

Approved October 8, 2020

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
April 9, 2020**

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

Planning Commission Members:

Gary Cannon, Chair
Brian Russell
Dennis Hansen
Kent Hartley
Ed James
Troy Rushton
Grant Lefgren

Staff:

Jason Lethbridge, Development Services Director
Tim Prestwich, Zoning Administrator
Gary Wilson, City Engineer

Chair Gary Cannon called the meeting to order. Commissioner Rushton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Cannon described the purpose of the Planning Commission Meeting amidst the current COVID-19 restrictions.

• **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **HOME OCCUPATION**, EDWARD DEAN SMITH IS REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A HOME OCCUPATION, "DMR, LLC" TO BE LOCATED AT 3453 WEST 13175 SOUTH.

Zoning Administrator, Tim Prestwich, presented the staff report and stated that the applicant is aware that auto repair on his property is prohibited by Riverton City's Home Occupation Ordinance. The applicant is instead seeking to deliver his services as a mobile business. The applicant does not anticipate customers coming to his home; however, he does expect 2 to 3 auto parts deliveries per day. An office is located in the detached garage, hence the purpose of coming before the Planning Commission. The applicant will have a work truck that will be parked in the driveway or detached garage. Mr. Prestwich stated that no comments have been received from the public.

Commissioner James asked why Mr. Prestwich included the terminology "50% garage usage" on his motions. Mr. Prestwich explained that on a ½ acre or greater property, the ordinance allows for more than 50% of a detached building. The recommended motion was intentionally included in what the applicant showed on his site plan.

Chair Cannon opened the public hearing.

Mr. Prestwich stated that considering the circumstances, reading the public comments prior to the meeting was enlightening.

The applicant Edward Dean Smith was participating remotely but was not able to speak due to technical difficulties.

Commissioner Hansen stated that the applicant should not store vehicles needing repair on the property and requested that condition to that effect be added.

There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commission Russell moved to approve Application #PLZ 20-2010, DMR, LLC, to be located at 3453 West 13175 South 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, specifically the City Home Occupation Ordinance (18.190) and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Applicant must obtain and maintain a Riverton City business license.**
- 3. Owner's service truck be parked in his driveway or garage when at the home.**
- 4. No vehicle repair work may be conducted at the home.**
- 5. The Home Occupation may utilize the detached garage as shown on the plan.**
- 6. No vehicle storage at the home.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hansen. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- 2. HOME OCCUPATION, JENNY ROBISON IS REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A HOME OCCUPATION, "ROYAL ROBI COOKIES" TO BE LOCATED AT 3244 WEST BLUE HEELER WAY.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the staff report and stated that the proposed Home Occupation will have minimal impact on the neighborhood. The applicant manages the business by herself and has no employees. The kitchen in the home is utilized for the business and will not require modifications, which is allowed by the Cottage Food Law. The applicant expects 3 to 5 visitors per month and has adequate parking at the home consisting of a three-car driveway with one stall that is double deep. It was noted that the applicant frequently delivers her orders. The applicant makes specialty cookies directed at a target demographic. The application was before the Planning Commission because it involves food preparation in the home. The application was determined to meet all ordinance requirements.

Mr. Prestwich reported that he received one comment from a neighbor who inquired about impacts on the neighborhood and asked what will happen if the applicant has more visitors than anticipated. Mr. Prestwich stated that if the applicant has more than six visitors per day, she will need to come back before the Planning Commission for approval.

Staff approved this application with the conditions set forth in the staff report.

Chair Cannon opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

The applicant was not present or online to answer questions.

Commissioner James moved to approve Application #PLZ 20-2011, Royal Robi Cookies, to be located at 3244 West Blue Heeler Way 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, specifically the City Home Occupation Ordinance (18.190) and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Applicant must obtain and maintain a Riverton City business license.**
- 3. Home Occupation must operate within the Fixed Standards, and applicable Qualifications and Conditions as outlined in the Home Occupation Ordinance and this approval.**
- 4. Home Occupation must follow State and County rules and regulations for food preparation.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hansen. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- 3. HOME OCCUPATION, EDDIE AND LANA SANFAROSA ARE REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A HOME OCCUPATION, "HIGH CALIBER AIRLESS REPAIR", TO BE LOCATED AT 13095 SOUTH 2200 WEST.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the staff report and stated that the applicant indicated that he currently has other Home Occupations on the site; however, staff could not find any on record. Staff will research and reach a conclusion on the matter.

