Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes of Morgan City Planning Commission GENERAL meeting held in open public session on April 19th, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Room in the City Office at 90 West Young Street.

MINUTES APRIL 19TH, 2016 7:00 PM MORGAN CITY COUNCIL ROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	Vice Chairman, Nathan McClellan
MEMBERS	Julie Anderson, Robert Lynam, Weston Fry, Dave Carter, Jim Brown.
EXCUSED	David Griffith, Doug Garfield.
CITY STAFF	Steve Garside, City Planner; Ray Little, Mayor, Jeff Wardell, City Council Member.
OTHERS PRESENT	Moroni Wardell, Sally Jensen, Danny Wall, Parker Bauer, Chanelle Jones, Kristi Gilbert.
INTRODUCTION	Vice Chairman, Nathan McClellan called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

WORK SESSION

DISCUSSION	**Concept Approval RM-15 Mountain View Villas-** This property was initially designated as phase 3 of the Mountain View Mixed Use Project. This property was before the Commission last month as a request for Concept approval, but that application was withdrawn during the meeting. The Developer has since separated the Mountain View Mixed Use project into two applications. The Commission is reviewing concept approval for Mountain View Villas. Jim Brown is concerned with road width not represented on the concept plans at City Standards. Wes Fry stated at last City Council meeting, Council members were concerned with only one entrance from 700 East. Nate McClellan asked Steve Garside to explain what the consideration of Concept is. Steve Garside explained a single development since the development area will be recorded separately; Mountain View Villa and Mountain View Subdivision. This is a concept development of a RM-15 zoning designation housing one common area with approximately 20 patio homes and a Home Owners Association. The Commission and staff discussed the concerns of on street parking due to a similar development in city has issues. Consideration of a fire lane road, increase guess parking stalls and only allow parking on one side. The Commission discussed the applicant having turnarounds and hammer heads which would be presented on the Preliminary submittal. The Concept drawings did not represent any sidewalks. Danny Wall stated this is a concept plan and neglected to reflect sidewalks on the drawings. Sidewalks will be included on the Preliminary Drawings. The Commission concluded the items discussed are basic and yet are items of concern and need to be addressed at Preliminary. The development representative Danny Wall agreed and will have the items included on the preliminary drawings submittal. Jeff Wardell stated the Council is in favor of a second entrance. Mayor stated that the developer has not signed the development agreement. Steve indicated the concept can still be reviewed and approved contingent upon the approval of the development agreement and zone change approval. Nate McClellan questioned why the development agreement had not yet been signed. Mayor enlightened the commission regarding the hold up on the development agreement. The development agreement encompasses the entire development including the apartment development area. The developer is questioning items that involve the other area and that the Mountain View Villas portion of the agreement is agreed upon.

	Preliminary Approval Mountain View Subdivision Phase 1 and 2- During Concept review and the initial Preliminary review, this project was entitled *Mountain View Mixed Use.* For the review process, the single family development under the R-1-8 zone has been separated from the patio home RM-15 zoning development. City Council members would like an additional access to the subdivision. Julie Andersen questioned the requirement of a Park. Steve Garside indicated the Ordinance does not require a park. If the detention pond is to be grassed, the Commission would like the developer to add a walkway easement and recommend playground or bench equipment. Upon reviewing the phasing of the subdivision, the detention pond is in phase 2. Mayor understands from the City Engineer, the pond will be developed during first phasing. The storm water from the hill is showing just piped to the field. The Commission questioned the open ditch beyond the development, if it is required to be fenced or piped. Steve Garside stated that would be the ditch company's requirement. The Commission discussed extensively the easement for public access to the detention pond such as; liability, maintenance, fencing, walkway, etc. **Utility Placement and Landscape requirements in the Industrial Zone-**Item not discussed. **Off premise signage-**Item not discussed.

GENERAL SESSION

MINUTES APPROVAL – March 15th, 2016

MOTION	Minute approval tabled for March 15th, 2016 minutes. Commission did not receive correct minutes to review prior to meeting. Second: Weston Fry Vote: Unanimous

