

Mayor
Kenneth Romney

WEST BOUNTIFUL CITY

City Administrator
Duane Huffman

City Council
James Ahlstrom
James Bruhn
Kelly Enquist
Debbie McKean
Mark Preece

550 North 800 West
West Bountiful, Utah 84087

Phone (801) 292-4486
FAX (801) 292-6355
www.WBCity.org

City Recorder
Cathy Brightwell

City Engineer
Ben White

Public Works Director
Steve Maughan

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THE WEST BOUNTIFUL PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING ON TUESDAY, **MARCH 24, 2015**
AT 7:30 PM AT THE CITY OFFICES AT 550 NORTH 800 WEST

AGENDA AS FOLLOWS:

Welcome. Prayer/Thought by invitation

1. Accept Agenda.
2. Consider Conditional Use Application for Flag Lots in Stringham Farm Subdivision.
3. Consider Final Plat Approval for Stringham Farm Subdivision.
4. Staff Report.
5. Consider Approval of March 10, 2015 Meeting Minutes.
6. Adjournment

Individuals needing special accommodations including auxiliary communicative aids and services during the meeting should notify Cathy Brightwell at 801-292-4486 twenty-four (24) hours before the meeting.

*This notice has been sent to the Clipper Publishing Company, and was posted on the State Public Notice website and the City's website on **March 23, 2015**.*

MEMORANDUM



TO: Planning Commission

DATE: March 19, 2015

FROM: Ben White

RE: **Flag Conditional Use Permit for Stringham Farm Subdivision**

The Planning Commission deliberated the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed flag lots in the planned Stringham Farm Subdivision at its March 10th meeting. Ultimately, the issue was tabled for further discussion.

In this memo, staff has summarized the potential detrimental effects from the flag lots as previously discussed and has drafted a list of possible conditions for mitigation. More than one Mitigating Measure may be appropriate to alleviate each Negative Impact. Following the list, the memo ends with language for inclusion in any potential motion to approve the permit.

The developer has also provided a letter regarding the possible conditions discussed at the last meeting. It follows this memo.

REASONABLY ANTICIPATED DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS

Detrimental Effect 1: It is difficult for persons and emergency responders to find the appropriate house when it is not visible from or located on the public street.

- a) The address numbers will be made of a durable material and displayed in a prominent permanent location next to the staff driveway.
- b) The displayed address numbers will be illuminated

Detrimental Effect 2: The flag lot staffs are located in a ninety degree street corner. The driveways will be approximately the same width as the road and resemble a street extension creating a safety issue for vehicle drivers on 750 West and persons on the private property.

- a) The driveway must be made from a material other than black bituminous asphalt so it is more distinguishable from the public street, e.g., light colored concrete.
- b) Permanently installed lights must be placed along the driveway so the driveway is better lit and resembles a street less.

- c) Two flag lots cannot have adjacent staffs accessing the public street. This requires the reconfiguration of the proposed Stringham Farms Subdivision.
- d) Install a fence down the center of the combined staff driveway eliminating the similarity to the road.

Detrimental Effect 3: Flag lots require a dedicated fire access road.

- a) Access to the flag lots for emergency vehicles and equipment must be maintained, subject to applicable fire code regulations, including a minimum of a twenty foot wide fire access. Other fire department requirements may be required as a condition of a building permit approval.

Detrimental Effect 4: Flag lots do not have parking along the property frontage. Many visiting persons are reluctant to park on private property, particularly on private property where the parking area is not visible from the public street.

- a) The access to a flag lot(s) must have a driveway/staff at least 26' wide to allow for parking.
- b) Lighting along the driveway will improve visibility and safety for emergency responders and pedestrians walking along or accessing the flag lot driveway staff.

Detrimental Effect 5: If flag lots share a common driveway, the entire fire lane would be required with the construction of the first house, placing the entire financial burden for the access on to one property owner.

- a) The full width of the driveway/staff must be constructed at the same time as the street and other public improvements for the entire length of the flag lot staff.

