

Planning Commission Chair:	Tim Petty
Planning Commission Vice-Chair:	Todd Burton
Commissioners:	Robert Guillier Scott Dixon Glen Woolsey
Secretary:	Crystal Western
City Council Representative:	Greg Johnson

UINTAH CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, June 23, 2016
7:00 PM



2191 East 6550 South – Uintah, Utah 84405

(801) 479-4130 Fax: (801)476-7269

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Called to Order by Tim Petty at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance led by Scott Dixon.

Roll Call: Present - Tim Petty, Robert Guillier, Scott Dixon. Excused –Todd Burton, Glen Woolsey.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: None.

Attendees: Crystal Western, Mike Burke, Camille Chapman, Joshua Chapman, Ernest Rowley, Dixon Pitcher, Matt Gertage, Paula Kennedy

Agenda Items:

1. Public Comment (2 minutes per person) *(recording: 00:01:09)

- Mike Burke: Mr. Burke addressed the commission. He asked the commissioners if they'd ever gotten a charge card in the mail promising them a better rate, then later found out it's not what it claimed to be. He asked the City to be very careful with who they allow to do business with and what their changes are, especially when it has a community of 150 people such as Cottonwood Estates. He asked the commissioners to be really careful of what's going on there, because it's not what it used to be. He said he wouldn't want anything to fall on the City, and that he thinks it's a beautiful city, he has a business here, and he thinks it's fantastic.

2. Approval of minutes for the Work Session and Planning Commission meeting held May 24, 2016. *(recording: 00:02:35)

Presenter: Tim Petty

- Tim Petty asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes.
- There were none.
- Robert Guillier made a motion to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes for May 24, 2016 as written.
- Seconded by Scott Dixon.
- All in favor, motion passed.

3. Discussion/Action on final plat application for Keith Vanderhout; Cottonwood Estates located at 975 E. 6600 S., Uintah. *(recording: 00:03:20)

Presenter: Keith Vanderhout

- Ernest Rowley with Landmark Survey was present to represent Keith Vanderhout with Cottonwood Estates.
- Tim went over the parking issues that had been discussed at the last meeting. Robert Guillier asked him to clarify what will be changing. He explained that in the past parking was allowed on both sides of the street during the daytime. He said now parking will now be allowed 24 hours a day, but only on one side of the street. No parking will be allowed on the side of the street with the fire hydrants. No parking signs are being installed.
- Tim said there is a question as to whether or not there is enough space for parking. Tim asked how many spaces there were, and Ernest responded that there are 22 single occupancy spaces. Tim said it looked to him like you could only fit 22 if you double stacked some of the spaces. Ernest said the 22 are not double stacked, but that you could double stack the spaces and double that number. Tim said it would be up to the planning commission to interpret whether or not double stacking would satisfy the rule.

