

APPROVED: PC 11-14-2019

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**October 10, 2019**

**The Riverton City Planning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Riverton City Municipal Building, 12830 South 1700 West, Riverton, Utah.**

**Planning Commission Members:**

**Dennis Hansen, Acting Chair  
Kent Hartley  
Ed James  
Grant Lefgren  
Troy Rushton**

**Staff:**

**Tim Prestwich, City Engineer  
Craig Bott, City Attorney**

**In the absence of Chair Russell, Acting Chair Dennis Hansen assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order. Commissioner Rushton led the Pledge of Allegiance.**

New Planning Commission Member Grant Lefgren was welcomed.

• **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **CONDITIONAL USE**, MICHAEL PAUDLE IS SEEKING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A MONUMENT SIGN FOR MONTESSORI OF RIVERTON, TO BE LOCATED AT 1640 WEST 13200 SOUTH.

City Attorney, Craig Bott, reported that with the above matter it is necessary to open the public hearing first and then present the staff report. By opening the public hearing first the staff report becomes testimony and can be considered part of the decision-making process.

Commissioner Rushton asked if that was the order in which it should be done or just a suggestion since there may not be outstanding questions as the staff report has not been presented. Chair Hansen stated that the public hearing should be opened after which the staff report should be given so that it is heard as part of the public hearing. The meeting would then be opened to public comment.

Chair Hansen opened the public hearing.

City Engineer, Tim Prestwich, presented the staff report and stated that this is an unusual application. It comes to staff because of the location of the monument sign. There is a Table of Uses in the ordinance that states that certain signs and zones become a conditional use that must be approved by the Planning Commission. This particular monument sign is to be located in the R-22 zone and is a conditional use. The Montessori School is located on property that has a combination of zonings including C-N (Commercial Neighborhood), POS (Parks and Open Space), and R-22. He noted that the zoning in the area has a long and storied history. The Montessori School operates in the rear of the property and the owners would like a monument sign out front near the entrance.

A rendering of the site was displayed. The base of the sign is two-feet tall and constructed of brick and is less than eight-feet tall overall, which is required by ordinance. The applicants have reduced the size of the sign to meet the setbacks. The sign was determined to comply with the ordinance. The Planning Commission should determine whether the sign is in compliance with the ordinance. Staff believed it was and recommended approval as shown with the conditions set forth in the staff report. A Building Permit would be required because of the footing as well as a Sign Permit from the Planning Department. The signage should also match what is shown on the plans.

Commissioner James expressed support for the sign and noticed on the aerial photo that there is a different zone. He asked if it is one parcel or two. Mr. Prestwich explained that there are two parcels. The C-N zone is close to the parcel lines and the POS and R-22 are separate parcels with a shared zone boundary. Commissioner James asked if there had been any thought given to bringing it into the POS zone. Mr. Prestwich responded that many years before, there was discussion of developing a larger park. The owner at the time sold the property and developed the Beasley Farms Subdivision. Mr. Prestwich thought the more likely outcome would be for the POS zone to go away and the C-N or R-22 zones would be expanded.

A question was raised as to whether there will be any lighting associated with the sign. Mr. Prestwich responded that the sign will be internally lit. With regard to hours of operation, the ordinance does not address the hours the sign could be illuminated. That perhaps could be addressed in the motion if deemed important by the Commission. It was confirmed that the sign is two-sided.

Mr. Prestwich indicated that the hours of operation are during school hours. A question was raised as to whether it would be necessary to light the sign during the evening and early morning hours. Mr. Prestwich explained that a condition addressing that concern could be added to the motion.

Mr. Bott commented that it could be argued that the sign has an advertising purpose as well as a directive purpose, which would indicate that it may need to be lit outside of school hours. Mr. Prestwich stated that the applicant wants the location to be at the entrance, however, if the property were rezoned C-N it would fall under the regular Sign Ordinance.