ITEM #1 CONCEPT APPROVAL RM-15 ZONE MOUNTAIN VIEW VILLAS

DISCUSSION	This property was initially designated as phase 3 of the Mountain View Mixed Use Project. On prior staff reports the approximate address was 1000 North 700 East. This property was before the Commission last month as a request for Concept approval, but that application was withdrawn during the meeting. In the Commission's February meeting this property was presented as part of an amendment to the zoning ordinance, changing the zoning for 1.1 acres to RM-15. The Commission recommended approval of that zone change conditioned upon the approval of an attendant development agreement. One of the provisions of that agreement was limiting the number of dwelling units. The Council adopted the recommendations of the Commission with an increase of the number of units from 18 to 20. The application is consistent with the provisions in the development agreement. The Developer has not yet signed the development agreement. The concept approval is being reviewed contingent upon the signing of the agreement. Concept review is just that – whether this proposal conceptually meets the objectives of the General Plan, current zoning regulations, and the overall intent of the City, while ensuring that there is sufficient capacity for the utilities to service the proposed development. The proposed use of medium density residential for this project is consistent with each of those land use concerns, and an initial review indicates a sufficient capacity for utility services. The use of the patio home concept will be in line with the existing residential uses in the vicinity. The issue that has arisen with like developments is the on-street parking. This proposal addresses those issues in two ways. First, the driveways are 25 feet in length, which provides sufficient length for a full-sized vehicle to be in the driveway. Second, they have provided guest parking at three locations. Staff would recommend that the applicant consider adding a stall to the guest parking area between units 8 and 20, and providing another 3 stalls in the area between units 9 and 17. During work session, the Commission discussed adding a fire lane, a hammer head or turnabout and parking allowed only on one side. The applicant needs to provide the location for snow storage, as well as a landscape plan, including the proposed buffering for the adjacent single family homes. Fencing will need to be provided.

	This development will require the creation of an HOA. Conditions within the documentation creating the HOA should be disallowing the use of guest parking for any resident parking or storage of trailers, recreational vehicles, etc. It should also provide for the City to be a participant therein solely for the purpose of ensuring that the private roads and utilities remain private. The proposed width of the roadways will need to be reviewed by the fire marshal. If designated as fire lanes, they will need to be posted to reflect that, and parking may be prohibited on the roadways. This project will also require the completion of the improvements along 700 East, or the entering into a delay agreement for a later installation of those improvements. The applicant needs to be aware the requirement of landscape plan submittal. Planning Staff recommends approving the concept plan with the following conditions, which must be met before the completion of the review process: 1. Landscaping. Along all frontages of the RM-15 zoned use, and the areas between the RM-15 zone and the single family zones and uses, require landscape buffers. 2. Utilities. The applicant must ensure the sufficiency of all utilities. As this property was part of the special improvement district, no meeting with the water board is required. This property was also included in the sanitary sewer capacity calculations. 3. Snow storage. The City's Code requires the applicant to contemplate and designate snow storage areas. 4. The fencing requirements must be met. 5. The creation of a Homeowners' Association. 6. Additional guest parking to increase from 4 to 8 stalls. 7. Fire marshal review. 8. Completion of the right of way improvements along 700 East. Vice Chairman Nathan McClellan asked staff if the above items need to be complete prior to the Planning Commission granting concept approval. Steve Garside indicated concept approval can be granted without the recommended improvements but will need to be complete at Preliminary. Nate asked the members to voice their concerns. Jim Brown stated during the work session, the Commission discussed having a hammer head on the west roadway with extra guess parking. Changing to a hammer head would increase parking to 12 guess stalls. Weston Fry stated at the recent City Council meeting that the Council Members would like an additional entrance from 700 East. Suggestion is to have a fire lane and gate on the west roadway that is accessed from 700 East. Citizen Shanelle Jones suggests having enough room to turn a truck around. Citizen, Parker Bauer request the Commission to evaluate the width of the roads and garage sizing to actually house two cars. Weston Fry asked the development representative Danny Wall to reiterate on the garages. Mr. Wall stated they had planned on enough room for two cars plus a little extra. The Commission also discussed sidewalks during the work session. Mr. Wall state it was an oversight excluding the sidewalks on the concept drawings. The preliminary drawings will reflex sidewalks. Nathan McClellan recapped the discussion; Concept approval contingent upon the signing of the development agreement and rezone approval, second entrance from 700 east as an emergency fire lane with hammer head, sidewalks, additional guess parking with limitation on on-street parking. Jim Brown stated this development is already part of the planned eru's calculations for the sewer system.
MOTION	Weston Fry moved to grant Concept Approval for Mountain View Subdivision Phase 1 and 2 with the following considerations; sidewalks, additional guess parking, limit on street parking, hammer head. Second: Dave Carter Discussion on the motion: Jim Brown stated to include an emergency exit to 700 east. Added to the motion: An emergency fire lane with ingress/egress 700 East. Weston Fry accepts the amendment to the original motion. Second: Dave Carter seconds the amendment to the motion. Unanimous.

ITEM #2 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL-MOUNTAIN VIEW SUBDIVISION

DISCUSSION

During Concept review and the initial Preliminary review, this project was entitled *Mountain View Mixed Use.* For the review process, the single family development under the R-1-8 zone has been separated from the patio home RM-15 zoning development.

The Planning Commission granted concept approval for phases 1 and 2 of this project at its January 2016 meeting. The review for Preliminary approval ended at the request of the applicant during the Commission's March meeting.

This project proposes to extend the residential use in the area from 700 East towards the I-84 right of way. The residential development would stop approximately 200 feet from that right of way, leaving the remaining area for future commercial development. This property is currently vacant, and, with the exception of the existing residential properties along 700 East, it abuts other vacant properties which are being used agriculturally.

The project consists of the two phases, both being single family developments. The RM-15 patio home project is separate and is at the concept stage.