- Tim stated that there are currently 74 lots in Cottonwood Estates, and 8 additional lots have been already been approved. Tim said that the required room for recreation vehicles is 3:1. Tim said that the parking is not yet where it needs to be for 8-10 additional lots, and there would need to be 26-28 spaces to meet the requirement.
- Ernest agreed on 74 lots. He stated that if all 10 new lots are approved, making a total of 84 lots, then 28 spaces would be required. However, he said he thought the 74 lots already included the 10 new lots.
- Tim said that he spoke with Keith Vanderhout the day before and was told there are 74 lots now. Ernest said that he didn't agree, he said he has personally counted the lots and according to his figures only 21 spaces would be needed. Tim said that Keith was using a 4:1 ratio and asked Ernest if he was using a 3:1 ratio. Ernest responded yes. Tim suggested they might have to pull up Google and count the lots.
- Tim asked Ernest if he'd brought in plat maps. Ernest said that he did not bring a plat to this meeting, but there is an aerial photo they could count from. He said he had already turned plats into the City at a past meeting. Attempts to locate the plats in the city offices were unsuccessful. Ernest said that he'd also sent an e-mail to the city in the past which showed a breakdown of the current lots. Tim said that he remembered seeing that e-mail.
- Ernest said either way though, if the commission allowed double stacking in the spaces there would be space for the 28 required. Tim stated that he didn't think double stacking met the intent of the ordinance. Tim said that the ordinance reads that the extra space should be used for vehicle repairs, even though right now it's being used as an additional parking rental.
- Robert Guiller asked Ernest to clarify what he means by the term "double stacking". Ernest explained that it is two vehicles parked within one stall.
- Ernest said that he understands the commission's concerns with double stacking and vehicles being blocked in, but even so, it is being done there currently. Robert Guiller said that even if Cottonwood is not currently enforcing the ordinance, that doesn't change the rules outlined in ordinance. Ernest responded that the ordinance actually doesn't say anything either way about double stacking. Tim agreed that it doesn't. Tim said that it is meant to provide an accessible space though so that if someone needs to work on their car they have somewhere to go. Ernest said that whether they have to ask another resident to move their vehicle or not, it is still accessible to residents who need access to the spot. Tim said that it sounds like with the current number of lots that there is already not enough room. Ernest disagreed; he said that the problem lies in the improper positions that residents are parking in, not in the amount of space available.
- Scott Dixon asked if Cottonwood Estates has a Homeowner's Association that has input on these types of issues. Ernest responded that he does not know. Mike Burke said not yet. Scott suggested that the resident's look into forming a group of some sort that can review these kinds of issues and changes. Ernest stated that if the people were unhappy they would be here tonight. Tim responded that they have been here in the past at the planning commission public hearing. Ernest stated that he was at that meeting too and listened to their concerns at that time. He said that he had been personally thanked at by residents at that meeting who said he'd answered their questions. Tim said that the Cottonwood residents are very concerned, and that at least one resident has attended every meeting that's been held on this subject. Scott again suggested the residents and the owner of Cottonwood assemble and air their grievances to one another. Ernest responded that this is a property rights issue. Ernest reminded the commission that Keith owns the park and all he's asking the commission to do is to approve his development and his plans for his property under the City's ordinances. Ernest said that even though the residents are leasing a piece of the property from Keith, they don't have any input on what he can and can't do with the remainder of his property. Scott Dixon said that the City is trying to be a peacemaker in this situation and protect what the residents were originally offered in their leases. Scott stated that it sounds like most of the Cottonwood residents are willing to allow improvements and expansion, but they just want to keep being informed. Ernest said that he felt like the loss of visitor parking was the biggest

issue the residents had, and it has already been resolved. Ernest stated that the residents now have more visitor parking than they have ever had.

- Tim said the commission is just trying to enforce their ordinance. Tim said that he totally agrees that Keith has the right to develop his land.
- Tim stated that his concern is that the 3:1 ratio requirement has not been met and there isn't adequate parking for the proposed additional 10 lots. Ernest said that it has been met with the 22 stalls shown. Tim stated that there needs to be 28. Ernest disagreed, and said that this had all been planned out very specifically so that they would be meet the ordinance after build out. There was again disagreement about how many existing lots are on the property.
- Robert Guiller expressed to Ernest that the City has to support both the City's businesses and the City's residents. He said that the City sustains both and does not lean one way or the other. He said that even though the City encourages business and growth they also always have to take into consideration the wishes of the citizens. He said the City has a responsibility to align the interests of the citizens and the businesses.
- Ernest said that he's attended a number of planning commission meetings over the last few months, and he feels the community has had ample opportunity to air their concerns. He also said there is normally only one meeting held where the citizens state their concerns, and for this item there have been several.
- Robert asked Ernest if he has anything with him, in writing, showing the lot spaces, sizes, etc. Ernest again stated that he did not bring the plat with him tonight, but that he'd sent that information in a past e-mail. He reiterated that when he laid out this plan he specifically planned for it to meet ordinance specifications at build out.
- Tim pulled up an online map of Cottonwood and counted the trailers. He concluded that there are 74 existing lots.
- The commission told Ernest they really need to see a drawing. Ernest stated that the drawings have already been submitted at past meetings. Scott Dixon told Ernest that it is a good practice to always be well informed and well prepared before making a presentation at a meeting like this. He told Ernest he should have brought copies of any drawings pertaining to the item being discussed, and not have assumed they were already on file.
- Tim said that the relationship between the residents and the owner really isn't the planning commission's issue. He said that the planning commission's job is to enforce the ordinances. He says that he feels like the City has allowed him to add the lots and maximize it out according to the ordinance. He said the only problem is that the 3:1 parking hasn't been met. He said nothing more has been shown since the last meeting. There was extensive discussion about previous submitted drawings and parking. Tim said that he feels double stacking does not meet the requirements of the ordinance.
- Ernest requested that the commission at least approve lots 1-8 which are not in question. A map of Cottonwood was reviewed by the commissioners so that all were in understanding of where lots 1-10 were located. Tim said that he would be willing to suggest approval of lots 1-8, but not 9 and 10.
- There was a short discussion about green space. Tim said that he felt like approving lots 9 and 10 would be pushing it too close for the 8% recreational space required by the ordinance.
- Robert Guiller made a motion to approve the Final Plat Application for new lots 1-8, excluding 9 and 10, located at 975 E. 6600 S., Uintah.
- Seconded by Scott Dixon.
- All in favor, motion passed.