Detrimental Effect 6: The storm drain design for the subdivision has a proposed public storm drain pipe to be laid directly under the flag lot driveway/staff with a storm drain clean out box located at the opposite (north) end of the flag lot. This will require the public works department to access the storm drain box across private property with heavy equipment.

- a) An 8-inch thick concrete driveway over 8-inch thick compacted base course is required to prevent public works vehicles from damaging the private driveway. This access must be extended to within five feet of the storm drain box.

Detrimental Effect 7: The flag lots will make it difficult for storm water to drain away from the properties.

- a) A single catch basin located in the northwest corner of Lot 3 must be installed. A detailed grading and drainage design for each flag lot will be required as part of the building permit application. Upon review by city staff, additional drainage measures may be required.

Detrimental Effect 8: Flag lots have a greater impact on neighboring property's privacy than lots fronting on public streets.

- a) The front and rear yard orientations are to be identified on the plat to reflect the orientation of the majority of the neighboring properties. The front and rear yards on the flag lots will be along the east and west property lines.

Detrimental Effect 9: Flag lot driveways can create a negative impact on neighboring properties including noise, light, privacy and safety.

- a) A non-transparent fence must be maintained along the outside edges of the flag staff access driveway. The fence must be six feet in height, except that the first thirty (30) linear feet from the subdivision roadway must comply with the front yard fencing requirements for the R-1-10 zone. Lighting will be provided and maintained along the fences.
- b) The fence in item 9(a) must be installed with the installation of public improvements.
- c) A side yard setback equal to the twenty feet (20') required for a corner lot is required on the two lots adjacent to the flag lot staffs (Lots 3 and 6).

Detrimental Effect 10: When two flag lots are proposed with adjacent flag lot staffs, it leads to neighbor disputes.

- a) A shared access is permitted but both flag lots will be subject to a recorded cross-access and maintenance agreement in a form acceptable to the City.
- b) Each flag lot must have its own separate access driveway from the other flag lot. Each access must meet the minimum fire department access requirements and parking requirements as determined separately.
- c) Each flag lot must have its own separate access and be separated from the adjoining flag lot by a six foot (6') non-transparent fence, except that the thirty feet adjacent to the public street must comply with front yard fencing requirements for the R-1-10 zone.

Detrimental Effect 11: Because water meters are not to be located in paved areas, there must be sufficient room along the flag lot frontage for water and other utility services.

- a) Each flag lot staff must contain a minimum of seven (7) feet of landscaped area to accommodate utility services, space for garbage cans in the street and flared drive approaches.

LANGUAGE FOR POTENTIAL MOTIONS

Based on the conditions adopted above, a Motion to approve will include the reasons for the conditions and include the following findings:

1. Subject to the foregoing conditions, the proposed flag lots will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity; and
2. The foregoing conditions will mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the flag lots and accomplish the purposes of the City's land use ordinance.

March 19, 2015

West Bountiful City Planning Commission
550 North 800 West
West Bountiful, Utah 84087

Re: Stringham Farm Subdivision - Flag Lot Recommendations

Dear Planning Commission:

We appreciate your reviewing our Stringham Farm Subdivision Plat and realize there are some concerns regarding the two flag lots we are requesting. There is a purpose for flag lots in our community and our proposal is a good example for such a consideration. It is practical and beneficial to the city because of the property's unique historical layout and existing landscape. This section of ground is so long and narrow, it lends itself to this type of development. The flag lot configuration also allows for more developable lot space and additional landscape.

There have been questions raised regarding our plan and steps which could be taken to mitigate potential challenges. To help with the review and approval process we suggest and are willing to:

- Establish a mutual maintenance agreement for the two flag lots which will share the same access lane, right-of-way, and common lot lines.
- Addresses for both flag lots will be prominently displayed at the entrance of the lane or right-of-way.
- A 20' ft. wide public utility easement will extend to each flag lot from the street. The combined width of 40' ft. for both lots will allow room for a shared concrete drive 20' ft. wide. The color contrast between the black asphalt of the city street, to the white concrete of the lane, will help with the designation of the private drive. A sign can also be placed showing that it is a private driveway.
- On street parking and garbage can placement on the city street should not be a problem with the over-all width of the 40' ft. entrance to the flag lots. There should also be additional parking either up the lane or within the flag lot properties themselves.