There will be no additional employees at the home and an air compressor will generate noise in the garage at times. Mr. Prestwich referred to a photo of the property and explained how the applicant's business will be managed and how the applicant's property will be utilized. No customers will come to the home and all work will be done in the garage and driveway. All equipment will be transported in a trailer that is owned by the applicant.

Because it is an attached garage on less than a ½ acre, 50% of the attached garage space is the limitation by ordinance. Mr. Prestwich explained that staff would like to include a condition that the trailer be required to park to the side of the home.

Commissioner Lefgren asked if a fence will screen the back of the home and enclose the trailer. Mr. Prestwich stated that the trailer will be enclosed on three sides. Chair Cannon stated that the home to the south is on the garage side, which may help reduce the noise.

Commissioner James was concerned that the compressor will generate a significant amount of noise. He asked if there is an indication that the applicant will keep the garage door closed when in use. Mr. Prestwich stated that there is a clause in the ordinance that requires the garage door to be closed when the air compressor is in use. It also prohibits any business activity between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. It was noted that the Planning Commission can adjust the requirements for the situation.

Commissioner Rushton asked about the trailer recommendation and disagreed that the trailer should be required to be concealed. Mr. Prestwich stated that the condition he recommended is just a consideration.

Chair Cannon opened the public hearing.

The applicant was not present or online to answer questions.

There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Russell moved to approve Application #PLZ 20-2012, High Caliber Airless Repair, to be located at 13095 South 2200 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, specifically the City Home Occupation Ordinance (18.190) and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Applicant must obtain and maintain a Riverton City business license.**
- 3. Business use no more than 50% of the attached garage space.**
- 4. Garage door be closed when the air compressor is being used.**

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

4. CONDITIONAL USE PRIVATE LANE, TERESA PHILLIPS IS REQUESTING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A PRIVATE LANE PROPOSED AT 2432 WEST 12310 SOUTH.

Mr. Prestwich presented the staff report and stated that this situation is unique in that the lots are currently existing on the property. The property was identified on a map displayed. What was presented was a conceptual layout. The applicant is required to engineer and design the plans as a condition of developing the property.

Mr. Prestwich reported that a neighbor to the east was concerned about the proximity of the lane to their property and requested that a fence be required if approved. Mr. Prestwich stated that there is no fencing requirement and there is already an existing fence along the property. The neighbor was also concerned that the fence will be damaged by vehicles driving on the lane since the lane is flush against the fence. Mr. Prestwich reviewed the private-lane ordinance and stated that staff included a condition in response to this concern. Mr. Prestwich commented that the request meets all criteria and recommended approval subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report.

Commissioner Lefgren asked if an additional fire hydrant will be required along the lane. Mr. Prestwich stated that it is likely that the Fire Department will require sprinklers or a fire hydrant and that the applicant has been notified. Commissioner Lefgren asked the width of the lane for emergency vehicles. Mr. Prestwich stated that the width is 27 to 32 feet, which exceeds the ordinance.

Chair Cannon asked if the detached garage is located on the old or new existing lot line setbacks and how it will fit in the ordinance with the new property line in the past and moving forward. Mr. Prestwich explained that the application specifies that the garage does meet the setbacks and that the garage was previously over the line; however, the applicant moved the line to the fence line.

Commissioner Lefgren asked if the front lot on the property was at a minimum. Mr. Prestwich stated that it was previously less, however, the applicant has adjusted the line to make it the minimum. Commissioner Lefgren asked if the easement would make it smaller. Mr. Prestwich responded that it would not. The applicant is selling the two lots and has informed the potential buyers of the requirements.

Commissioner Rushton asked if the field behind the property will have access to the lane if developed. Mr. Prestwich stated that it will not.

Chair Cannon asked if the owner of the front property will retain ownership to the driveway and give access to the detached garage to the owners on the back lot. Mr. Prestwich stated that they will.

The applicant was not present or online to answer questions.

Mr. Prestwich reported that no public comments were submitted.