Mr. Bott reported that information was brought to staff's attention regarding the property line near the sign, which is in dispute and being litigated. The allegation is that the property line is to the left of where it is shown. If, as a result of litigation, the property line is moved to the left, the sign would be too close to the property line to fall within the standards. If approval of the conditional use is granted tonight and the applicants request sign placement and boundary line changes, it becomes an existing non-conforming use. If that is of concern, the Commission may wish to table the matter until the litigation is resolved and the property line is established. If the property line remains where it is, the applicants could come back and seek conditional use approval. If the property line is modified, the applicants may want to consider placing the sign elsewhere so that it complies with the signage and distance

requirements. They would not have to reapply and pay the application fee a second time if that were the case.

Commissioner James asked if the property line is moved to the north if there is enough room for the sign to be moved and still conform to the line of sight and ordinance requirements. Mr. Prestwich confirmed that condition number one specifies that it must comply with the standards, which would include the setback standards for the line of sight. An additional condition could be added to ensure that it meets the future property line requirements as well.

Chair Hansen opened the meeting to public comment.

Josh Aune, reported that his wife runs the Montessori School. He stated that it is unlikely that their neighbor will let up on the litigation any time soon so if the matter is tabled it will be years before it is readdressed. Mr. Aune reported that the property line shown on the rendering does not exist. It was the proposed property line when they originally entered into the real estate contract with their neighbor. He asked them to buy the property but it was never pursued. Where the line is shown is in violation of the ordinance because it creates less than a 100-foot frontage for the parcel the parking lot is on. It is impossible for the line to be there. The possible property line based on the litigation is to move it further away. There is no way the property line can move closer to the sign because it is already in violation of another ordinance that requires a 100-foot setback. It was clarified that if anything, the property line would be moved to the east.

With regard to the lighting, Mr. Aune stated that one of the uses of the sign is advertising. As a result, having it be illuminated outside of business hours is of interest to them. They do not want it to be an eyesore and would prefer not to see a time limit and asked that they instead impose a lumen restriction. In response to a question raised, Mr. Aune stated that it is not a self-illuminating sign and will more subtle.

Ryan Rudd identified himself as the applicants' neighbor. He was not present to dispute the design of the sign and did not want to hinder the Aunes from advertising for the school. Mr. Rudd indicated himself as an attorney. He drafted the litigating documents and was present in court when the matter was discussed. He wanted to correct a few misstatements and stated that there are a few options on the table. First, he claimed that the 100-foot frontage Mr. Aune spoke of is not accurate. There is a requirement that there be common ownership between the two parcels and the need to request a variance with the City so that the non-conforming 100 feet of frontage would be decreased to 89 feet. If that is what the court orders, a decision was anticipated in the next few days. If the court orders that the current property line is, in fact, correct, they can move the property line onto the parcel that is zoned C-N or request a variance.

Property line issues were addressed between the applicant and Mr. Rudd. Chair Hansen indicated that the property line issue is not in dispute, is not on the agenda, and should not be part of the discussion.

There were no further public comments. Chair Hansen closed the public hearing.

Commissioner James stated that there seem to be two options. The first was to table the matter until the property line issues are resolved or impose a condition on the location of the sign depending on where the property line is located. He was concerned about the width of the frontage not being in conformance with the Code and the potential need for a variance. He did not have a clear understanding of how to approve the sign when they do not know where it will be located until the legal matter is resolved.

A comment was made that if there was an issue the matter would likely come to Planning Commission later to address the non-conforming issue. It seemed like a non-issue now but could come back later.

**Commissioner James moved to APPROVE Application #PLZ 19-2034 Montessori Monument Sign, located at 1640 West 13200 subject to the following:**

**Conditions:**

- 1. The site, signs, structures and use shall remain in compliance with any and all applicable Riverton City standards and ordinances, and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Signage to match signage shown on the plans.**

**Finding of Fact:**

- 1. The sign is in conformance with City Codes and it would not have a negative impact on Redwood Road.**

**Commissioner Rushton seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

- 2. COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN, JAMES GRAHAM IS SEEKING APPROVAL OF A FINAL COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN FOR "RIVERTON CREEK OFFICE BUILDING" TO BE LOCATED AT 11720 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD.**

Chair Hansen opened the public hearing.