Your consideration in allowing us to proceed is greatly appreciated.

Kindest regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wendell and Mary Wild". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized script.

Wendell and Mary Wild

MEMORANDUM



TO: Planning Commission
DATE: March 30, 2015
FROM: Ben White
RE: Stringham Farm Subdivision Final Plat

The Stringham Farm Subdivision is a nine lot subdivision located in the R-1-10 zone that includes one lot with an existing house that fronts on to 1000 North Street, six lots on the 845 North and 750 West Street extensions, and two flag lots. The Planning Commission discussed this item at the March 10th meeting. The item was ultimately tabled partially due to a Conditional Use Permit for the flag lots having not been approved.

1. The seven traditional lots conform to the zoning lot area and width requirements. The two flag lots are addressed by conditional use. The Conditional Use Permit must be approved prior to approving the subdivision. Any conditions which would affect future property owners should also be noted on the plat.
2. Easements are identified on the plat. An item to specifically note is that the storm drain from the street must drain through the flag lots, along the west boundary of lot 9 and it discharges into the existing ditch along 1000 North Street. Because of the proposed storm drain pipe, Public Works is requiring that trees be restricted from being planted in the easement and existing trees be removed. Also access to the storm drain manhole on the north side of the Lot 5 and 9 lot line must be maintained.
3. Show the buildable areas on at least Lots 4, 5, and 6 to identify the permissible house orientations. These were originally shown on the preliminary plat.
4. According to City Code a mid-block walkway would be required when blocks exceed 800 feet, a mid-block walkway is to be provided. During the previous Planning Commission meeting, the developer indicated that he was not in favor of the walkway. One reason that was stated was because the development did not have enough property to accommodate the walkway without losing a Lot. The City code requires that the walkway be ten feet wide (16.12.050). The City has four existing similar walks already; (1) to Birnam Woods Park is 10' wide and the property is owned by the city (2) to the City Park off 2050 N and is 8' wide and owned by the city (3) walkway off 1490 N over to bridge over the DSB canal is 7' wide and owned by the city (4) walkway to the elementary school off 750 W is 6' wide and is privately owned with a public access easement.
5. Engineering has provided the developer some changes to the construction drawings which their resolution should be included as a condition of approval; items such as material specifications, depths and slopes of pipes.
6. Approval from the South Davis Metro Fire Department and the South Davis Sewer District has been obtained. Final approval should be conditioned upon design approval by Weber Basin.
7. Final plat fees have been paid. Final approval should be conditioned upon payment of any additional fees, executing bond agreements and development agreements prior to plat recordation.
8. A street light should be constructed on the street corner.

1 **West Bountiful City** **PENDING** **March 10, 2015**
2 **Planning Commission**

3 **Posting of Agenda** - The agenda for this meeting was posted on the State of Utah Public Notice
4 website and the West Bountiful City website, and sent to Clipper Publishing Company on March
5 6, 2015 per state statutory requirement.

6 **Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of West Bountiful City held on Tuesday,**
7 **March 10, 2015, at West Bountiful City Hall, Davis County, Utah.**

8

9 **Those in Attendance:**

10

11 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Vice Chairman Terry Turner, Alan
12 Malan, Laura Charchenko, and Corey Sweat (Alternate).
13 Councilmember Kelly Enquist.

14

15 **MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Chairman Denis Hopkinson, Mike
16 Cottle.

17

18 **STAFF PRESENT:** Ben White (City Engineer), Cathy
19 Brightwell (City Recorder), and Debbie McKean (Secretary).

20

21 **VISITORS:** Leland Martineau, Wendell Wild, Mary Wild, Mayor
22 Ken Romney, James Bruhn and Steven Merkley.

23 The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Vice Chairman Turner.
24 Corey Sweat gave a prayer.

25 **I. Accept Agenda.**

26 Vice Chairman Turner reviewed the agenda. Laura Charchenko moved to accept the agenda as
27 presented. Alan Malan seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor among members
28 present.