Commissioner James asked if the five items submitted for comment are realistic in terms of the review process. Mr. Prestwich stated that the applicant has some concerns, however, those five items will be addressed in the review process.

Commissioner Hansen asked if the request could be approved for subdivision approval in the future. Mr. Prestwich stated that it will not be approved as a subdivision since these are existing lots.

Commissioner Cannon asked if the adjacent neighbors will be allowed to open the back of their property and join it with this property. Mr. Prestwich reviewed the ordinance and stated that only four lots are allowed on a private lane. Commissioner Cannon asked if additional development will be approved along the side of the neighbor's property who submitted the comment. Mr. Prestwich responded that there cannot be any more development unless the neighbor approves it.

Chair Cannon opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Hartley moved to approve Application #PLZ 20-2008, Teresa Phillips Private Lane, to be located at 2432 West 12310 South subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Private lane shall service one (1) lot.**
- 2. Private lane shall be a minimum 20-ft wide pavement with 25-foot wide easement.**
- 3. Private lane shall meet applicable Riverton City Ordinance and Engineering Standards and Specifications.**
- 4. City staff shall review and approve the design of the lane, drainage system, drive approach, Long term stormwater management plan and utility connections.**
- 5. A building permit may be issued after the staff approves the plans but prior to the lane being paved, if the Fire Department determines adequate fire protection is in place.**
- 6. The private lane must be paved prior to final inspection and certificate of occupancy for the new home.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell. Vote on motion: Commissioner Russell-Aye, Commissioner Hansen-Aye, Commissioner Hartley-Aye, Commissioner James-Aye, Commissioner Lefgren-Aye, Commissioner Rushton-Aye, Commissioner Cannon-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5. MINOR SUBDIVISION, DAVID MADSEN AND BRIAN EBERT ARE REQUESTING SUBDIVISION APPROVAL OF ASPEN COURT, A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT 1546 WEST 11745 SOUTH.

Mr. Prestwich presented the staff report and stated the above matter is an administrative action item for findings based on the specifics of the ordinance. The subdivision is currently approved for two lots; however, the current application is for an additional two lots. The property was identified on a map displayed.

Mr. Prestwich reported that this item is related to the next agenda item and the neighbors are receiving notices for both. A significant number of comments were submitted from the neighbors and they were printed and provided to the Commission Members. Mr. Prestwich reported that one neighbor stated that the property has been surveyed and six feet of the proposed property is on his property. Mr. Prestwich reached out to the applicant and reviewed the Alta Survey. It was determined that the fence is slightly inside the boundary. Staff recommended that the motion specify that the boundary must be resolved prior to plat recordation. It was noted that the subject property will still be within the correct dimensions to continue with the current plans.

Commissioner James asked what the certification process is to determine the property boundary. Mr. Prestwich responded that if there was a dispute on record, the City would postpone further action until the impacted property owner grants approval. Chair Cannon stated that if there is a discrepancy in the square footage, it will not change the zoning or prohibit the applicant from moving forward. Legal action may take place; however, it will not prevent the applicant from developing the property.

Chair Cannon opened the public hearing.

The applicant, Brian Ebert and Engineer, David Madsen participated via telephone.

Mr. Ebert stated they were made aware of the dispute late this afternoon and he spoke with their surveyor and engineer. The property owner to the north has indicated the fence line has existed for approximately 100 years. In the best interest of all parties involved, Mr. Ebert suggested they reach an agreement with the property owner to the north and adjust his fence line to the south of the existing fence. He stated that doing so will satisfy his neighbor's concerns. Based on information from the surveyor and engineer, the lots will still be one-half acre in size. Mr. Ebert stated that the appropriate agreement will be drafted to ensure that all parties have agreed to the terms.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner James moved to approve Application #PLZ 19-1005, Aspen Court Subdivision, to be located at 1546 West 11745 South as shown on the accompanying plans subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Fix minor Riverton City Engineering Division redline comments on the plans.**

2. **Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with Riverton City Standards and ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**
3. **Applicant shall complete a Long-Term Stormwater Management Plan according to Riverton City standards and ordinances.**
4. **A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction or 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. **Applicant shall pipe or abandon all open irrigation ditches on the property, and coordinate piping/abandonment with affected upstream and downstream users and the City Engineer according to City Ordinance prior to issuance of building permits.**
8. **Site fencing shall be installed as shown on the plans and must be installed prior to issuance of building permits.**
9. **All parties, prior to recording of the plat, shall agree on the property lines.**

Commissioner Rushton asked if it is appropriate for the City to require Condition 9. Commissioner James explained that the City becomes a party to the recording of a plat if there has been a predetermined issue to be resolved. Chair Cannon stated that it is not the City's responsibility to interfere if the zoning is not impacted. Commissioner Rushton recalled from previous experience that if there is a dispute, the City should not delay an application. Commissioner Lefgren agreed with Commissioner James that the matter should be taken care of before development takes place.