Mr. Prestwich presented the staff report and stated that the property is located near the north border of the City on the west side of Redwood Road. A map of the area was displayed and the surrounding zoning described. The General Plan for the area is mixed-use. The multi-family area was previously zoned Commercial. The creek is a FEMA and County-controlled floodway, which means that as staff has reviewed the plan, they have worked with the applicant to ensure that they have been working with FEMA and Salt Lake County Flood Control. Mr. Prestwich stated that several staff members review site plan applications including the City Engineer and the City Storm Water Manager/Flood Plain Coordinator. He noted that some channel improvements will occur as part of the development.

A rendering of the property was displayed. The existing drive approach would be relocated. The site plan was next presented. The location of the building was proposed. Mr. Prestwich stated that the creek channel places limitations on the lot. The proposed building will have four stories with a height of 57.5 feet, which is permitted in the zone. The rear setback shall be 30 feet or one foot for every foot of height. The applicants are proposing a setback of 78 feet. The side yard setback requirement in the zone regardless of height is 20-feet. The applicants are proposing nearly 60 feet. Both of the proposed setbacks meet the ordinance.

Mr. Prestwich reported that staff reviews site plans against several criteria including the parking requirements, which have been met with minor adjustments. They have adequate landscaping and open space including Midas Creek. Very little landscaping was proposed along Midas Creek because it is an active floodway. Because it is a commercial site plan with the potential for multiple tenants in the building, a monument sign has been proposed along Redwood Road. If the site plan is approved, it would include approval of a monument sign on Redwood Road. It would need to comply with all applicable standards. The sign was to be located south of Midas Creek near the entrance.

The architectural elements of the building will include red brick, turn of the century features including brick columns, treatments on top of the windows, accent walls, and variation on a horizontal wall to reduce massing every 30-feet, which is required by ordinance. Roofline variation is also required. Staff received numerous questions about the height of the building. The C-G zone specifies that buildings shall not exceed two stories or 35 feet in height, whichever is less, except where adjacent to a regional transportation corridor where buildings may not exceed four stories or 80 feet in height.

Mr. Prestwich explained that fencing is always an issue with respect to commercial projects, particularly when they are next to residential and whenever there are incompatible uses. There is existing fencing that the applicant is requesting remain. A new eight-foot masonry fence is proposed to match the existing fence in color and texture. The applicant has expressed interest in purchasing the property to the south that is currently zoned RR-22 and wondered if the existing fence could be eliminated. The ordinance allows the Planning Commission to waive fence ordinance requirements in instances where the General Plan allows the property to go to a different use. The Planning Commission shall determine whether to enforce the fence requirement.

Mr. Prestwich explained that the ordinance requires canals and irrigation channels be fenced but does not address creeks. There has been some inconsistency in that regard. The applicant would prefer not to have a fence. They proposed a two-rail vinyl fence in the area. If the Planning Commission determines that there should be a fence there, the applicant would prefer the proposed fence style. Mr. Prestwich explained that there must be fencing along the walkway next to the bridge to prevent fall hazards.

The Lighting Plan must also be approved with the site plan. The Lighting ordinance specifies that the lights must be down lit and light structures cannot extend past the property. The proposed design meets those requirements. There is some light leakage across the property line but the ordinance does not address light trespass. Staff believed the plan is in compliance with the ordinance.

Mr. Bott asked if the creek is natural or manmade. Mr. Prestwich responded that it has been man-modified but is an existing creek. Mr. Bott explained that that makes a significant difference with respect to fencing. Typically, manmade waterways need to be fenced but creeks do not have the same liability.

Mr. Prestwich presented the Landscape Plan and stated that the applicant had difficulty getting enough trees because he cannot plant anything in Midas Creek. He included 20 trees per acre for the gross acreage and planted four of the acres without Midas Creek. The County and FEMA restrict what can be put in the channel, so the landscape plantings do not extend beyond the bank. As a result, there was limited room for trees. The applicant planted in excess of 20 trees per acre for the net site excluding Midas Creek. The rest of the landscaping was determined to meet the ordinance with trees on the parking islands. The applicant also separated the parking stalls with landscaped islands and sod.