29 **Business Discussed:**

30 **II. Public Hearing to Receive Comments Regarding Proposed Language Changes in Title**
31 **17 to Address Modification to Nonconforming Structures.**

32 **ACTION TAKEN:**

33 **Corey Sweat moved to open the public hearing at 7:35 pm to receive public input on**
34 **proposed language changes to Title 17 addressing modification to nonconforming**
35 **structures. Laura Charchenko seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor**
36 **among those members present.**

37 **Public Comment:**

- 38 • Council member James Bruhn took the stand and addressed the Commission commenting
39 that he has reviewed the proposed language change and does not feel that there should be
40 a restriction in the setback for existing nonconforming dwellings.
41 • No other public comment was made.

42 **Laura Charchenko moved to close the public hearing at 7:38 pm. regarding public input on**
43 **proposed language changes to Title 17 addressing modification to nonconforming**
44 **structures. Corey Sweat seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor among**
45 **those members present.**
46

47 **III. Consider Conditional Use application for Farm Animals for Steven Merkley at 655**
48 **Jessi's Meadow Drive.**

49 Commissioner's packet included the farm animal conditional use permit application with a site
50 plan and a memorandum from Cathy Brightwell dated March 6, 2015 regarding the Conditional
51 Use Application for Farm Animals received on February 25, 2015 from Steven Merkley, 655
52 Jessi's Meadow Drive. The memorandum stated the following:

- 53 • Request from Mr. Merkley is to have 3 horses on their property.
54 • Municipal Code allows a resident to apply for a conditional use permit to increase the
55 number of large and /or small animals allowed on their property.
56 • Applicant would qualify for 3 horses if granted this conditional use permit. Total points
57 on .8 acres would be 80 points. Three horses at 25 points each, with the approval of the
58 application, would total 75 points.
59 • Staff believes the application meets the required affirmative findings required in
60 Conditional Use Ordinance 17.60.030.
61 • Neighbors were notified of the application on March 6, 2015.

62 Cathy Brightwell addressed the Commission in regards to the application. She noted that Mr.
63 Merkley was present to answer questions. Staff recommends approval of this permit. There
64 were no neighbor responses.

65 Mr. Merkley took the stand to answer questions from the Commission.

66 Alan Malan asked how many horses are currently on the property. Mr. Merkley answered 2
67 horses presently and he would like an additional horse.

68 Laura Charchenko has no problems approving this permit and asked about his plans to build the
69 barn shown on his site plan. Mr. Merkley asked about the height requirements of a barn.

70 Corey Sweat had no questions/comments.

71

72

73 **ACTION TAKEN:**

74 **Corey Sweat moved to approve the Conditional Use Application for Farm Animals for**
 75 **Steven Merkley, 655 Jessi's Meadow Drive, with a reduction of points for large animals,**
 76 **specifically 3 horses totaling 75 points, with the applicable standards and affirmative**
 77 **findings listed in 17.60.030. The following conditions will apply: Applicant will ensure that**
 78 **animals will not cause damage to neighboring properties; applicant will abide by all**
 79 **setback requirements in Chapter 17.16.080 of the City Municipal Code; Applicant will**
 80 **control animal waste, debris, noise, odor and drainage in accordance with usual and**
 81 **customary health standards to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the animals and**
 82 **public; and this conditional use permit will expire upon the sale of the said property. Alan**
 83 **Malan seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken.**

84 **Corey Sweat – Aye**85 **Laura Charchenko- Aye**86 **Alan Malan- Aye**87 **Terry Turner - Aye**

88

89 **IV. Consider Conditional Use application for a barn at 672 North 660 West that exceeds 20**
 90 **feet in height.**

91 Commissioner's received a memorandum dated March 6, 2015 from Ben White regarding a
 92 conditional use permit application from Richard and Janet Lee, 672 North 660 West, for an
 93 accessory building along with site plans for their request. Said property is in the R-1-10 zone.

94 The memorandum from Ben White included the following information:

- 95 • Desire for Robert and Janet Lee to construct a barn in the rear portion of their property
 96 located at 672 North 660 West. Property is on the east side of the road with the rear
 97 property line abutting the Union Pacific Railroad.
- 98 • Information in paragraph 17.24.060 of the city code concerning conditional use for an
 99 accessory building.
- 100 • Staff's reminder to include in motion why certain conditions have been imposed or not.

