

City of Green River

460 East Main Street, Green River, Utah

Planning Commission Minutes
Regular Meeting
Monday, March 3, 2014

ATTENDING: Amy Wilmarth, Samuel Bassett, Kim Andrus, Keith Brady and Chris Lezama; Council Member Kathy Ryan; Employees, Conae Black and C.J. Vetere, from the Association of Governments Michael Bryant, Citizens, Donna Dinkins, Carlos and Ashley Reyes

CONDUCTING: Chair, Samuel Bassett, the meeting began at 4:10 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

1. Discuss/approve/deny minutes for February 3, 2014 regular meeting. **MOTION:** Kim Andrus moved to approve the minutes for February 3, 2014. Amy Wilmarth seconded the motion. **VOTE:** Amy Wilmarth, Samuel Bassett, Kim Andrus and Keith Brady voted aye. The motion carried.

2. Discuss/approve/deny addition of definitions and drawings to the Subdivision Ordinance. Conae Black worked on the definitions section to the amended ordinance. She stated that some definitions were taken from the existing ordinance but added in definitions that were pertinent to the changes that the planning commission is proposing. Samuel Bassett went over the drawings that he created that can be used as a tool to better explain the written text of the ordinance. A discussion was held on dead end streets and cul-de-sacs. Samuel Bassett needed more clarification on that section of the ordinance. Michael Bryant said the part that says "a road does not extend to the boundary of the development" so an existing road does not go to the end of that boundary. It also says, "and its continuation is not required its terminus should be no closer than 50 feet to the boundary." It is referring to development boundary not individual lots. For example if a 50 lot subdivision is proposed the road should be 50 feet away from the start of that development. Samuel Bassett asked if this was talking about a city road and not a road put in by a developer. Michael Bryant said it could be either one. Michael Bryant said as long as it is not required to have the road extend out then the terminus should be 50 feet from the boundary. He said maybe a better example would be if the road dead ends and there is property in front of it that could be developed in the future there is not any reason to extend the road that far because the last lot ends fifty or sixty feet further the other direction. There was some discussion on what the width of a cul-de-sac should be. Should it be wide enough for a school bus to turn around? How much room does a fire truck need? Currently the ordinance states that a cul-de-sac width is 60 feet. Samuel Bassett suggested that he and C.J. Vetere would do some research to find out what is required and what we already have in town and bring that information to the public hearing. Michael Bryant felt the language on the 50 foot terminus is not needed because when you don't need to continue the road then it at least needs to stub the development area. Keith Brady felt the language was confusing. Giving language to have a road stop at 50 feet doesn't make sense because what will be there instead, gravel or mud? He feels that the road should continue to whatever distance it needs to. Keith Brady read the sentence again in its entirety. The road does not extend to the boundary of the development and its continuation is not required its terminus should be no closer than 50 feet from the boundary. Again this is for a dead end street or a cul-de-sac. In the design section of the ordinance the cul-de-sacs part reads, "cul-de-sacs (dead end streets) shall be used only where unusual conditions exist which make other designs undesirable. Each cul-de-sac shall have a minimum right of way width of sixty feet (60') and must be terminated by a turnaround, except that where surface water cannot be drained away from the turnaround along the street due to grade, necessary catch basins and drainage shall be provided. Michael Bryant said a right of way is basically all of the public right of way and is typically sidewalk to sidewalk. It could be the same size as the streets. He suggested striking the "minimum right of way width" because that would be whatever size the road is. It would be restated as "each cul-de-sac shall be terminated by a turnaround of a minimum diameter of such and such measurement." Samuel Bassett summarized the changes discussed. He stated the

drawing will include a circle for the cul-de-sac with a diameter width of sixty feet at this time, calling this line a development boundary line and adding another drawing that says dead end street. **MOTION:** Amy Wilmarth made a motion to approve the definitions and drawings to the subdivision ordinance with the changes as discussed. Keith Brady seconded the motion. **VOTE:** Amy Wilmarth, Samuel Bassett, Kim Andrus and Keith Brady voted aye. The motion carried.

3. Discuss and set date for public hearing for the Subdivision ordinance amendments. Conae Black said last month the Planning Commission had already set a date for the public hearing and she did not get it posted in time so it has to be rescheduled. She suggested that they take the subdivision ordinance to the March City Council meeting and go over it with them at that time and the planning commission can then hold the public hearing any time they want. They don't have to hold it on the night of City Council. Amy Wilmarth still felt the night was best. There was some discussion on the best way to post for the public hearings. The Planning Commission decided to present to the Council at the March City Council meeting and hold the public hearing at the April City Council meeting.