There is an existing park strip along Redwood Road and the ordinance calls for the applicant to include trees there. The Parks Department has been maintaining this particular park strip for many years. The applicant has spoken with staff and the applicant has agreed to cut a new drive approach. No trees were desired in that location. The applicant has placed trees near the front of the site that will serve as a buffer. It was noted that the Planning Commission has discretion on the tree placement.

Staff recommended approval of the application with the conditions set forth in the staff report. Representatives from the Fire, Water, Engineering, Stormwater, GIS, and Planning Departments have reviewed the application and found it to be in compliance with the ordinance.

Mr. Prestwich reported that he has received a great deal of input on the matter. Proper notice was provided.

Commissioner James asked for clarification on the flow characteristics of the creek. He asked if there is flowing water year-round. Mr. Prestwich explained that it is a flood creek with tailwater from ditches, creeks, and sprinklers, but it is primarily a stormwater creek.

Commissioner James asked about the Flood District requiring fencing of canals and if there are regulations or requirements to fence the creek on the north or south side. Mr. Prestwich responded that there is no fencing required.

Chair Hansen opened the public hearing.

Brian Myotso identified himself as the President of the HOA of the Cottages at Hidden Creek and an engineer by profession. He stated that the Board has been very active in getting questions answered by Mr. Prestwich, David Jenkins, and James Graham. They have had concerns about the regulatory floodway and wanted to make sure that the water level inside their community is not increased so that their insurance costs do not rise. Mr. Myotso suggested the possible relocation of the garage dumpsters from their current location to the southwest corner of the lot to limit odors to their residents. They also wanted to make sure

the setbacks are locked in and that the parking lot lighting does not shine into their units. They hoped to have more trees along the property line to serve as a buffer and asked when construction was expected to commence.

Blake Votek, a Cottages at Hidden Creek HOA Board Member, stated that they met with the developer and one of their concerns was that there are very few four-story buildings backed up to residential properties. They asked the developer to be transparent and open with them. Mr. Votek stated that the HOA Board has done its due diligence and is aware that the project will likely move forward. He hoped they could have a trusting relationship with the developer going forward.

The applicants, James Graham and Drew Larsen, met with the HOA Board in an effort to address some of their concerns with the project. One of the primary issues was the flood plain. Mr. Graham stated that what they have designed will decrease the flood potential and allow them to retain the 100-year flood rather than cause it. They eliminated bottlenecks by adding the culvert so that any excess water will divert toward Redwood Road naturally. With regard to lighting, it was designed to shine toward the building rather than outward.

With regard to the dumpster, Mr. Graham stated that the dumpster location will be moved to the creekside. They intend to work with the HOA on the plantings on the north side as well. Mr. Graham stated that their access has been approved by UDOT and the permit was granted. A Traffic Report was conducted to determine the impact, trip numbers, and turning movements for the building. The Steam Alteration Permit was also approved via DWR to improve the drainage and the flow. Their project is located along one of the busiest roads in Utah. The project has also been reviewed by FEMA and will reduce flooding impacts on the surrounding property by containing the 100-year flood in the channel culvert. The flood risk will not only be reduced for the is property but for the entire City. One of the issues raised by the homeowners pertained to the type of tenant and use. Mr. Graham stated that the proposed building is the best possible tenant in terms of safety and the project will be good for the City.

Commissioner Hartley inquired about the fencing on the south side and what the applicants would like to see there. Mr. Graham stated that they would like to have the option to not fence that area because they will be developing it. His opinion was that it will look better with a campus feel than being split up. Commissioner Hartley asked about the proposed timeline and if they own the property or are in negotiations. Mr. Graham confirmed that they have purchased the property.

With regard to the timeline, Commissioner James asked if the applicants would object to a condition that within a certain period if they do not develop the property in accordance with the commercial park, they will install the fence. Mr. Graham stated that they would and considered 18 to 24 months to be a reasonable amount of time with which to submit an application.