101 Mr. and Mrs. Lee desire to build a two story barn with a height of approximately 23 feet on their
 102 property which is approximately .57 acres. The barn includes a second story loft. They need to
 103 qualify for an Accessory Building Conditional Use Permit if they want to build more than one
 104 story or more than 20 feet tall in the R1-10 zone.

105 Ben White introduced the application stating that the property is larger in size than most in the
 106 zone, is very deep so the structure will not be seen by neighboring properties, and backs up to the
 107 train tracks and freeway. Staff recommends approval of this conditional use with the findings
 108 and reasons listed in the memorandum.

109 Other than clarifying a question on staff's site plan, Commissioner's had no questions/comments.

110 **ACTION TAKEN:**

111 **Laura Charchenko moved to approve the Conditional Use application from Robert and**
 112 **Janet Lee, 672 North 660 West, for a two story/23 foot tall accessory building that exceeds**
 113 **the standard regulations of 20 feet due to the property size and the proximity of the**
 114 **railroad tracks, with the following affirmative findings: the proposed use will not be**
 115 **detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing in the vicinity, or**
 116 **injurious to property in the vicinity, will not inordinately impact schools, utilities, and**
 117 **streets in the area, will provide for appropriate buffering of uses and buildings, and the use**
 118 **of building materials which are in harmony with the area and compatible with adjoining**
 119 **uses, and will comply with the regulations specified in the R-1-10 zoning ordinance and**
 120 **with the following conditions. Alan Malan seconded the motion and a roll call vote was**
 121 **taken.**

122 **Alan Malan- Aye**

123 **Corey Sweat- Aye**

124 **Laura Charcheko- Aye**

125 **Terry Turner- Aye**

126

127 **V. Consider Conditional Use application for Flag Lots in Stringham Subdivision.**

128 Commissioner's packet included an application for Conditional Use Permit from Wendell and
 129 Mary Wild with an attached site plan, a memorandum from Ben White/Cathy Brightwell dated
 130 March 5, 2015 regarding Stringham Farms Conditional Use Permit- Flag Lots, material for
 131 review of flag lots, and information from Todd Smith/South Davis Metro Fire Agency.

132 Memorandum included the following information:

- 133 • Flag lots are a conditional use in the R-1-10 zone.
- 134 • A list of common complaints about flag lots.
- 135 • Previously used guidelines to evaluate flag lots.
- 136 • Possible conditions to mitigate negative impacts of flag lots.

137 Ben White noted the uniqueness of this request as two flag lots are requested to be located
 138 together. He referred to the information in the packets and asked them to consider possible
 139 mitigation efforts that may be appropriate in reducing negative issues of the flag lots. The ninth
 140 lot in the subdivision is the existing Wild home. Flag lots have staffs that are adjacent to each
 141 other and are located on a street corner.

142 Vice Chairman Turner asked Todd Smith to take the stand as the fire inspector for South Davis
 143 Metro Fire. Mr. Smith said he met earlier with the engineer and owner of the property to learn
 144 the specifics of their proposal and to discuss safety concerns.

145 Mr. Smith talked about general issues the fire department has related to providing service to flag
 146 lots, and referred to the fire codes that must be met and explained how they are used in
 147 conjunction with the building code. Some issues he raised include the need for access roads and
 148 driveways to be able to handle 7500 lb vehicles; the need for a turnaround when driveways
 149 exceed 150 ft. in length; a minimum 20 ft. driveway width with no parking, and 26 ft. width if

150 parking is allowed or there is a hydrant. There were questions about how the width may be
151 affected if the sides of the driveway are fenced and how much room is needed to deploy hoses.
152 Mr. Smith responded that walls could hinder the operation if they restrict access around the truck
153 but a width of 20 feet provides room for snow, gravel, garbage cans, , etc. that may get in the
154 way. He explained that the length of the hose off of the truck is 200 feet long. Most of their
155 hoses come from the sides of the truck and they measure from there to the furthestmost point on
156 the building. He added that some determinations cannot be made until the development of the
157 home(s) on the property. He answered questions and described what it takes to be able to get
158 services to the properties in different situations.