4. Discussion/Action of Conditional Use Permit Application #2016-0199 for Joshua Chapman; The Chapman Shop located at 6797 S. 1800 E., Uintah. *(recording: 00:30:03)

Presenter: Joshua Chapman

- Joshua and Camille Chapman appeared before the Planning Commission.

- Joshua explained to the commissioners that he holds “build camps” each summer where they teach children mechanical skills and they provide assistance with youth building projects. He explained how the camps have been run in the past, and his plans for future camps. He said that he usually holds about 4-5 camps a year, and they are usually held the summer time. Joshua stated that he plans on having students to park in his driveway, and that intends on having a 9:00pm curfew for activities and noise. He requested that the commission allow him to hold sleepovers with tents in the yard in order that he might accommodate participants who have traveled long distances to attend the camp.
- The planning commission discussed many concerns they had, taking into consideration some specific complaints they’d received from the Chapman’s neighbors. There was much discussion about what type of conditions would be appropriate for this type of a CUP. The following items were discussed:
 - HOURS OF OPERATION: Tim asked how critical the overnight aspect is. Joshua said he feels it is necessary. The commission said they would only be able to allow it if the students were kept indoors between the hours of 9:00pm and 7:30am, and no tents or trailers would be allowed in the yard. The commission said they would only allow indoor overnights if the indoor accommodations are inspected and approved by the Fire Marshall. The commission asked how many camps Joshua had planned for this year, and he answered 3 overnight camps for age 10-18yr olds, and 2 one-day camps for age 5-9yr olds.
 - RESTROOMS: The Chapmans stated that there are 2 bathrooms on their property that are accessible to the students. They said that the students are given an orientation on their first day and are shown the locations of these bathrooms.
 - PARKING: Josh said that he feels the current parking is already adequate. He says his driveway is large and can accommodate up to 10 cars. Tim said that the planning commission would not allow any on street parking and that all parking must be in the driveway. The Chapmans discussed the possibility of replacing the grass along the street at the front of the lot with gravel, which would then allow for even more parking.
 - NUMBER OF STUDENTS: Tim told the Chapmans that a daycare is the closest situation we have to these camps. He said that he had called the state to research what is allowed at a daycare. He said daycares are allowed a ratio of 8:1, that being 8 children to 1 adult. Tim asked the Chapmans how many children they have in their family who are currently living on the property. The Chapmans said that they have 5 kids. Tim explained to them that according to the 8:1 ratio with Joshua and Camille being the adults, 16 children could be allowed but it would have to include their own children in that number whether their own children were students or not. Joshua stated that many of the students stay and attend the camp with their children and that the actual ration of children to adults is usually more like 3:1. Tim suggested that they stick with the 8:1 ratio and model it after a daycare. Robert expressed concern, and reminded the commission that this area is residential and the number of students should be kept quite low. Tim agreed.
 - ACCUMULATION OF PARTS & MATERIALS: The commission informed Joshua that he is required to have an inspection by the Fire Marshall, and that the instructions are listed on the business license application. They told him that the property will need to be cleared of junk and debris in order to make it a safe environment to have students in. Tim asked Joshua if he feels like the property is currently safe for students. Joshua answered that he felt it is safe, and they are continuing to do additional clean-up on the property. Tim asked them where they currently store their camp materials. The Chapmans said they don’t usually store many materials, only a few electronics on the back patio which are not in view of the street or the neighbor’s houses. They said at the end of the take apart class, they throw everything away.