4. Discuss status of General Plan update. Samuel Bassett said with the majority of the survey results entered into the data system the current status is 18% of our community responded to the survey. He has broken down the results by age to see if some of the answers were skewed because of age. There was some discussion on the survey results. Amy Wilmarth said she would present to the City Council in March.

5. Discuss/approve/deny amendments to the R-1 Residential Zone. Samuel Bassett presented to the Planning Commission some suggestions he had on amendments to the R-1 residential zoning ordinance. Michael Bryant asked why he wanted to change the lot size to 6250 square feet. The current lot size is 7500 square feet. Conae Black said she had a few problems with the suggested changes. She felt the idea was good but she would like to see a different zone to allow for smaller lot sizes for a more density. Samuel Bassett explained the need for some kind of a change. He stated that there were some zoning barriers for affordable housing. One barrier is the lot size for a single family dwelling in the R-1 zone which is 7500 square feet with a minimum width of 70 feet. Another is the size of the dwelling shall not be less than 850 square feet. Conae Black said another suggested change was the single exterior wall to be 14 feet in length rather than 16 feet. Her concern was the ability of single wide manufactured homes coming into the zone when we already have a zoned area for that. Samuel Bassett said a manufactured home can still be made at 16 feet and is allowed in the R-1 zone without a permanent foundation. Conae Black said she would like to add into the newly created zone flag lots. Michael Bryant said a flag lot is shaped like a flag with a pole. The reason for that is in order to access a dwelling off a road you would need a twenty or thirty foot driveway. The issue is should people be able to build if there was enough access to build behind another dwelling. Samuel Bassett surveyed what the existing lot sizes are and he found area where the lots are not 7500 square feet and are not 70 feet wide. In some areas two or more lots would have to be purchased in order to build a single family dwelling in the R-1 zone. Michael Bryant said the larger lot size is for bigger homes and the smaller lot size for smaller homes. He felt that even 6250 square feet was a large lot size. He suggested the lot size for the R-1 zone can be 7500 square feet the lot size for the R-2 zone be 6250 square feet and the R-3 zone lot size taper down from there. He also felt that the lot and width size changes would be a better fit for the R-3 zone. Conae Black suggested taking a better look at all of the residential zoning ordinances and to develop something for affordable housing. Michael Bryant suggested that there could even be a zone where the lot sizes were larger than 7500 square feet. It was stated that once the planning commission has gone through the ordinances the next step would be to amend the zoning map for the smaller lots.

6. Discussion on non-conforming mobile home park. C.J Vetere stated that Alton and Betty Burns owned four lots together and made a trailer court out of the four lots. There is an access road to the court that goes down the middle of the court. The lot lines have existed for over thirty years. In 1996 Phillip and Donna Dinkins purchased all four trailer court lots from the Burns. During that time there were two more trailers in the court then there is now. In 1996 one of the trailers burned down and about 2001 another trailer burned down. In 2006 Phillip and Donna Dinkins sold back

two of the four lots back to the Burns. They are requesting to allow two trailers to move back onto the space where the two trailers were that burned down. The current ordinance states that you need one lot with a minimum of two acres for a mobile home park. Michael Bryant asked if the ordinance stated whether it needed to be all one owner. C.J. Vetere said no. Michael Bryant asked how many spaces there were for trailers. Mr. Reyes said six spaces and right now there are only two trailers on the lots so there should be room for four more trailers. C.J. Vetere said he understands that they may not be able to move in four more trailers but doesn't understand why they can't move in trailers to replace the ones that burned down. Mr. Reyes compared it to the Trailer Park on Elberta Street which is now owned by Duane and Penney Riches court that is not on two acres of land and they have been able to move trailers in and out. Michael Bryant said what increased the non-conformity was selling the two of the four lots. It should have all been one lot so that portions of it could not have been sold off. Keith Brady said they should go before the Board of Adjustments and ask for a variance because it has always been a non-conforming trailer court. There was argument as to whether they should or should not be allowed to move in two more trailers. Some of that argument was what harm would it do to have two more places to live in a place where there are already trailers. Also there is not much the property owner can do except purchase the other two lots and dissolve the property lines or resell their two lots. On the other side of that argument it does not allow the city to move forward on what they have changed the zoning of that property to and what precedence is it setting to just allow the two trailers to be moved onto the property. There will always be unique situations on property. The Planning Commission decided that the property owners should take it to the Board of Adjustments. Conae Black said she would contact the Board of Adjustments and set up a meeting. Mr. Reyes asked if he should pay for a business license. Conae Black said yes, as long as they are leasing some property.

7. Adjourn. Keith Brady moved to adjourn. Chris Lezama seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Samuel Bassett, Chair

Conae Black, City Recorder

Approved: _____