies: Jon Wells

**Visitors:** Ryan Rogers, agent for North Ridge Development, and Jack Nixon.

**Workshop Session:**

**The Commission will continue discussion on proposed changes to the Land Use Matrix and amending the EMD (Electronic Message Display) ordinance.**

Chairperson Vernon introduced the workshop session topics. He suggested that the Commission begin with a discussion on the Land Use Matrix.

Char Izatt explained that the wording for the EMD ordinance needed to be addressed. She expounded that the ordinance already required that a conditional use permit be obtained for EMDs.

Commissioner Price inquired if there was a time limit stipulated for temporary electronic signs.

Char Izatt explained that temporary signs could be used temporarily fourteen days each year, plus during holidays.

Commissioner Price asked if they were allowed during grand openings.

Char Izatt replied that signs could be used for thirty days for a grand opening. She added that the ordinance did not mention specifically whether a mobile trailer was considered part of the sign.

Commissioner Price inquired if the Commission could prohibit the use of portable EMDs.

Char Izatt noted that it was possible because they were allowed as freestanding or monument signs.

Commissioner Price stated that the easiest thing would be to prohibit portable EMDs.

Jon Wells suggested formulating a list that signs must conform to.

Commissioner Price suggested stating that portable EMDs are not allowed when a permanent EMD is already in place.

Commissioner Jewkes stated that it would be easier to not allow portable or temporary EMDs.

Char Izatt asked if the Commission wanted to allow portable or temporary EMDs for thirty days during grand openings.

Commissioner Price noted that businesses may try to duplicate grand openings when owners changed and have temporary EMDs more than once.

Jon Wells explained how expensive EMDs are and noted that it would not be practicable for some businesses to purchase them for temporary use. He suggested requiring a conditional use permit for movable signs.

Char Izatt stated that the same requirements for permanent signs could be used for portable ones.

Clay Bodily added that a conditional use permit would require the Commission's approval before a grand opening sign were used.

Commissioner Price inquired if any of the commissioners wanted to ban their use completely.

Commissioner Douglas stated that they should be allowed for grand openings.

Commissioner Jewkes asked what the purpose of banning temporary EMDs was. Commissioner Price noted that banning them would reduce sign clutter.

Char Izatt concurred that it would prevent sign pollution.

Commissioner Price stated that the signs should only be allowed for grand openings.

Jon Wells observed that the ordinance already requires them to be 100 feet from any other EMDs. He noted that the restriction would ensure that businesses did not have a permanent and portable EMD.

Char Izatt asked the commissioners to review the Land Use Matrix before the next meeting to see if they had any alterations to suggest.

### **Resident Input**

No resident input.

### **Consideration of Consent Agenda Minutes of March 16, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting**

Minutes were approved by consent.

**Public Hearing to consider recommending approval of Ordinance #11-06, which amends the Zoning Ordinance, Title 17, by repealing the contents of Chapter 17.24 "Parking and Loading Zone" in their entirety and replacing the contents of Chapter 17.24 "Parking and Loading Zone"**

**Public Hearing was opened by Chairperson Vernon at 7:22 p.m.**

Mr. Jack Nixon approached the Commission and stated that he was representing a property owner. He explained that the property has no space for parking because the parking lot next to the building is owned by another person who will not allow their patrons to park there. Mr. Nixon explained that the ordinance allows for parking to within 300 feet of the business, but that there is no parking available to the business in that distance. He noted that the property owners could not sell the property because of the problem. He added that if the ordinance were changed, then they would be able to sell the property. Mr. Nixon observed that the business could not count the parking spots along the street as patron parking.

Jon Wells explained that the distance is measured by how far a patron would have to walk and not as a straight line.

Mr. Nixon interjected that the problem was not singular to the property in question.

**Public Hearing was closed by Chairperson Vernon at 7:32 p.m.**

Chairperson Vernon asked Jon Wells for his opinion on what the distance should be.

Jon Wells explained that there was some available parking across the street, but that it may be more than 500 pedestrian feet away. He added that the ordinance does not work for the property in question.

Commissioner Jewkes inquired as to renting parking from another business

Mr. Nixon explained the stipulations put in place by the other business owner for the renting of parking spaces.