- SAFETY CONCERNS: Tim asked them if there are restrictions to where students can go. The Chapmans responded that the yard is fenced, and that students are informed at orientation which areas of the property are off limits. There was some discussion about where the parameters should be and what areas must be off limits to students. Tim asked about safety during power tool usage. Joshua said that all power tool usage is highly supervised, and that all students/parents sign a liability waiver. The commission said that Joshua must restrict access to the stock-piled materials on the property, as per the Fire Marshall's specifics in the inspection. Tim said that all storage areas need to be clearly marked.
- ACTIVITY IN THE STREET: The commission informed Joshua that they do not feel comfortable allowing activity of any kind in the street, and they didn't feel like the neighbors would allow it.
- FOOD PREPARATION: Camille told the commission that she currently holds a valid food handlers permit. She said that she'd contacted the health department and they told her they would consider these camps a private event, not open to the public, so a commercial kitchen is not required.
- REVIEW: Tim stated that he'd possibly be willing to set-up conditions for approval with a 3 month review. The commission discussed the 3 month time period, and decided that 1 month would be better because at that time the majority of this year's camps would have already been held and they could get immediate feedback from the neighbors before more camps were allowed to be held. After this discussion, Tim stated that this CUP should be on a month-to-month review in front of the planning commission for the time being, with the possibility of yearly reviews in the future.
- Robert Guiller asked Joshua if he had adequate insurance coverage for these events, and Joshua responded that he had already been in contact with his insurance agent and that he felt his insurance coverage was adequate.
- Scott Dixon continually expressed much concern about this business jeopardizing the quiet atmosphere of the neighborhood. He stated he felt this type of business was too large for a residential neighborhood setting. Scott told Joshua that he felt it would be better to find a larger piece of property, like a farm, to hold the camps at. Joshua said that is something he might be willing to consider in the future but there would be such a large expense to obtaining a bigger location he cannot entertain that idea at this time. Scott responded that he still felt the good this business would do would be at the expense of the neighbors.
- Robert Guiller made a motion to approve CUP #2016-0199 with the following conditions:
 - One month review
 - Outside operating hours must be within the parameters of 7:30am – 9:00pm
 - A student orientation is required in which students must be informed of the location of provided restrooms
 - No on-street parking will be permitted
 - The number of students per camp will be restricted to a maximum of 15 students, with the ratio of 5 children:1 adult
 - A valid food handler's permit must be maintained
 - No camp activities will take place in the street
 - Storage areas will be kept off-limits to students
 - All clutter will be cleaned-up, in compliance with the requirements of the Fire Marshall upon inspection
 - All students are required to stay on-site at applicant's property while attending the camp
- Seconded by Scott Dixon.
- All in favor, motion passed.

5. Discussion/Action on Uintah City Ordinance 5-2-C1; An ordinance regarding animal licensing and regulations. *(recording: 01:38:25)

Presenters: Tim Petty

- Planning Commission tabled this item, to be added to future agenda.