159 **Commissioner's Questions/Comments: Flag Lots**

160 Alan Malan asked Mr. White about the drainage issues. Mr. White explained that some storm
161 water would drain toward the street; some water would drain to the rear yard on and around the
162 flag lots. The flag lots must have a catch basin to prevent drainage problems. There could be
163 another drainage box put at the north end of the streets in the future, but its location will be
164 defined by the home design.

165 Mr. Malan asked if curb and gutter would help on the flag lots with the drainage situation. Mr.
166 White felt the best value for the curb may be on the north side where the drive ends, but it
167 depends on the home design. Curb going along the driveway would probably not help much.

168 Terry Turner asked what impact flag lots would have on people around them that have no say in
169 this matter. Mr. White stated that the impacts would probably come later as the property is
170 developed and residents settle in. He explained that we try to mitigate all the things that we
171 think may happen but it is impossible to know what issues may arise and mitigate everything in
172 the development stages. He added that the negative impacts created by the flag lots will change
173 with the change of property owners.

174 Ms. Charchenko asked about impacts to the driveway from heavy trucks and maintenance
175 vehicles. Mr. White responded that the driveway must be designed to carry the loads created by
176 the heavy vehicles. The maximum length of a driveway without a turnaround, as noted by the
177 fire marshal, is measured from where the fire truck will stop, not from the farthest point on the
178 driveway, but consideration should also be given to construction vehicles and storm drain
179 vacuum vehicles.

180 Mr. White explained that the fence along the sides of the driveway is intended to block noise,
181 light, collect drainage, provide privacy, etc. He also recommended prescribing the orientation of
182 the homes on the plat so that backyards line up with the properties behind them where possible.
183 The home on lot 3 would likely face south but all the others would face east or west.

184 Leland Martineau took the stand representing the property as the engineer. He stated that he has
185 never seen a 26 foot wide drive required before and asked the Commission to consider a 20 foot
186 driveway. Mr. White explained that to meet fire code there can be no parking with a 20 ft.
187 driveway. Due to the limited amount of space available for parking for lots 4, 5 and 6, it is
188 expected that cars will park along the driveway even if no parking signs are posted. He also
189 discussed the need for flag lot owners to have a shared access agreement for the driveway.

190 Laura Charchenko explained that they need to consider conditions that may become a problem
191 several generations to come. People will park along the driveway whether there is an agreement
192 prohibiting it or not.

193 Alan Malan feels that each lot should have its own drive with a fence down the middle as well as
 194 fences separating the flag lot driveways from the houses on each side. He pointed out that this
 195 area is called a driveway but it is road and it is a safety issue. He felt that if the fence is not there
 196 we are possibly setting up a feud situation and that the fences between the drive and the
 197 neighboring properties are for safety. There was discussion about his proposal including how it
 198 would make parking more difficult. Lot #6 has no parking because of the narrow frontage,
 199 location of the driveway and a fire hydrant across the street. At a minimum, Mr. Malan feels the
 200 driveway fence needs to be a requirement along lots 3 and 6. Laura Charchenko and Corey
 201 Sweat were opposed to the fence down the middle of the drive. They do not feel it is a
 202 reasonable request.

203 After reviewing the guidelines provided by staff, Laura Charchenko did not feel that some of
 204 them applied, and discussion took place regarding which ones they should use. Mr. Sweat felt
 205 that most of the guidelines suggested by staff should be required in the conditions.

206 Laura Charchenko asked that items d, h, l, q, and r in the list of previously used guidelines to
 207 evaluate flag lots be considered.

208 Steve Doxey encouraged them to consider their conditions carefully in order to reduce negative
 209 impacts and detrimental effects of the development, and noted that it is important to clearly spell
 210 out reasonable conditions and document them in the motion because these decisions will run
 211 with the land.