Commissioner Lefgren acknowledged a concern raised by the HOA about flooding and flood insurance. He asked about the elevations of the road relative to a possible overflow onto Redwood Road. Project Engineer, Tom Assigbe with Ensign Engineering stated that the

top of the bank at Midas Creek has been built up along the creek to avoid flooding into the parking lot area. He confirmed that floodwaters would flow onto Redwood Road before it reaches homes to the north and west. Flow issues were discussed.

Blake Votek commented on the property to the south is a residential lot. He asked if it was purchased by the applicants. He was surprised that the occupant of the home was not present to comment. He considered an office use to be the best use for the property.

Cynthia Glover asked that the trees be maintained inside the property so that the leaves do not fall on the HOA property and result in higher maintenance costs for the residents.

Brittney Baker reported that she lives west of the proposed building. She asked why the applicants are requesting four stories when the property is approved for two.

There were no further public comments. Chair Hansen closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Lefgren stated that in the parking lot there is a section toward the northeast portion and asked how motorists will back out if the parking lot is full. Mr. Graham explained that they would have to back out to a notch and then turn around. They meet the Code requirements and did what they could with the creek. He noted that they are maxed out with their parking. Mr. Prestwich clarified that the parking stalls are larger than the standard.

Commissioner Lefgren remarked that there seems to be an issue with the Code by allowing a four-story building on such a small site. He considered that to differ from a four-story building on a larger site. He was unsure if it was an oversight and suggested the applicants consider placing it closer to Midas Creek rather than pushed up against the residences. He had difficulty approving the request because of the site layout.

Mr. Bott stated that it is primarily a policy decision that is made by the City Council. When an ordinance is passed that is what decisions must be based upon. Mr. Lefgren asked where the Planning Commission stands in making those types of recommendations for future scenarios. Mr. Bott explained that the Planning Commission can make recommendations to the City Council relative to ordinance changes.

**Commissioner James moved that the Planning Commission approve Application #PLZ 19-8002 Riverton Creek Office Building Commercial Site Plan at 11720 South Redwood Road subject to the following:**

**Conditions:**

- 1. Fix minor Riverton City staff redline comments on the plans.**
- 2. Storm drainage systems and accommodations shall comply with the Riverton City Standards and ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**

3. **The applicant shall complete a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City standards and ordinances.**
4. **A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
5. **The site and structures comply with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
6. **The applicant must obtain final approval from all utility providers.**
7. **The applicant must provide City staff with copies of final permits from outside agencies such as FEMA, Salt Lake County Flood Control and UDOT.**
8. **Roof-top mechanical equipment to be screened by parapet walls, parapet walls must have height of depth variation every 50 feet.**
9. **No fencing shall be required at this time as long as a rezone is granted within 24 months. If no application has been submitted on the commercial property to the south, this condition shall be enforced and an eight-foot masonry fence shall be constructed with pattern and color on both sides to closely match the existing eight-foot masonry wall along the north and west property lines.**
10. **The two-rail fence along the top bank of Midas Creek shall be removed from the plans.**
11. **The dumpster shall be moved to the southwest corner of the site.**
12. **If possible, trees shall be included that provide screening with minimal maintenance to the adjoining properties.**

**Findings of Fact:**

1. **This submittal has met all of the design standards of the City and other public agencies and is appropriate for a commercial project along an arterial highway such as Redwood Road.**

**Commissioner Hartley seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Kent Hartley-Aye, Chair Hansen-Aye, Ed James-Aye, Grant Lefgren-Nay, Troy Rushton-Aye. The motion passed 4-to-1.**

Mr. Prestwich stated that several months earlier the City Council transferred all land-use decisions to the Planning Commission.

**3. GENERAL PLAN, RIVERTON CITY IS CONSIDERING CHANGES TO THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that the public hearing for the above item was continued from the last meeting. He commented that the General Plan is amended from time to time by the City. The Land Use Element and the General Plan are both being amended this fall. At the next meeting, the Commission will review the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. The Commission Members will be provided with copies in advance of the meeting. No motion was required of the Commission tonight.