6. Discussion/Action on Site Plan Amendment for Dixon Pitcher located at 6658 S. Highway 89. *(recording: 01:38:47)

Presenter: Dixon Pitcher

- Dixon Pitcher appeared before the Planning Commission with drawings of the site.
- Tim Petty presented a binder of documents for the septic system on the site. He said that he had already reviewed them, and he also scanned them and saved a PDF copy.
- Dixon referred to his drawing and explained that they are planning to take the existing 20 storage units off of their current foundation and move them to another location on the property. They will then build a row of retail shops on the already existing foundation that formerly held the storage units. He explained that when the hotel on the property was built, they put in a major underground septic system which was approved by the city. He showed the commissioner's where the septic field is on the drawings. He showed them where the septic, electricity, and water will hook-up. He also showed them the proposed areas for parking and said there should be at least 40 stalls.
- Scott Dixon asked if the parking lot was already asphalted, and Dixon responded that it was.
- Tim Petty stated that they'd talked at the on-site meeting, and that the parking needs to be clearly shown on the drawings. Dixon said that the drawing does show the asphalt and referenced areas on the drawing for the commissioner's to review.
- Dixon used the hotel and Smitty's as an example, and assured the commission that he has done a lot of building projects in the city, and that he feels he doesn't do anything half-way.
- Tim Petty stated that he's not worried about the quality of the project. He said that his concerns are traffic flow in the parking lot and the safety of pedestrians. Dixon answered that the all the parking stalls will be striped. The commission suggested that further delineation is necessary, and they proposed that there also be islands at each end to clearly define parking areas from the road. The commission studied the drawings at length and there was much discussion about parking lot issues and how they might be resolved.
- Tim Petty said another concern he has is about the septic system. He said Dixon had shown the septic system for the hotel, but the commission needs to see the system for the proposed retail shops. Dixon referenced the drawings and said there is another separate septic system. Tim said he thought that was the same one as the one in the binder showing the system for the hotel. Dixon responded that there is a second tank, separate from the hotel, and the commission is welcome to have another on-site meeting and he will show it to them. Tim studied the drawings in the septic system binder that was presented earlier. Dixon stated that the tanks for the hotel are located on the hotel's property.
- Tim clarified that the tanks are separate, but not the drain field. Dixon agreed. There was much discussion about the location of drain field, and the location of all the tanks on the property. There was a dispute between Dixon and the commission about the precise location of the drain field. Dixon said the drain field on the property has been studied and approved by the state and is inspected twice a year. Dixon and the commissioners discussed this issue and studied the drawings at length.
- Tim asked how many rooms were in the hotel. Dixon answered 52. Tim said that it looks to him like the Health Department has only approved 58 toilets to be allowed on the property. Dixon said that there is the capacity for 14 more toilets available. Tim told Dixon that he will have to work things out with the Health Department, but it looks to him like they have only approved 58 toilets total. Dixon said there is the capacity for 14 more, and Tim said anything over 58 would need to be approved by the Health Department. Dixon said that he would be glad to submit documentation showing he'd gotten approval on that

from the Health Department. Tim assured Dixon that the commission is not trying to be a road block to the process, they just want things done correctly.

- Scott asked Pitcher to go over his plan once more and asked some questions about the location of the new retail shops. There was a discussion with the commissioners and Dixon's contractor about what changes will be made to the footings and slab, and he asked about the moving of the existing storage units. There was much discussion about the area where the storage unit buildings are to be relocated. Scott advised Dixon to take precaution and make sure the soil there is suitable for the new slab and footings.
- There was more discussion about parking, and the commissioner's expressed concern that there might not be adequate parking for the new businesses. Scott explained that each business really should have their own allotted stalls for dedicated parking. Dixon responded that there haven't been any problems in the past with dedicated parking.
- Tim asked how trucks access the property, and Dixon referenced his drawing and explained that process they use and said that it works out nicely.
- Dixon expressed to the commission that he feels that when the retail shops are completed, they will be very well done, and they will be a nice addition to the city. He also stated that he is very willing work with the city on any of the City's concerns and suggestions to make the project better.
- There was more discussion about clearly defining parking areas from road areas.
- Tim concluded that there was more that needed to be submitted before the commission could approve the Site Plan on this project. Tim said that he doesn't have concerns with the construction of the new retail shops and the movement of the storage units. However, he does need Dixon to submit a set of professionally completed plans with more thorough information. Tim explained that the drawings that Dixon brought in today were preliminary and too incomplete. Dixon asked what sorts of things were missing from his drawings. Tim responded that he'd like to see the whole site on the plans. Scott said that the plans should show the correct grades, drainage, septic systems, and drain fields. Tim said that storm drains, utilities, fences, lighting, property boundaries, and set-backs need to be shown, as well as a lot of other things. Robert Guiller assured Dixon that they trust his word when he says he will comply with all the City's requirements, but they still have to see it on paper.
- Scott explained that they appreciate that he brought drawings, but there is more to a Site Plan than just an aerial photo. Scott said that Dixon needs to have an official Site Plan drawn up by an actual civil engineer. They discussed how much of the site needs to be on this new site plan, since the area where they want to build has already been drawn up and submitted in the past. Dixon explained that the site has already been approved in the past by the planning commission and that he just needs to make an amendment to the previously approved site. Dixon stated that it is simply an extension on an existing site.
- Dixon asked the commission to clarify what items he works with Jeff Monroe on, and which items he works with the commission on. Tim explained that Jeff deals primarily with the building itself and all building permit issues.
- Tim asked if this project would be split into phases and Dixon said it would not. Tim said phasing would not be required on this Site Plan then.
- Dixon's contractor asked the commission to clarify what area they consider to be the "whole site". Scott said a lot of what is needed should be shown on the hotel's Site Plan. Tim said that if no changes are planned for this or any future build, then the Site Plan for this might not need to include the hotel's entire property. Scott Dixon said that he felt it would be best to take the Site Plans from some of the surrounding buildings, and integrate them all into one set of plans. He said then they could really see the "whole site".
- Dixon asked if the City's new firehouse was required to submit a Site Plan. Tim answered no because they weren't changing grading, and Dixon stated that he isn't either at his site. Tim stated that the grading would change, and Dixon again insisted it would not. Tim said that the addition of pavement would collect more storm water. Dixon said those

