

Huntington City Planning Commission
Minutes
May 4, 2021

The Huntington City Planning Commission met at a public meeting May 4, 2021 at Huntington City Hall located at 20 South Main Street. The meeting started at 5:00 p.m.

Item #1 – Roll call included the following attendance record:

Commission Members: Patrick Fehlberg, Edward Geary, Marianne Hunter, Shantelle Kay, Kathy Mecham (excused)

City Council: Tom Kay

Zoning Administrator: Gary Arrington

City Recorder: Jenene Hansen

Item #2 – Oath of Office/Shantelle Kay

Recorder Jenene Hansen administered the oath of office to Shantelle Kay.

Item #3 – Approval of February 2, 2021 minutes

PATRICK FEHLBERG MOVED TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MINUTES; MOTION SECONDED BY MARIANNE HUNTER AND THE COMMISSION ALL AGREED.

Item #4 – Review of Huntington City General Plan Chapter 2

TABLED – General Plan Chapter 2 is the definition chapter; we will hold off on this until we get through the rest of the plan and make changes if needed at that time.

Item #5 – Discussion on Residential Zones

General discussion on Residential zones in Huntington and other cities in Utah.

Patrick Fehlberg presented information on residential zones and explained that this is part of the General Plans development. Comparison of zones R-1, R-2 and R-3 was discussed. The idea of changing the frontage from 68' which is the minimum for any residential lot and increasing it to 90' and also increase the sq. footage from 7,000 to 10,000; if you wanted to subdivide you could take a quarter block and make it into quite a few building lots. Zones currently developed as R-2 such as a duplex and the apartments as R-3 would stay as is. The setbacks standard is currently 30' front 30' behind. **Gary Arrington** added that we measure from the back of curb, the frontage is 30' or you can be identical to the house next to you. **Patrick Fehlberg** also discussed the accessory structure, he suggested changing it to 1' from the fence line but 10' feet from an existing structure. There could be a zoning specific for mobile homes with tiny homes permitted. We have trailer parks in town and there is a bit of demand for cheaper options, this might be a way for someone to develop land. **Gary Arrington** brought up a few items that he thought would be problematic with the way it was written, for example the number of units, the development of amenities per how many housing units. The minimum sq footage of 1000 makes so it can't be a single wide. Setbacks and size of lots in the New MH1 zone was discussed, MH1 would be a medium density type approach to housing; mobile home size designation was discussed. **Gary Arrington** said that we as a city cannot ban modular homes, modular homes by nature are allowed anywhere according to state law as long as they are a certain width. An Existing single wide can only be replaced if it burns down. In today's world small is going to be better, apartments and twin homes is something that people can afford. Even in Huntington a 2000 sq ft house will cost in the mid 3's to build. Small homes and apartments are probably what people are going to end up with. Small home communities can be nice and neighborly friendly. The purpose of consolidating is that Huntington is too

small to have too much. Comparing to a college town is not a good comparison. **Gary Arrington** said that he would like to see us going to one zone. **Edward Geary** added, if you are talking about those who would be served by a mobile home park why would you not be served by a manufactured home park. Mobile home parks you rent the land and you might own your mobile home. If you had a community with 25 manufactured homes of a moderate size, you could house more people than you could in double wide mobile homes. **Patrick Fehlberg** added that in the existing mobile home parks, they don't have the space to put a double wide. **Gary Arrington** added that there are a lot of vacant lots in this town we are not short of land. **Edward Geary** added there are two topics, #1 does it make sense to get rid of the R1, R2, R3 as area designations and make them conditions approved for particular sights? **Patrick Fehlberg** said we could do an R1-1 which would be 90% of town and R1-2 for split homes. Right now, it wouldn't be an issue but looking to the future. **Gary Arrington** said it is our job to plan for the future, to going with R1 and then maybe coming up with some enhancements to whether it be tiny homes or small homes. I can see an advantage of a small home and wouldn't have a problem with a small home as long as they meet zoning requirements such as landscaping. **Edward Geary**: The suggestion of merging the zones is elevating the frontage and the square footage requirements. **Patrick Fehlberg** reported that the square footage of a lot would go up, the square footage of a home would increase and the minimum width and depth would increase but the frontage and back of the lot would be smaller. Definition of the Accessory Dwelling Unit. **Edward Geary** added there would be two ways to expand housing. #1 – If one is an accessory unit inside the dwelling. #2 – If you have a lot that meets the size requirement for two dwelling units, you could add a second dwelling unit on the lot; then request a zoning change from R1-1 to R1-2 if you wanted to add an ADU. **Edward Geary** also noted that by code, most lots in Huntington would qualify for 2 dwelling units or more. **Patrick Fehlberg** suggested zoning change in lot width would make so you could fit 6 homes on one side of the block versus 8. Huntington has an average of 4 homes on a single street. If you own a whole block, you could do a divider street and if you have skinny lot's, they would be deep, if you have wide lots, they can be shallower. Commercial zone would stay the same. **Edward Geary** added that the reason for change is because the average salary does not buy the average house. One way to make decent housing available is to put more houses on a block. The issue of the ADU is somewhat different than how many primary units you can have on a piece of land. A 1000 sq. ft house is more house than some might need. Looking at the example of St. George "ADU-Specific Standards" it seems we could adopt this as it has all of the essentials. If we up the minimum of 1000 sq ft. on a home and the ADU should not exceed 800 sq ft. **Gary Arrington** asked, do we need to make an extinction, meaning should we care if there is a bigger house in the back yard or in the front yard. We don't need to worry which house is the primary; if you meet the zoning criteria we don't care about the size of the primary house. **Gary Arrington** is saying we don't want to manage too much. **Patrick Fehlberg** asked for input on G.1.a. If located within a single-family dwelling it was decided to remove 40%, we don't want to worry about sq footage. Add this to the code book 9-8-6, we Still want to separate access from the primary dwelling. **Gary Arrington** suggested removing 2.d. Height because it is already in the code book. The definition of the dwelling unit that would be added to Chapter 2 of the general plan is the Accessory Dwelling Unit in the 9-8-6 in the code section of development standards. **Edward Geary** wondered if it is necessary to increase our frontage requirements. Ways to get lower income housing here was discussed. Patrick Fehlberg gave an example of renting out a basement. After this discussion it was decided that Patrick Fehlberg will work on wording and get with Jenene Hansen to circulate before the meeting next time.

Item #6 – Discussion on Mobile Homes

This will be tabled until next month.

Item #7 – Public comments

NONE

Item #8 – Discussion of items to be added to next meeting

Mobile homes.

Edward asked that everyone look at the commercial zone and see if it is ok as is or if we need to make changes.

Item #9 – Adjournment

Upon proper motion and full approval of the planning commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Jenene Hansen, Huntington City Recorder