Commissioner Rushton asked for input from City Attorney, Craig Bott but his comments were off mic and inaudible. Commissioner Cannon stated that the neighbors do not necessarily desire to purchase insignificant pieces of property from one another. He questioned whether it behooves the City to tell property owners where their property line is.

Commissioner Russell asked if Commissioner James would like to modify his motion. Commissioner James wished to leave his motion as-is.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lefgren. Vote on motion: Commissioner Russell-Nay, Commissioner Hansen-Aye, Commissioner Hartley-Nay, Commissioner

James-Aye, Commissioner Lefgren-Aye, Commissioner Rushton-Nay, Commissioner Cannon-Nay. The motion failed 3-to-4.

Commissioner Hartley moved to approve Application #PLZ 19-1005, Aspen Court Subdivision, to be located at 1546 West 11745 South as shown on the accompanying plans subject to the following conditions.

- 1. Fix minor Riverton City Engineering Division redline comments on the plans.**
- 2. Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with Riverton City Standards and ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**
- 3. Applicant shall complete a Long-Term Stormwater Management Plan according to Riverton City standards and ordinances.**
- 4. A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction or 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. Applicant shall pipe or abandon all open irrigation ditches on the property, and coordinate piping/abandonment with affected upstream and downstream users and the City Engineer according to City Ordinance prior to issuance of building permits.**
- 8. Site fencing shall be installed as shown on the plans and must be installed prior to issuance of building permits.**

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell. Vote on motion: Commissioner Russell-Aye, Commissioner Hansen-Aye, Commissioner Hartley-Aye, Commissioner James-Nay, Commissioner Lefgren-Aye, Commissioner Rushton-Aye, Commissioner Cannon-Aye. The motion passed 6-to-1.

- 6. REZONE, RD DEVELOPMENT IS REQUESTING A REZONE OF ABOUT 12.05 ACRES LOCATED NEAR 11800 SOUTH AND REDWOOD ROAD.**

Development Services Director, Jason Lethbridge, presented the staff report and stated that the application has been discussed previously by the Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Lethbridge reviewed the history of the application and stated that it is a valid application and within the City's ordinance. The property was identified on a map displayed.

The RM-6 zoning was defined. It was noted that the applicant is requesting this zoning for small single-family detached lots.

Mr. Lethbridge reported that there has been a significant amount of public comment and concern with the road network, density, and lot types within the development. The road connections will need to be resolved regardless of the density. He pointed out that road connections do not need to be addressed with a rezone, however, staff included potential language in the staff report.

The applicant included the concept plans to indicate that the zoning being applied for will function with any of the potential road networks. He also wished to express his willingness to comply with the City. The Planning Commission's action during the application process was reviewed.

Mr. Lethbridge reported that the current focus of the Planning Commission is to determine the lot size and density. The proposal was presented outlining the details in each zoned portion of the property on a map displayed. Whether this applicant or a future developer applied to develop under this zoning, they would be held to the same standards should the request be approved. Mr. Lethbridge stated that the RM-6 zoning currently includes a requirement for fencing, which does not need to be addressed. Any additional language in the RM-6 zoning ordinance the Commission would like to add or modify is at their discretion.

Public comment was also submitted concerning the appropriateness of holding a public hearing for this item under the current COVID-19 circumstances. Mr. Lethbridge recommended the item be continued to the next public meeting with the intention being that the public can be more involved and informed on the matter. The public comment period will remain open, staff will post the presentation of this item as quickly as possible, and the public will have the opportunity to listen, review, and comment before the next Planning Commission meeting. Staff's intention was not to exclude the public or limit their participation.