The commercial property along the I-84 corridor is not a part of this request and review.

The minimum lot size for the R-1-8 portion of this development is 8,000 square feet. Each of the lots meets that requirement. Lot frontages and widths also satisfy the ordinance requirements.

The applicant must provide letters of approval from each of the utility providers.

Fencing must be installed along all boundaries of the development that are adjacent to agricultural uses and zones. Any portions of the canal that remains open must also be fenced.

Planning staff recommends the granting of preliminary approval with the following conditions:

1. Approval letters from each of the utility providers.
2. Fencing to be required along all open canals and portions of the project which border agricultural uses and agricultural zoned properties.

The engineering staffing notes do have items that need to be addressed but should not interfere with preliminary approval. The items will need to be corrected and approved by engineering prior to final approval.

The Commission discussed the detention development for public use. The Developer asked what the Commission would like to have built in the detention area. The detention pond could have a duel use with green space and the possibly of benches and playground equipment. The Commission discussed having a public access to the area such as a walkway between building lots so residence would be able to access the area without encroaching upon personal property.

Weston Fry mention Residential to Commercial fencing. Steve Garside stated the Ordinance requires fencing on the side abutting residential to agricultural due to the application of the residential development. The Commercial zoning to Residential fencing requirements would occur when the Commercial development application was submitted.

Nathan McClellan questioned the developer regarding lot 143/144 as buildable lots with the piped ditch running through those lots. Mr. Wall stated they will use them as buildable lots. Jim Brown asked if the developer was aware of the setback requirement for a building lot and the developer indicated he was aware. Robert Lynam asked about basements on those lots due to the ditch piping at a higher elevation than a possible basement. Are they going to be a walkout type or no basement? Danny stated they are looking at walkout type basements.

Citizen comment from Chanelle Jones stated the traffic will increase considerably. There should be some type of traffic study done prior to approval of this project since the apartment project has been approved and traffic is already bad on 700 East. Nathan McClellan informed Mrs. Jones that a traffic study was required on the previous development ingression and egression pertaining to 700 East. The study resulted with the conclusion 700 East is not at capacity as per UDOT standards. Chanelle asked about traffic lights. UDOT has done studies

	on State owned roads in Morgan and have concluded no traffic lights are required for the amount of vehicular traffic. UDOT strongly encourages cities to follow state criteria. Nathan McClellan recapped the discussion with the following conclusion: Duel use of detention as green space with possible benches and playground equipment, public access easement to the duel use detention pond, review ditch path impact on homes with basement and engineering notes reviewed and completed.
MOTION	Wes Fry moved to grant Preliminary approval for Mountain View Subdivision with the following conditions; duel use of detention pond as green space/park, public access easement to duel use detention pond, recommendations mentioned by City Planner and Engineering requirements completed. Second: Jim Brown No discussion on the motion. Unanimous.

ADJOURNMENT:

General meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT	Parker Bauer is representing the Quail Ridge Home Owners Association. He had indicated the President of the HOA Kent Ure, has discussed with Mark Thayne about moving the approved Valley View Apartment Complex to a different parcel located in the Light Industrial area which is owned by the developer. The developer said they would consider but would have to meet with city officials that could make a decision on moving the approved project. Mr. Bauer was instructed to talk to staff during office hours.
RECONVENE WORK SESSION	Planning Commission members reconvened work session. **Landscape frontage requirements in the MD Zone**-Robert Lynam introduced a slide show presenting other Cities Manufacturing Districts landscaping designs. Mr. Lynam produced pictures of large park strips, sidewalk versus no sidewalk, landscape park strip and landscape frontage. Some with grass and trees while others had rock type landscaping. The Mayor also reviewed with the Commission the new utility standard layout in the MD Zone. With this new utility standard, the previous Landscape strip of 5 feet has increased to 10 feet. Adding the 4ft sidewalk, 1ft property and the required landscape frontage of 8ft will create a 23 foot landscape area. This is greater that what is required in the Commercial Zoning. The Mayor has asked the Commission to review the landscape frontage requirement for a possible decrease due to the increase in the landscape park strip with the new utility standard in the MD zone. The Commission discussed the options and concluded: Amend Landscape frontage to 4 feet with same landscaping percentages and increase the amount of trees required in the M zone Park Strip. **Permitted Street Trees**-Steve Garside presented samples of "permitted street trees" from a couple of other City's Ordinance. The Commission will review those listings and discuss including such type list for Morgan City Ordinance. Staff has been talking about including a "permitted street trees" because trees are planted that grow too large for the park strip, root systems that break the sidewalk, trees that grow too tall and disrupt power lines. **Off Premise Signage**- Mr. Garside presented pictures of off premise or directional type signage in parts of Salt Lake City. The Commission is still deliberating on the need for off premise signage and will reconvene at next work session regarding the item.

Teresa Shope

Teresa Shope, Secretary

These minutes were approved at the May 17th 2016 meeting.