

ON July 22, 2020 AT 6:00 P.M., THE HURRICANE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MET IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 147 N 870 WEST HURRICANE, UT.

Members Present: Paul Farthing, Dayton Hall, Mark Sampson, Ralph Ballard, Chris Christensen, Michelle Cloud, and Rebecca Bronemann.

Members Excused: Shelly Goodfellow

Staff Present: Planning Director Stephen Nelson, Planning Technician Brienna Spencer, City Council Representative Darin Larson, Engineering Department Representative Darrin LeFevre, and City Attorney Fay Reber.

Chairman Paul Farthing called meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mark Sampson and Ralph Ballard offered the prayer. Roll call was taken.

New Business:

2020-PSP-03 Consideration and possible approval of a proposed Preliminary Site Plan, Villas at the Haven, containing 20 multi-family units located at approximately 100 N and 2170 W. Brad Oliverson Applicant.

Mark Sampson questioned the process of approval after the preliminary site plan is approved. Dayton Hall asked how many bedrooms will be in each unit. He stated under code you have to have 2 parking spaces per unit. Brad Oliverson stated they have the garage and the single parking driveway as the parking for the units which is tandem parking. Mr. Hall stated tandem parking is permitted in multi-family and doesn't understand the issue and questioned the staff recommendations for parking. Mr. Nelson stated that tandem parking is only allowed if approval from Planning Commission. Staffs concerns are that single garages generally end up being storage so you have one vehicle in the driveway and the other on the street. 2170 West isn't designed for overflow parking. Mr. Oliverson stated that the purpose for the community is for retired and elderly people/couples. Something that isn't too big for them and won't require anything extra work to care for with a nice little amenity package. It won't be families living in the units. If those living in the units need extra care, they will be moving into the Haven, there will not be the healthcare workers coming and going. Mr. Hall stated the way he sees it is if they approve the preliminary now, it'll be subject to staff comments. Mr. Nelson stated that he would be open to compromise offsite parking to help but believes if there is only the tandem parking, there will be parking issues later on. Mr. Hall stated that he sees only an extra 6 parking spots aside from those provided at the units. Chris Christensen asked Mr. Nelson if he was satisfied with the amount of parking onsite for visitors. Mr. Nelson stated that he is and if they have a double driveway, that'll help with the parking as well. Mr. Christensen would like to see the development that is dark sky compliant. He is the dark sky warrior. Mr. Nelson stated that will be part of the final site plan. Paul Farthing stated that he can see how you can get away with just one parking spot if you were 75+ because chances are, you only have one car. However, a lot of 55+ persons still have two vehicles. He doesn't know why you would want to move into the villas unless the next step would be to move into The Haven. Mr. Oliverson stated they actually put more parking than required in front of the Haven and they that more residence have cars than not. He believes it's better to have more parking than not enough. Mr. Farthing asked if there was any way to fit more parking in the site plan while providing nice living spaces instead of a double car garage? Ralph Ballard asked what the tradeoff would be if the applicant did a double driveway. Mr.

