



---

**HERRIMAN CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION WORK**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
*Thursday, March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2016*  
*Approved June 30, 2016*

6:08:20 PM **6:00 PM - Work Meeting:** *(Council Chambers)*

**Attendance**

**Planning Commission Members:**

Chris Berbert  
Blayde Hamilton  
Adam Jacobson  
Jessica Morton  
Robyn Shakespear  
Clint Smith  
Wade Thompson

**Council Members:**

Mayor Freeman, Jared Henderson, Nicole Martin  
Craig B. Tischner, Coralee Wessman-Moser

**City Staff:**

Bryn McCarty, City Planner  
Sandra Llewellyn, Planner I  
Heather Upshaw, Senior Planner  
Jackie Nostrom, City Recorder  
Tami Moody, Director of Administration and Communications  
Brett geo. Wood, City Manager  
Gordon Haight, Assistant City Manager  
Blake Thomas, City Engineer  
John Brems, City Attorney

Chair Smith welcomed those in attendance and voiced gratitude for joint meetings with the council.

1.1 6:08:56 PM Approval of Minutes

Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser **MOVED** to continue the minutes.  
Commissioner Adam Jacobson **SECONDED** the motion.  
The voting was unanimous. Motion carried.

Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser **MOVED** to reorder the agenda to bring item 1.4 prior to item 1.2.  
Commissioner Adam Jacobson **SECONDED** the motion.  
The voting was unanimous. Motion carried.

#### 1.4 [6:10:00 PM](#) Accessory Buildings

Planner I, Sandra Llewellyn oriented the council and commission with the changes made to the accessory buildings ordinance. The plan was to simplify the ordinance and make it consistent through all zones. There were some proposed changes to allow items to be approved at the staff level. In the A-.25, A-.50 and all R zones on half acre or smaller, it would remain the same and be an 800 square foot maximum size. For a half acre or larger it was a 1,200 square foot maximum; the change will be that no accessory buildings shall cover more than 25% of the rear yard. The maximum height in half acre or larger will be 25 feet if they adjust the side and rear yard setbacks to 10 feet each and will be approved by staff. Zone A-1 will remain the same. There will be additional language added for elevations that would state elevations of accessory buildings must match the elevation of the main dwelling including colors and materials, except in the case where the building is being used to house animals. A suggestion to be more specific about the elevations matching the front of the building (not necessarily the whole home) was voice by commission and council. A discussion about what materials could be used for a building housing animals took place. A suggestion was made that this type of building should come to the planning commission for approval. City Planner, Bryn McCarty suggested stating that all elevations match the home, if the owner has animals and wants an exception it has to go before the commission. Commission and council agreed and a discussion continued. It was noted that the accessory building cannot be taller than the house. A brief discussion about side yard setbacks took place. Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser requested that a statement be added to state, subject to building department. These changes to the ordinance will be on the agenda for April 21, 2016.

#### 1.2 [6:27:03 PM](#) Density Criteria

City Planner, Bryn McCarty requested direction regarding density criteria. The proposal was to lower the density in the A-.25 zone to a maximum of 2.8 instead of three. A change to the bonus density for combining property would be a maximum and would require different ownership for parcels.

The Rose Creek parcel map was displayed. It has 231 acres with 498 lots and 56 acres of open space which is about 25%. Planner, McCarty proposed creating a new zone that would be used for the property currently zoned A-1. The new zone would be based on the density and not the lot size. The criteria would require PUDs and half acres and that a subdivision will have a maximum density of 1.8 units per acre. The applicant would have to do some lots that are larger than half acre to make the density work out. A third acre lot (8,500) was suggested to provide flexibility. A PUD would allow for more density. She suggested a maximum of 2.5 but was still open to a minimum lot size. The density could be based on the acreage of the development; the larger the PUD, the more flexibility on density to get up to a maximum of 2.5. Chair Clint Smith asked what would make people want to rezone their property to this proposed zone and the response was that the city would require it of anyone going from an A-1. A-.25 would no longer be allowed. She pointed out areas on the general plan with low density. Commissioner Blayde Hamilton wondered how to entice land owners to come into the city and change to the proposed zone. Chair Smith suggested that there would be a development agreement tied to a any large annexation. Planner, McCarty suggested making it a requirement for any PUD over 100 acres to have a development agreement and provide basic requirements.