same things are happening at the fire house and he stated that he feels the City is making this more expensive for him than they need to. Tim responded that that isn't their intention here, they just need the site plan drawn up correctly. He told Dixon to study the binder he was given by the city, and inside he should find a complete list of what items the city requires on an official Site Plan.

- Tim informed Dixon that according to the City's ordinance the planning commission can allow him to go ahead with the building permit and construction can begin on this project, but that the Site Plan will not be approved until a professionally prepared official Site Plan is submitted and reviewed by the commission at a future meeting. Tim explained that an occupancy permit cannot be issued until the Site Plan had been approved.
- Scott explained that to begin construction before the Site Plan approval is risky and is not the usual order of doing things. Dixon's contractor asked the commission if they perceived any issues that would affect the building location. The commissioner's said they don't see any issues with the retail buildings themselves, but there are additional things that need to be done on the land surrounding the building which is why a Site Plan is required. Tim said that if the commission had perceived any issues they would choose to withhold the building permit, but that they didn't feel that it was necessary to do so on this project.
- Scott expressed that he thought that this expansion would be a good move and an improvement to the site.
- Scott Dixon made a motion to approve the Preliminary Layout for 6658 S. Highway 89, with a civil engineered Site Plan to be submitted for review at a future planning meeting.
 - Site Plan is to include storm drain calculations, septic system, drain fields, parking count, and all other items that would typically be inclusive on a civil drawing.
- Seconded by Robert Guillier.
- All in favor, motion passed.

7. Discussion/Action on Preliminary Plat Application for Doug Crofts; Teena Crofts Trust located at approximately 6778 S. 2125 E., Uintah. *(recording: 02:14:50)

Presenter: Doug Crofts

- Doug Crofts was unable to attend the meeting. Doug sent an e-mail saying that he is waiting on updates to be made to the plat, and he requested that this item be rescheduled to a future meeting.
- Scott Dixon made a motion to table this item, and continue it to a future agenda.
- Seconded Robert Guillier.
- All in favor, motion passed.

8. Discussion/Action on Site Plan Review Process. *(recording: 02:15:50)

- Planning Commission tabled this item, to be added to future agenda.

9. Commissioner's Responsibility Reports and follow-up from previous meeting. *(recording: 02:15:52)

- Tim Petty – nothing to report
- Robert Guillier – nothing to report
- Scott Dixon – nothing to report

10. Meeting adjourned. *(recording: 02:16:00)

- Scott Dixon made a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting for May 24, 2016 at 9:17 p.m.
- Seconded by Robert Guillier.
- All in favor, motion passed.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission this 26 day of July, 2016.



Planning Commission Chair