Oliverson stated that they would lose landscaping and open space. Mr. Ballard thinks that staff comments and Mr. Hall's concerns of the parking are valid and visitors could lead to a parking issue. Mr. Sampson asked what JUC comment 2 was meaning about the ductile pipes needed. Mr. Nelson stated it is a comment from the water department where there are standards that require if there is a private water system and the piping that goes through it is serving multiple units, it has to be ductile piping. Darren LeFevre stated the pressure zones in the area and the likelihood of it breaking. Hurricane City doesn't want that liability. Ductile piping is required to avoid breaking due to pressure. Mr. Farthing is torn because if people are downsizing, he'd hate to see the applicant lose landscaping and open space for a bunch of parking spaces. Rebecca Bronemann stated that hopefully people would research before moving into a place like this. She would assume that they would make accommodations to whatever is available to them if they really want to live there. Mr. Ballard recommended some kind of signage for parking stating where there is additional parking. Maybe there is a simpler way to resolve the issue without adding an unneeded double garage/driveway. Mr. Oliverson explained what their future plans are for the Haven. He said that when they do that development, it will eliminate the parking problem on 100 N that they did not foresee happening. Maybe that could be overflow parking for the villas with it being across the street. Mr. Christensen stated that he believes that would be inconvenient to have offsite parking and have to walk across the street to visit the residence residing in the Villas. There are currently 80 residents living in the Have and 20 of them are couples and 10 of those couples have cars. He would imagine the percentage would be about the same for the Villas. Mr. Farthing mentioned concerns about possible future owners and the possibility of them not enforcing the parking rules. Mr. Oliverson asked about possibly doing a development agreement upon final approval. Mr. Nelson stated a development agreement would be something that could be done. Mr. Christensen's concern is having multiple people coming to visit mom and dad, what are you going to do with minimal parking? Mr. Oliverson asked about the city possibly working with them on reducing the open space requirements to accommodate more parking. Mr. Nelson stated that there are some provisions where the Planning Commission can waive some of the requirements for open space and landscaping. Mr. Hall has an idea of not allowing tandem parking due to the amount of discussion there is on the parking issue. He does like the idea of the parking spots not associated with the units over by the facilities to include those in the total of parking provided. Mr. Farthing as is there any compromise to the parking situation? Maybe require 20 or 30 instead of 40? Mr. Nelson stated that they are providing 40 parking spaces, but 100% of them are tandem parking. Mr. Ballard brought up the development of Rainbow Canyon and how they have designated visitor parking. Mr. Christensen asked what Mr. Nelson and the city would like to see. Mr. Nelson stated that staff's initial recommendation was to require that every driveway have a two-car capacity, with the main concern is that there is no real overflow street parking for the development. Commissioners continued to discuss the possible options to resolve the parking issue. Mr. Hall recommended following the ordinances and not allow the tandem parking.

Dayton Hall motioned an approval subject to JUC and staff comments to be included in the construction drawings and the final site plan prove a minimum of 2 non tandem parking spaces per unit and the buildings are set 20 feet apart. Seconded by Chris Christensen. Unanimous.

Planning Commission business:

1. **Review of proposed side yard street setbacks for accessory buildings in residential and residential agriculture zones.**

Commissioners discussed why this item was being brought before them a second time. Stephen Nelson stated that last meeting he brought up that the City Council approve what the Planning Commission had recommended to have side yard street setbacks be two feet in residential and residential agriculture zones. However, during that meeting, staffs raised a concern about public utility easement that go along the roadway and how that set back could conflict. City Council's recommendation to staff was that they would approve the two feet now but for staff to bring back a change for them to consider the 10 feet in the near future. Mark Sampson asked why staff disagreed with the Planning Commission and why it was brought up to the City Council after it was already discussed with them. Mr. Nelson stated that a number of staff brought it up because they felt like it was a big enough concern that it deserved consideration by the City Council. Mr. Sampson mentioned it would have been nice to have staff raise their concerns with them the first time, so they could have considered it in their own decisions. Dayton Hall stated that he thinks they did raise their concerns but the Planning Commission did not agree with them. Ralph Ballard replied to Mr. Sampson that the Planning Commission sends things to the City Council, they give the best advice they can and someone takes that and does the best they can with it. He stated that they are more of a counseling compacity and assisting the City Council and not the governing body. Chris Christensen asked how you can build anything in a 10-foot utility easement, it isn't yours to build in. Why would the city say its two feet when they are allowing the building already? It seems conflicting to him. Mr. Nelson stated that staffs biggest concern is that with the two feet, there is some conflict with where most utility easements are and potential future ones. Mr. Christensen thinks the setback should be 10 feet. Mr. Ballard stated that the easement was given for access and you need to provide it, that is the entire reason you gave it up. He did state that it bothers him a little bit with the potential public utility easement. Mr. Hall stated that there are a lot of lots that don't have PUE's along the side where if we were to do what staff recommends and made a 10-foot setback then those that don't have one would be prohibited from building in that 10 foot area even though there isn't a PUE. That is his concern, why would we restrict people from using that area when there is no reason to it except for maybe someday the City wants to put utilities there. Mr. Nelson explained the reason for setbacks on a property but they are mainly for safety, help protect against property infringement and it also aesthetics on how you want your neighborhood to feel/look. Commissioners have discussed dripline issues in past meetings and where you measure the setbacks from, whether it was from the drip line or from the foundation of the property line. Stephen summarized what the City would like to see and what his steps will be going forth with presenting a new ordinance to the Planning Commission. Mr. Ballard stated that he would like to have the dripline clarified because it can be a problem. Commissioners and staff went back to discussing side yard street setbacks. Mr. Hall stated that all they are doing is stating that if there is a public utility easement then there will not be any accessory buildings allowed to be built within it.

Meeting adjourned at 7:25p.m.