Mr. Bott suggested that staff establish a deadline for the submission of comments to give time to forward to the applicant for review and to submit a response. With this interaction, both sides were given ample opportunity to hear each other and provide input to the Commission.

Commissioners Russell and Hartley both stated that the applicant's information and public comments are the same. The Commission was under the impression that new information would be presented or that public comment had changed. Mr. Bott stated that this is a dynamic of due process and the City is required to allow the applicant and residents to provide public input until a determination is made.

Commissioner Cannon asked why a continuance was given for the application. Mr. Lethbridge stated that the only reason staff was recommending a continuance was because of the limitation of public participation at or this meeting. He wanted to prevent a violation of due process. He recognized that the timing is inconvenient, however, wanted to

ensure that the public is allowed to give feedback. The purpose of repeating the item was because the City Council remanded it back to the Commission.

Commissioner James commented that the Council needs to be aware that the Commission has repeatedly requested information from the applicant. The Commission has not received information on the wetlands and the net effect of the area. The Commission was also being presented with two rezones and an issue with roads. This is very repetitive and until the applicant brings in specific information to address these issues, it should not be presented.

Commissioner Rushton disagreed with Commissioner James in that the zones do have adequate guidelines and the developer discussed SD zones with the City. The Commissioners need to be ready to make a decision.

Mr. Lethbridge stated that the proposal does not include unique zoning in each area. The SD zone is designed to take one project area and provide differing standards to address in this situation. The wetlands will remain an issue in Area 1, however, the language in the SD is a maximum and the highest number of units that can be placed in the area, not what will necessarily be approved. The Public Works Department has been involved with the property owner in evaluating the need for public space as part of the development.

Commissioner Rushton referred to the map and asked if it is within the Commission's right to request that Area 2 require 1,000 feet on the borders. Mr. Lethbridge stated that the language is currently written to include that. Commissioner Rushton also asked if the road network could be an SD as part of the recommendation. Mr. Lethbridge confirmed that it can and that Redwood Road can be stubbed with the residents in the R-6 lots required to go through the road network. Commissioner Rushton asked if Melba Lane be stubbed at Redwood Road, even though it is outside the developer's area. Mr. Lethbridge suggested that because Melba Lane is outside the project area, it cannot be an SD designation. The Commission could, however, recommend to the Council the recommended zoning with the SD conditions. This will put the responsibility on the Council to make the determination.

Commissioner James asked about the maximum density count when the applicant previously came before the Council and Commission. He felt it was a necessity to discuss the number of units deemed appropriate for the traffic on Redwood Road. Mr. Lethbridge indicated that he would defer those comments to the applicant.

Commissioner Cannon opened the public hearing.

The applicant, Dave Morton, thanked staff and the Commissioners for their efforts and apologized that the application had come before them again. He noted that that was not his intention. He stated that his team has done their best to incorporate the needs of the City with the concerns of the neighbors. They have had meetings with the neighbors along with Council Member Buroker to understand their concerns. Their objective was to alleviate the concerns of the neighbors and make the Council and Commission's jobs easier. Mr. Morton stated that they have outlined the specific designation of the SD specific to these areas. Many public comments pertained to the property consisting of 72 lots and more attached housing. In an effort to alleviate these concerns, he imposed parameters to ensure that

there are specific outlines moving forward. The proposed project will be entirely single-family other than in Area 3, which has been for sale for over 10 years. The objective was to work with the Planning Commission to encourage the best outcome possible. Originally, the RM-6 zone was created by Mayor Staggs specifically for this area.

Commissioner Russell commented on the importance of gathering the remainder of the public comments between now and the next meeting and giving the applicant an opportunity to address them as requested by the City Attorney.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Lethbridge stated that one of the reasons why the Commission has repeatedly seen this application is because the underlying zoning is not optimal for the property. He reviewed the property's zoning history and explained why it is so complicated. He commented that this application may be an opportunity to review the zoning for the property.

Commissioner Russell asked if it was possible to make a motion to return this item as a decision item and if doing so would allow the public and applicant to communicate by email. Mr. Lethbridge suggested that the public hearing be continued until the Commission determines, at which time the item would be on the agenda as a decision item.

Mr. Bott suggested that the Commission continue the public hearing until one day before the meeting. Public comment can be accepted until three days before the meeting, which will give the applicant two days to respond.