Jon Wells noted that many businesses do not want to rent parking spaces on a long term basis.

Chairperson Vernon inquired as to increasing the distance to 1000 feet.

Commissioner Jewkes noted that no matter where the rented parking spaces are, most citizens would simply park on the street to utilize the business.

Commissioner Price stated that if the distance were increased to 1000 feet then parking could be done in residential areas.

Chairperson Vernon stated his opinion that it should be increased to 1000 feet to increase the amount of options for the business.

Commissioner Jewkes noted that if the distance were stretched too large, then parking could occur any where in the city for any business and the ordinance would be void.

Mr. Nixon observed that there was a possibility to rent property across the street for a year or two.

Chairperson Vernon inquired if any other changes in the ordinance needed to be discussed.

Jon Wells observed that the only other change was to the size of parking spots.

Chairperson Vernon stated that he was in favor of increasing the distance to 1000 feet.

Jon Wells added that an increase in the distance would provide more options for the business.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Price made a motion to change Ordinance #11-06, section 17.24.020 (c) regarding off site parking spaces to read "In the case of nonresidential uses, required off street parking spaces that cannot be provide on-site may be located on other property not more than one thousand feet (1000') from the nearest edge of the paved parking area of the off site parking lot". The motion was seconded by Commissioner Douglas and unanimously carried.

Commissioners voting in favor: Douglas, Vernon, Price, and Jewkes

**Ryan Rogers, agent for North Ridge Development, has requested review of an annexation petition for property containing 10.10 Acres, more or less, and owned by Lowell & Nanette King located at approximately 900 South 250 East. (Parcel #s 08-117-0015 and 08-117-0016)**

Chairperson Vernon introduced the agenda item and invited Mr. Ryan Rogers, agent for North Ridge Development, to approach the Commission.

Commissioner Price verified the location of the property.

Mr. Rogers reminded the Commission that he had shared his development plan with them the previous month and had approached the City Council regarding his request for annexation. He noted that the property was being annexed as an agricultural zone.

Char Izatt informed that Commission that they needed to review the annexation evaluation form.

Chairperson Vernon went through the annexation form with the Commission. Their responses to the questions are as follows.

1. Does the property under consideration for annexation fall within the area designated for expansion in the city's annexation policy plan?

Yes

2. Is the property under consideration for annexation contiguous to existing city boundaries?

Yes

3. Are only whole parcels being considered for annexation, except in cases where the property owner has signed the petition?

Yes

4. Have the petitioners stated a proposed land use for the property under consideration?

Yes

Is the proposed land use in harmony with the General Plan?

No

Has the city's General Plan indicated a need for park or trail land within the area proposed for annexation?

No

6. Will the annexation likely encourage urban sprawl?

No

7. Planning Commission's recommendation and concerns, if any, on the annexation request.

Only concern noted was that proposed land use would require zoning different than the General Plan.

**The Commission will continue discussion of proposed Ordinance #11-05, which deals with Commercial Recreational Vehicle Parks or Campgrounds.**

Chairperson Vernon explained what the Commission had been working on regarding the RV ordinance.

Commissioner Price inquired if the Commission was being too stringent regarding RV parks.

Chairperson Vernon noted that the commissioners had been provided with a sample ordinance from North Logan and that they did not allow parks to be over four acres.

Commissioner Jewkes inquired if anyone had approached the city regarding an RV park development.

Char Izatt stated that there had been no requests.

Char Izatt noted that the commissioners should make a motion on the previous agenda item.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Price made a motion to forward the review of the requested annexation petition for property located at 900 S 250 E, owned by Lowell & Nanette King to the City Council. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Jewkes and unanimously carried.

Commissioners voting in favor: Douglas, Vernon, Price, and Jewkes

**MOTION:** Commissioner Douglas made a motion that proposed Ordinance # 11-05, which deals with Commercial Recreational Vehicle Parks or Campgrounds be approved. Commissioner Jewkes seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Commissioners voting in favor: Douglas, Vernon, Price, and Jewkes

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Commissioner Douglas to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 p.m. A second was made by Commissioner Price and the motion was approved unanimously.

Commissioners voting in favor: Douglas, Vernon, Price, and Jewkes

Chairperson Rik Vernon,

Attested:

---

Charlene Izatt, Deputy Recorder