Commissioner Jessica Morton would like to see, at least, a 10,000 minimum lot size. Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser suggested an average lot size of at least 10,000 but would like it to be higher and still allow for flexibility depending on the development. Chair Smith wondered how it would work out if the proposed changes and density requirements were implemented into the Rosecreek Subdivision. City Planner McCarty proposed requiring half acre lots adjacent to existing lots that are half acre or larger and require that at a minimum of 10% of the lots be half acre. Another proposal was that all PUDs over 100 acres must receive final approval from the City Council. Mayor Carmen Freeman suggested that should be required for PUDs over 50 acres. Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser would like to see a scenario for the proposal. Planner, McCarty responded that she does have a scenario but planned to draw up

scenarios of what was suggested/liked during the meeting. She disclosed that she likes to give the developers an option that provides them a range of product. Council Member Moser liked the Rosecreek layout with smaller lots in the middle and then in a few years families can move to the larger lots in that same development and she agreed that there should be some flexibility of lot sizes. She voiced concern with calling the zone A-1.8 she'd like to use a different name for the zone because it might be confusing for residents. Planner, McCarty was fine with her suggestion and presented an example of Prairie Oaks in Rose Basin using the proposed density criteria, as well as, an example of a 100 acre development subdivision. A discussion regarding how the proposed lot sizes would affect different developments took place. Chair Smith requested a side by side comparison with the current density criteria and the new proposed criteria.

Assistant City Manager, Gordon Haight explained that the city has a desire to perhaps require PUDs so we always get 20% open space. Chair Smith expressed that open space makes a subdivision feel more open. Planner, McCarty asked what type of open space the council and commission would like to see. Chair Smith explained that there are already a lot of amenities like lacross fields, arena, skate fields, trails, basketball courts, frisbee golf and a lot of play structures. He liked that people do not have to go far to get something different.

Discussion about requiring PUDs for developments that are a large acreage took place. Commissioner Adam Jacobson wondered if the council was sure that they want the council of the future to make decisions about that. Typically in communities they want the planning commission to take the load to provide some buffer for the council. He felt the council should be driving the ordinances that make it so you can control development, sounding, not controlling. When council does that it puts them more on an edge and can cause issues in the future. Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser explained that her rationale was to be able to have the budget responsibility to maintain however the open space looks, and she felt it needed to be handled on a case by case basis. A blanket ordinance would be easy, if it were perfect. She felt that council members may see a need from constituents for an amenity and they can be sure it's something that can be financially maintained. Chair Clint Smith felt that taking the development of 100 acres or more to the council works well, those developments can be significant. Commissioner Jacobson reiterated his concern was for future council that may not always look towards the future and may no longer be as involved as this council. Commissioner Chris Berbert expressed that the planning commission is guided by the master plan, which is driven by the council. He felt that ordinances are what establish all the standards and the planning commission's objective is to enforce the ordinance.

Planner, McCarty summarized the direction given. She understood that they would like to see scenarios with both options discussed. Regarding the issue of beginning a text change process, she wondered if they were comfortable enough to move forward and work through details in the meantime. Chair Smith would like to see more information first and the planning commission agreed. Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser felt that it was fine to begin the process because it would be lengthy and felt there was time to work through the details. Commissioner Chris Berbert asked about the A-.25 zone and wondered if it will no longer exist. It was explained that it would exist where it is currently but it would no longer be offered. Planner McCarty will start a text change for low density agricultural and will provide a text change for the current zone explaining that it will no longer be used.

### 1.3 [7:19:54 PM](#) PUD Open Space

City Planner, Bryn McCarty explained that in a PUD 20% of open space is required. She proposed two changes. Half of the open space requirement was to be in one contiguous parcel. Language would be added that states that open space has to be a useable parcel. Currently hillsides and drainages would count at 50%. The change proposed could be for the hillsides and drainages to count at 25%. Gordon Haight, Assistant City Manager explained that a developer gets no open space credit for a school even though some open space is shown with a school. He asked council and commission what they would like to see. Commissioner Blayde Hamilton doesn't like the decreased proposal because he felt that it devalues the owners land. He

suggested having the land owner earn the value with some type of point system criteria. He would like to protect the land owner and the city. A discussion ensued.

