

# City of Green River

460 East Main Street, Green River, Utah

Planning Commission Minutes  
Regular Meeting  
Thursday, July 5, 2012

**ATTENDING:** Katherine Brown, Robert Smith, Amy Wilmarth and Jack Forinash; Employees, Conae Black

**ABSENT:** Ben Coomer and Kathy Ryan

**CONDUCTING:** Chair, Robert Smith, the meeting began at 10:10 a.m.

## **ORDER OF BUSINESS:**

1. Discuss/approve/deny minutes for May 3, 2012. Katherine Brown and Robert Smith had some changes to the minutes. After some discussion they felt it would be beneficial to have the assignments for the subdivision ordinance in the minutes. **MOTION:** Katherine Brown moved to table any action on the minutes until amendments were made. Jack Forinash seconded the motion. **VOTE:** Katherine Brown, Robert Smith and Jack Forinash voted aye. Amy Wilmarth was not present for the vote. The motion carried.

## 2. Discuss/approve/deny the Subdivision Ordinance.

Katherine Brown went through the subdivision ordinance from Cleveland and came up with some suggestions to amend the title and Purpose. She found five different points. 1. Protect and provide for the health, safety and general welfare of Green River City. 2. Facilitate the orderly and beneficial development of land within Green River City in accordance with the General Plan. 3. Establish reasonable standards of design and procedures for subdivisions, plat amendments and lot line adjustments to insure proper legal descriptions and recording of subdivided land. 4. Insure that public facilities and utilities will have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed subdivision. 5. Encourage wise use and management of natural resources is keeping of total character of Green River City. Katherine Brown felt the Title and Purpose that is in our ordinance should be placed somewhere else. Robert Smith liked Katherine Browns suggestion of adding in the General Plan. Robert Smith said a change to 11-3-1 that has been discussed is changing the word variance to change in the last sentence. He also mentioned 11-3-6 A 3 stating "Having been submitted to the planning commission has not been approved by the city council by a favorable vote of two-thirds of their membership." The council usually goes by a majority vote which is three-fifths not two-thirds. Katherine Brown suggested striking "by a favorable vote of two-thirds of their membership". Robert Smith felt that 11-4-1 which states any person wishing to subdivide land shall secure from the planning and zoning administrator information pertaining to the city's plan of streets, parks, drainage, zoning and other master plan requirements affecting the land to be subdivided. This is something that could be on the checklist. Some where else in the ordinance it states that the sub divider must get an approval from the fire department. They have discussed on 11-4-5 to change that to approve or deny within thirty days from the submission date. He wants to also put in something about 30 days after the next meeting. Katherine Brown asked Robert Smith to explain what he meant by the next meeting. Robert Smith said if they bring the information in the week before then the planning commission needs to approve it the week before the next meeting. Conae Black asked Robert Smith why he wanted to assign the planning commission a deadline. Robert Smith said the developer wants to know as soon as possible. Conae Black said yes. Robert Smith said the previous city council insisted on a deadline with a recent ordinance that was amended. Conae Black said she remembered the council request on deadlines for the conditional use ordinance and didn't have a problem with that but didn't think that putting a deadline on the planning commission for the subdivision ordinance was a good idea. Robert Smith agreed that it would be not be possible with a complicated subdivision that needed to get engineers involved or other people involved. Conae Black said she could not see why the city would deliberately put off a developer and just not act upon a request. She said we are limited with our time and resources and it may be difficult to set a

deadline. Robert Smith said with a small subdivision of ten or less all that is needed is a preliminary plan. Katherine Brown said the point of putting in a deadline is so people won't feel that the process will be dragged out. Conae Black said she hopes that wouldn't be the case. If we are doing our jobs correctly then it shouldn't be dragged out. Robert Smith said the next paragraph says the preliminary plan shall remain in effect for a period of two years and he is not sure that he likes that. 11-4-7A talks about post performance and state a bond will be posted in an amount determined by the city council. He didn't think a city council is qualified to determine a bond amount. Conae Black asked who was qualified. Robert Smith said an engineer. This led to the same discussion as before on having the planning commission approve or deny subdivisions and not the city council unless the planning commission feels it needs city council involvement. That is something that needs to be changed in the duties of the planning commission. Robert Smith moved on to chapter five. 11-5-2 addresses the preliminary plan and K of that section states what is wanted from the engineer but does not require an engineer stamp. He felt this was necessary for the larger subdivisions and this should be included on the check list. He went on to 11-5-3 which addresses the final plat and stated he would like to get the county requirements for recording the subdivision an update the ordinance to those requirements. He pointed out that in 11-5-3 D that addresses the naming of streets references 11-6-4H which does not exist.

Jack Forinash was assigned chapter six. He said that he took from the sample ordinance and added the updated state requirements and also took from previous discussions and added that into his draft. He suggest 11-6-2A1 to read "residential streets shall have a minimum width of forty-eight feet. Width is determined as the combined dimensions of the pavement, curb and gutter on both sides, and four-foot paved sidewalk on both sides". He went on to changing the width for collector streets in 11-6-2A2 to fifty-five feet. He also suggested the minimum street width of a roadway wherever curb and gutters are installed for residential streets, thirty-six feet and for collector streets, forty-four feet. He took out some of 11-6-2B to read "alleys shall have a minimum width of twenty feet. Alleys may be required in the rear of business lots or residential blocks under conditions where such alleys are considered necessary by the planning commission". He was not sure what 11-6-2D meant. There was some discussion on this. The also stated the same for 11-6-2F and felt that a visualization of these numbers would be helpful and included what he thought the visualization should look like. Amy Wilmarth agreed. In 11-6-2H he added "or approximately duplicate" for it to read "new street names should not duplicate or approximately duplicate". There was some discussion on the naming of streets and what the planning commission felt was best. In 11-6-2K he added "where a road does not extend to the boundary of the development and its continuation is not required, its terminus should be no closer than fifty feet from the boundary. He also added in 11-6-2 "Private Streets: A means of perpetual maintenance must be demonstrated to and approved by the planning commission before a private road may be approved." The planning commission felt this should not be added. Jack Forinash added in 11-6-2 "Driveways: No driveway shall exceed two hundred feet in length and/or 12% grade. Driveways serving single residential dwellings shall be a minimum of twelve feet wide. Driveways serving two or more residential dwellings shall be a minimum of twenty-four feet wide". The planning commission felt the length should be changed to one hundred feet rather than two hundred feet. In 11-6-4A he added "location of watercourse, problems of sewerage or driveway grades, or other physical conditions". He added 11-6-4H which reads "a town boundary line shall not divide a lot. Each such boundary line shall be made on a lot line". He added landscaping requirements into the ordinance for a new section of 11-6-5 and development requirements into the ordinance for a new section of 11-6-6. He stated the areas not addressed in this chapter but perhaps could be elsewhere are 1. A declaration that the subdivider/developer is responsible for installing street pavement, curb, gutter, and/or sidewalks up to standards. Any exceptions such as neighboring lots do not have curb, gutter or sidewalks. 2. Document required to be submitted to the planning commission for review/approval. 3. A policy on the issuance of a certificate of occupancy based on successful completion of infrastructure. 4. security to assure successful completion. 5. modification of plans policy. And 6. phased projects policy.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Smith, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Conae Black, City Recorder

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_