Commissioner Russell moved that the Commission continue the public hearing for Application #PLZ 19-4015 to amend the General Plan to Medium-High Density Residential and rezone the properties to RM-6 SD to the next regular Planning Commission meeting. Public comments were to be accepted up to three days prior to the meeting, on April 17, giving three days for staff and the applicant to review the comments. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hansen. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

In response to a question raised, Mr. Lethbridge stated that staff is equipped and can accept a two-minute video to give residents more opportunity to make public comments. Staff was cautious about offering capabilities that fail during meetings and wanted to avoid situations where staff is paraphrasing public comments.

DECISION ITEMS

There were no decision items.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. HOME OCCUPATIONS ORDINANCE, DISCUSSION ABOUT POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE HOME OCCUPATION ORDINANCE.

Mr. Lethbridge stated that the Home Occupation ordinance was adopted approximately 12 years ago and has had only a few adjustments. Simple Home Occupations are not to be noticed by neighbors and must be low impact. Residents are currently restricted from putting stickers, logos, etc. on their vehicles. Staff suggested that this restriction be lifted. Discussion ensued regarding the size limitation of signage on vehicles and vehicles with signage parking at individual's homes, including Riverton City vehicles.

Commissioner Rushton stated that the restriction should be removed. One limitation put in place recently involved commercial vehicles being restricted from parking on the street.

Commissioner Cannon asked if the word "temporary" or "time frame" exists in the current ordinance. Mr. Lethbridge stated that if reference is not made to a time frame in the Home Occupation Ordinance, however, it does in the Parking Ordinance.

Commissioner Lefgren suggested preserving the stipulation preventing residents from drawing clients to their home office. However, he stated that this will be rare and approved to remove the item since this circumstance can be considered by individual cases.

The Commissioners unanimously suggested that if an application involving food preparation can now be approved by staff with the condition that it qualifies for the Cottage Food Law State ordinance.

Mr. Lethbridge asked if the Commissioners would like to continue to see applications concerning garages, or if they would like to have staff approve it. Commissioner Hansen stated that there are applications that will be appropriate for the Commission to review, however, there are situations where it is not required. Commissioner Cannon asked if the same type of noticing reaches the residents if it does not come before the Commission. Mr. Lethbridge stated that the noticing is slightly different in that neighbors are not notified of public hearings and residents have two weeks to contact staff. More comments are received this way in comparison to when a notification is given for a Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner James asked if there is a provision to look at Home Occupations in the home. Mr. Lethbridge commented that there are limitations.

Commissioners Hartley and Rushton did not feel this item needs to come before the Commission. Mr. Lethbridge remarked that it will be a staff-level approval that is essentially a conditional use permit. Applicants will be required to adhere to all standards and qualifications in order to qualify. This will be at staff's discretion and they will bring any applications they deem appropriate to the Commission.

2. SIGN ORDINANCE, DISCUSSION ABOUT POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE SIGN ORDINANCE IN THE PCC ZONE.

Mr. Lethbridge reported on the history and purpose of PCC Zone. Currently, the City does not have a table of uses or sign regulations. An applicant is in the process of preparing to come before the Commission with a master site plan and will need requirements.

Mr. Lethbridge requested that for signage requirements, the RM-6 zone is recommended to match residential zones and the PCC Zone is recommended to match the regular commercial zones. Currently, a building is allowed 15% of the primary façade in signs to determine how to display their signs. Building owners, developers, tenants, etc., have complained that they are only allowed two secondary signs, which results in the majority of the tenants not receiving a sign for advertising. Mr. Lethbridge brought the matter up with the Economic Development Committee and they suggested that residentially sensitive signage be determined by defining a maximum square footage and allocating a portion of that to business owners. Mr. Lethbridge stated that the ordinance also requires City Council to approve master sign plans, however, the City Council authorized all site plans going forward to be approved by the Planning Commission. He stated that other conflicts require correction by staff.

Mr. Lethbridge explained that an Eagle Scout produced bandages for Riverton City's Emergency Preparedness trailer five years ago that now can be used as masks.

3. MINUTES

a. MARCH 12, 2020

Commissioner Hansen moved to approve the minutes of March 12, 2020. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.