Commissioner Adam Jacobson reported on the federal government requirements for floodplains and wetlands. We reported that labeling it as floodplain or wetland would not allow the land then to count as open space because it is not developable or improvable property. Commissioner Blayne Hamilton still felt that it would penalize the landowner, even with a floodplain or wetland. Chair Smith liked the language proposed "that is configured in a useable size and shape." Council Member Coralee Wessman-Moser suggested that the term useable be better defined as one contiguous parcel that is a configured size and shape to meet one of the objectives of the parks master plan.

City Planner, Bryn McCarty reported about someone wanting to give the city property on the hillside as open space, instead of providing open space in their subdivision. She further explained that the land on the hillside would not be buildable. Assistant City Manager, Gordon Haight requested from commission and council how much the hillside land should count towards open space. Council Member Moser noted that if the land could accommodate trails, it should hold value. Chair Smith felt that the applicant would benefit significantly to donate the hillside property outside their development. Assistant City Manager Haight explained that the developers are looking for a way to use that hillside property. Council Member Moser and Chair Smith both advised that the land offeres should count at 25% maximum; council and commission agreed.

#### 1.5 [7:38:58 PM](#) Rosecrest Master Plan Updates

City Planner, Bryn McCarty oriented the commission and council with a brief history of the Rosecrest Master Plan. The original PUD approval was August 14, 2008. Master development agreement approved December 18, 2008. The PUD plan is an attachment/amendment to the MDA. All pods come back to the planning commission for final approval. The overall plan was amended on April 5, 2012 due to the addition of the Salt Lake Community College and the Mountain View Corridor frontage roads. There will be an overall amendment proposed due to the soccer facility, removal of Hamilton property and an adjustment for school property. The overall density will not change and the number of units will be lower. Council Member Moser requested an accounting and would like the public to see the reduction of units based on the reduction of size. Planner McCarty responded that Matt Watson would provide that when it comes back.

Planner McCarty explained that the dedication of the roadway for Juniper Crest had been presented to the planning commission a few weeks ago. City Engineer, Blake Thomas reported that a traffic study had been completed several years ago and the road has changed and is now obsolete. They requested that a new study be conducted. With the lowering number of residential units, the volumes decreased. Therefore, the same number of lanes was no longer required. He described a three lane cross road with the ability to keep the bike lane. Council Member Moser questioned that being awkward because the road would go from five lanes, to three lanes and back to five lanes. The council agreed. Chair Smith asked about the process to change the infrastructure. Planner McCarty outlined the process and how the development agreement would be altered along with staff changes. Matt Watson outlined why the change could work and other changes that have had to be made during the build out of the project. Council Member Moser voiced concern about future problems with bottlenecking and merging and a discussion ensued. Mr. Watson explained that the road does not have the traffic to create the concerns noted and that the road would be built to meet build out demands. Council Member Moser's preference would be to leave it as originally planned. Assistant City Manager, Haight explained that the road was built too wide and it is problematic for the city. It has too little traffic, on too big of a road and it is costly for the city to maintain. However, he heard the council express a desire to keep the wide road and he will discuss it with the developer and hope to collaborate with the city. Chair Smith requested that it be resolved with the council before the planning commission was asked to weigh in on the subject. The council agreed. Planner McCarty reported that there are other changes to the master development agreement that will need to be worked through as well.

2. NEW ITEMS OF SUBSEQUENT CONSIDERATION (OTHER):

None

3. FUTURE MEETINGS:

3.5 Planning Commission Meeting – Thursday, April 7, 2016 @ 7:00 PM  
3.2 City Council Meeting – Wednesday, April 13, 2016 @ 7:00 PM

4. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Clint Smith called for a motion to adjourn.

Council Member Coralee Moser **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting and Council Member Craig B. Tischner **SECONDED** the motion. The voting was unanimous. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:04:50 PM.