A question was raised with regard to the timeline of the updated Master Plan. Mr. Prestwich expected to address it after the Moderate-Income Housing Plan is finalized. Feedback from the Commission was welcomed.

Chair Hansen opened the public hearing that was continued from the last meeting. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

● **DECISION ITEMS**

**1. AMENDED SITE PLAN, HEATHER ENGLISH IS REQUESTING APPROVAL OF EXTERIOR CHANGES AND SIGNAGE FOR SPEEDWAY, A GAS STATION AND CONVENIENCE STORE AT 12592 SOUTH 1300 WEST.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that the above matter was not noticed as a public hearing but the Planning Commission always has the discretion to take public comment. Noticing issues were discussed. Mr. Prestwich presented the staff report and stated that Speedway gas station is an existing commercial building on an existing commercial site. No changes were proposed to any of the buildings or structures. They are rebranding and getting a new tenant. The applicants intend to make changes to the architectural elements of the building that were approved previously by the Planning Commission. The applicants are proposing to replace the front façade with white and change the name to Speedway. The sign will not be illuminated. The canopy will change from yellow, gold and red to red, gray and white.

On the carwash, they are removing the bubbles and the pop wash and replacing it with the Speedway white and gray with red speed cap. If the sign is treated as a new sign, the signs would be limited to 30 square feet. The entrance and exit signs will be limited to six square feet under the current ordinance. If it is considered a legal non-conforming sign, they will replace it with new branding that will match the pop wash and exit signs. Mr. Prestwich explained that what has been submitted is a new sign plan that should be brought into conformance with the current standard of 30 square feet for the two wall signs and six square feet for the exit and entry signs.

**Commissioner Lefgren moved to approve Application #PLZ 19-8008 Speedway Amended Site Plan, located at 12592 South 1300 West subject to the following conditions:**

1. **The site, structures, and use shall remain in compliance with any and all applicable Riverton City standards and ordinances, and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
2. **Building colors and finishes to match those shown on the plans.**
3. **Signage to match signage shown on the plans with the following modifications**
  - a. **The “Speedwash” signs on the car wash shall not exceed 30-square feet each.**
  - b. **The directional signs on the carwash shall not exceed six-square feet each.**

**Commissioner James seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

2. **FINAL SITE PLAN, A&I FLOORING IS REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A FINAL SITE PLAN IN RIVERTON MARKET LOCATED AT 3657 SOUTH WEST MEADOW SPRING LANE WEST 12600 SOUTH.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that the request is for a final site plan for a commercial site plan. It is a decision item because it is inside a Master Commercial Site Plan. A Conditional Use Hearing was held previously. The Planning Commission approved the Conditional Use Permit and the applicant proceeded with his plans and has been reviewing them with staff since that time.

A site map was displayed of the Spring Creek Commercial project. The road through the development is private and is owned and maintained by the City. There is residential to the south and commercial to the east, north, northwest, and west. The property is zoned RR-22.

The applicant plans to keep the existing fencing and add similar fencing along the west and east property lines that connect to a gate. The plans show six-foot and eight-foot fencing because of the grade separation and the existing eight-foot fence. Staff recommended it be an eight-foot fence to provide screening.

In response to a question raised, Mr. Prestwich reported that the fence to the south along the private road is masonry and a continuation of the eight-foot wall.

Mr. Prestwich pointed out that there is a pedestal for a streetlight that was not installed with the development. He added an additional condition to include a streetlight in that location.

With regard to the landscaping coverage, the acreage includes part of the private road. The entire parcel including the private lane meets the 20% requirement. The coverage also meets the maximum coverage. The minimum parking requirements have also been met. It was noted that the parking is provided behind the gates. That works in this instance because

of the unique use of the building. Mr. Prestwich explained that the parking is behind the gates because the business involves servicing the equipment inside the trailers. The desire is for the area to be secure. If another user were to come in at some point in the future, they would likely be required to address the issue of the gates. In the Conditional Use Permit, the applicant was asked to keep the parking five feet off so that there is a landscape buffer between the residential and commercial uses.

