

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
August 27, 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
Grant Lefgren
Ed James
Troy Rushton

Staff:

Tim Prestwich, Zoning Administrator

Chair Gary Cannon called the meeting to order at approximately 6:33 p.m. Commissioner Rushton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Cannon reminded those present to be respectful of stated opinions and to maintain social distancing standards.

• **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. **CONDITIONAL USE**, DELWIN CRAIG IS REQUESTING APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE FOR FENCING, IN A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FOUR-LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 2021 WEST 11800 SOUTH.

Zoning Administrator, Tim Prestwich, presented the staff report and stated that the above item is only for the fence for Craig View Lane and will not impact the previously pre-approved subdivision. He acknowledged that this is a conditional use partly because when it previously came before the Commission, he did not include all the information or the explanation requested by the applicant in the motion. The above item will adjust one condition of the previous approval.

The property was identified on the map displayed and compared to the newly approved General Plan. It was determined to meet all City requirements. Mr. Prestwich explained that the City's Zoning Ordinance specifies that if a property is General Planned for the same use as what is zoned, the Commission can approve an exception to the fencing requirement.

The proposal for Craig View Lane is that the required masonry wall and the vine-covered fence that was previously approved will remain. The applicant is requesting a 6-foot vinyl fence along the north property line of Lot 3 and a 6-foot vinyl fence along the entire west property line. The applicant requested that Lot 4 have no fencing requirement.

The applicant currently owns the subdivision property as well as the property next to it. It is significant to acknowledge that the ordinance requires a developer to have a fence erected before development activity begins. In the past, staff coordinated with the applicant to show that there is a contract for the fence so that the initial grading can be completed. The applicant would like the option of completing the fencing or choosing to have no fence according to his needs.

The motion was displayed, and the changes were reviewed. The matter was noticed and notecards were sent to the neighbors. No comments had been received.

Chair Cannon opened the public hearing.

Commissioner James asked if the leftover parcel includes a retention pond. Mr. Prestwich responded that the remnant parcel consists of old sheds and a house and is not part of the retention system or subdivision. A lot line adjustment was previously made to create space for the lot next to it. The parcel with the house and sheds will have access from a private lane. Mr. Prestwich responded the approved fencing on the west side is 6-foot rhino rock. Mr. Prestwich explained that the City has verified that the applicant owns both parcels.

The applicant, Delwin Craig, identified himself as the owner of the property. He apologized to the Commission for the need to meet on this single issue. Mr. Craig confirmed that he owns the properties discussed and explained why he has requested no fence. He has had the property inspected and prepared for a teardown, but there continue to be issues on what to do with it. This project has been ongoing for three years and he would like to move forward since prices have increased considerably since the project began.

Bach Development owns the property to the west where the above item is being requested. Mr. Craig had met with them on three occasions. Bach Development plans to subdivide but have projects that are higher priority. The General Plan is intended for low-density residential, and this appears to be in Bach Development's plans. The vinyl fencing is in anticipation of what is going to develop in the area.

Mr. Craig displayed and reviewed slides of the properties to the south and east. It was noted that every home in the Green Haven development has utilized vinyl fencing. Vinyl fencing is characteristic of the new neighborhood. A picture of the proposed fencing was provided. Mr. Craig reported that the City's ordinance indicates that the Commission can consider waiving or completely removing the fencing requirement for any development under two acres. He noted that the homes being built on the property are for his son and friend who are residents of Riverton City.

Mr. Craig verified that the home on the property on 11800 South belongs to him. Mr. Craig identified the property line on the east and stated that the home along the property line is in disrepair. He purchased it to serve as Lot 4. Curbing will go down the lane and Mr. Craig hopes the lane will have the appeal of the surrounding neighborhood.

Chair Cannon asked what the cost difference is per foot between a high-grade vinyl fence and the rhino rock. Mr. Craig responded that the latest quote he received on rhino rock was

last year and the cost was estimated \$65 + per foot. A new quote had not been obtained. The cost of vinyl fencing was estimated at \$35 per foot.

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

Commissioner Hansen moved that the Planning Commission approve Application PLZ- 20-2027, Craig View Fencing Conditional Use subject to the following condition:

- 1. The developer shall install a 6-foot vinyl fence along the west subdivision line, also along the north line of Lot 3 per City Ordinance 18.155. The east line of Lot 4 shall have no fence requirement. The remaining perimeter lot lines shall keep the existing fences in place.**

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

DECISION ITEMS

There were no decision items.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

There were no discussion items.

MINUTES

There were no minutes to be approved.

2. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:48 p.m.