212

213 **ACTION TAKEN:**

214 **Alan Malan moved to table this item and schedule a work session to further discuss the**
 215 **issues. Laura Charchenko seconded the motion and voting was taken by a roll call vote:**

216 **Alan Malan- Aye**

217 **Laura Charchenko- Aye**

218 **Terry Turner- Aye**

219 **Corey Sweat- Nay**

220

221 **VI. Consider Final Plat Approval for Stringham Subdivision.**

222 Included in Commissioner's packet were two memorandums dated March 5, 2015 from Ben
 223 White regarding Stringham Farm Subdivision Final Plat and Stringham Farm Subdivision
 224 Construction Drawing Review. The final plat memorandum included the following information:

- 225 • Items for informational purposes.
- 226 • Item for consideration.
- 227 • 16.13.050 Blocks.

228 The drawing review memorandum included a list of comments generated from a review of the
 229 February 27th construction drawing package including comments regarding plat, sheet C-02,
 230 Sheet C-04, Sheet C-05 and Sheet C-06.

231 Ben White noted that the actual subdivision discussion is easier than the flag lot discussion. He
232 stated that all lots meet the basic criteria for the subdivision. He has been in contact with all
233 utilities and all is well with each of those except for Weber Basin. They have not yet notified
234 him that they have approved the design.

235 Mr. White noted that the only significant item that needs to be addressed is the mid block access
236 in this development. Per our ordinance (Section 16.12.050), a mid block access could be
237 required. The LDS church has been contacted and we have yet to hear their decision. He noted
238 pros and cons that could exist.

239 Mr. Wild's engineer stated that due to the size and location of the lots they do not have a lot of
240 room to give to make the mid block access work. Mr. White noted that with an easement it
241 would be possible to accommodate the mid block requirement without reducing the sizes of the
242 lots.

243

244 **ACTION TAKEN:**

245 **Alan Malan moved to table item six. Corey Sweat seconded the motion and voting was**
246 **unanimous in favor.**

247

248 **VII. Consider Proposed Language Changes in Title 17 to Address Modifications to**
249 **Nonconforming structures.**

250 Cathy Brightwell noted that this item has been before them several times. A variance request to
251 City Council initially brought this to our attention with much discussion. A Public Hearing was
252 held tonight and language has been proposed for consideration.

253 Alan Malan appreciated Council member Bruhn's comments that would change item 3. He feels
254 that language should be added to clarify that the new nonconforming portion of the structure
255 cannot encroach into a different setback not being considered. Mr. White pointed out the second
256 line in section three was staff's attempt to clarify that issue. It was suggested that legal counsel
257 make the suggested language changes discussed this evening and bring the final draft back for
258 review.

259

260 **ACTION TAKEN:**

261 **Corey Sweat moved to approve the addition of paragraph 17.56.030 C. with the change**
262 **that an additional line be added to clarify that an addition or enlargement to the non**
263 **conforming building cannot encroach in a different setback not being considered. Laura**
264 **Charchenko seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken.**

265 **Alan Malan- Nay**

266 **Laura Charchenko- Aye**

267 **Terry Turner- Aye**

268 **Corey Sweat - Aye**

269

270 **VIII. Staff Report**

- 271 • 725 West began construction this week.
- 272 • Current schedule for 400 North is mid April and could be 90 days +.
- 273 • Pages Lane reconstruction will not be possible this year due to the closure of 400 N.
- 274 • Cathy Brightwell noted that the April 14th meeting will likely be canceled for a City
- 275 Council Budget meeting.

276

277 **IX. Approval of Minutes for February 10, 2015**

278

279 **ACTION TAKEN:**

280 **Corey Sweat moved to approve of the minutes dated February 10, 2015 as presented. Alan**
 281 **Malan seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor among those members**
 282 **present.**

283

284 **X. Adjournment**

285

286 **ACTION TAKEN:**

287 **Alan Malan moved to adjourn the regular session of the Planning Commission meeting at**
 288 **9:20 pm. Laura Charchenko seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor.**

289

290

291

292 The foregoing was approved by the West Bountiful City Planning Commission on February 10, 2015, by
 293 unanimous vote of all members present.

294 _____

295 Cathy Brightwell - City Recorder

296

297