The applicant asked that the fencing match the texture and color of the existing wall. The gates are solid metal and painted black, which ties in with the black trim on the building. The building matches many of the architectural elements of the building across the road to the west. There are stacked stones on the corner and on the pop-outs with variation on the roofline and front in materials and color. Glass will not extend beyond the doors and will not go to the floor. There are metal overhangs with columns to support them. Staff determined that the proposed architecture complies with the ordinance. There are garage doors along the back and on the west elevation.

The Lighting Plan includes no projected light emissions with very little trespassing onto the nearby commercial use.

Mr. Prestwich next addressed the Landscape Plan and stated that there are trees along the frontage. The sidewalk is intermittent in the area. Because it is a public road there is no reason to connect the sidewalk at this time.

Concern was expressed about the landscaping obscuring the line of sight. Mr. Prestwich stated that because it is a private road traffic is expected to be slow. Narrow and low maintenance trees were placed on every island and entry. It was suggested that tree species be specified to preserve the line of sight.

Mr. Prestwich reported that the storm drain on the site ties into the Master Storm Drain Plan that was installed as part of the Master Development Plan. Staff recommended approval with the conditions set forth in the staff report.

Commissioner Rushton asked about the private lane and the concerns with parking. He asked if the City has latitude to limit parking along the street. Mr. Prestwich stated that it is not labeled as no parking but if the asphalt width is inadequate, the Fire Department could prohibit parking on one side.

A question was raised about the detention area near the Senior Center and whether it was designed for future development. Mr. Prestwich explained that two ponds are connected to a third on the north side of Deseret Industries. It is an elaborate system that slowly trickles into the City's system.

The applicant's engineer, Jared Forsythe, reported that with regard to the fencing he suggested his client use, initially, they wanted a concrete fence. Ultimately, the decision was made to match what exists currently. The applicants want privacy and do not intend to store anything outside other than the trailers. This building will serve as the headquarters for the business. They have 12 crews that do concrete finishing.

**Commissioner Rushton moved to approve Application #PLZ 19-8003 A&I Flooring Final Site Plan, located at 3657 West Meadow Spring Lane subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Fix minor Riverton City staff redline comments on the plans.**
- 2. Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with the Riverton City Standards and ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**
- 3. The applicant shall complete a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City standards and ordinances.**
- 4. A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
- 5. The site and structures comply with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
- 6. The applicant must obtain final approval from utility providers.**
- 7. The site, structures, and use shall comply with the Conditional Use Permit approved by the Riverton City Planning Commission on February 28, 2019.**
- 8. Masonry fence shall be eight-feet tall, with pattern and color on both sides to closely match the existing eight-foot masonry wall along the south property line.**
- 9. Rooftop mechanical to be screened by parapet walls.**
- 10. Remove the eight street trees shown on the plans on the north and northwest property boundaries due to safety concerns and the fact that they are on the blind side of the street.**

**Commissioner Lefgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

- 3. AMENDED SITE PLAN, GREG LARSEN WITH BUCKLYN ROSE HEALTH PROPERTIES IS SEEKING APPROVAL OF AN EXTERIOR CHANGE TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN FOR COUNTRY LIFE SKILLED NURSING PHASE 2 TO BE LOCATED AT 13757 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that there is a small change to the architecture of a building that was

previously approved. The matter came to the Commission in March at which time it was approved. One of the points of discussion was the pop-outs. The owner would like the rock to extend to the ground so that inside it can be used as floor space. It is a care center and they would like to be able place a wheelchair in the space rather than a bench seat. The applicant still plans to put stone underneath. It was noted that the modification will not change the setback.

**Commissioner Hartley moved to approve modifications to Application #PLZ 18-8008 Country Life Phase 2 Site Plan, located at 13757 South Redwood Road subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The site, structures, and use shall remain in compliance with any and all applicable standards and ordinances, and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Building colors and finishes to match those shown on the plans.**

**Commissioner James seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

- **MINUTES**

- 1. SEPTEMBER 26, 2019**

**Commissioner Hartley moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of September 26, 2019, as written. Commissioner James seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the commission.**

- **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:10 p.m.