



ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

NOTICE is hereby given that the **PLANNING COMMISSION** of Alpine City, UT will hold a **Regular Meeting and a Public Hearing at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah on Tuesday, June 20, 2017 at 7:00 pm** as follows:

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| A. Welcome and Roll Call: | Steve Cospers |
| B. Prayer/Opening Comments: | Carla Merrill |
| C. Pledge of Allegiance: | By Invitation |

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Any person wishing to comment on any item not on the agenda may address the Planning Commission at this point by stepping to the microphone and giving his or her name and address for the record.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. PUBLIC HEARING - Amendment to the Subdivision Design Standards Ordinance (Article 4.7)

The Planning Commission will review a proposed amendment to the Design Standards ordinance that would prohibit new private streets in Alpine City. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council for approval.

B. PUBLIC HEARING - Amendment to the Fence Ordinance (Section 3.21.6)

The Planning Commission will review a proposed amendment to the Fence ordinance that would allow open style fences directly on top of a retaining wall. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council for approval.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: June 6, 2017

ADJOURN

Chairman Steve Cospers
June 16, 2017

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO ATTEND ALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS. If you need a special accommodation to participate in the meeting, please call the City Recorder's Office at 801-756-6347 ext. 5.

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING. The undersigned duly appointed recorder does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was posted at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, UT. It was also sent by e-mail to The Daily Herald located in Provo, UT a local newspaper circulated in Alpine, UT. This agenda is also available on the City's web site at www.alpinecity.org and on the Utah Public Meeting Notices website at www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html.

PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ETIQUETTE

Please remember all public meetings and public hearings are now recorded.

- All comments **must** be recognized by the Chairperson and addressed through the microphone.
- When speaking to the Planning Commission, please stand, speak slowly and clearly into the microphone, and state your name and address for the recorded record.
- Be respectful to others and refrain from disruptions during the meeting. Please refrain from conversation with others in the audience as the microphones are very sensitive and can pick up whispers in the back of the room.
- Keep comments constructive and not disruptive.
- Avoid verbal approval or dissatisfaction of the ongoing discussion (i.e., booing or applauding).
- Exhibits (photos, petitions, etc.) given to the City become the property of the City.
- Please silence all cellular phones, beepers, pagers or other noise making devices.
- Be considerate of others who wish to speak by limiting your comments to a reasonable length, and avoiding repetition of what has already been said. Individuals may be limited to two minutes and group representatives may be limited to five minutes.
- Refrain from congregating near the doors or in the lobby area outside the council room to talk as it can be very noisy and disruptive. If you must carry on conversation in this area, please be as quiet as possible. (The doors must remain open during a public meeting/hearing.)

Public Hearing vs. Public Meeting

If the meeting is a **public hearing**, the public may participate during that time and may present opinions and evidence for the issue for which the hearing is being held. In a public hearing there may be some restrictions on participation such as time limits.

Anyone can observe a **public meeting**, but there is no right to speak or be heard there - the public participates in presenting opinions and evidence at the pleasure of the body conducting the meeting.

ALPINE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Design Standards Ordinance Amendment (Private Streets)

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 20 June 2017

PETITIONER: Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Amend Design Standards Ordinance as Proposed

APPLICABLE STATUTE OR ORDINANCE: Design Standards Ordinance (Article 4.7)

PETITION IN COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCE: Yes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Alpine City has very few private streets that were approved several years ago. In more recent years, the City has planned and worked with developers with the assumption that private streets are not allowed. However, there is mention of private streets in one spot of the development code. This proposed ordinance change would clean up that section of ordinance which indicates that private streets may be allowed after a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval from the City Council. This change would be in harmony with the intentions that Alpine City has for not wanting public streets. The few private streets that do exist in the City would be considered non-conforming if private streets are prohibited in the ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

We recommend that Article 4.7 of the Development Code be amended as proposed.

ARTICLE 4.7

DESIGN STANDARDS (Amended by Ord. 2014-12, 7/08/14; Ord. 2016-03, 02/23/16)

4.7.1 DESIGN STANDARDS

All subdivisions shall comply with the following standards unless an exception from one or more provisions of this chapter is approved by the City Council in accordance with the exception procedure of this ordinance.

4.7.2 GENERAL STANDARDS

1. The design and development of subdivisions, shall preserve insofar as possible the natural terrain, natural drainage, existing topsoil, and trees.
2. Land subject to hazardous conditions such as slides, mud flows, rock falls, snow avalanches, possible mine subsidence, shallow water table, open quarries, floods and polluted or non-potable water supply shall be identified and shall not be subdivided until the hazards have been eliminated or will be eliminated by the subdivision and construction plans.
3. The subdivider shall comply with landscape requirements of approval and mow and maintain vacant lots, keep sidewalks clear and streets swept during subdivision construction and until the lots are sold.

4.7.3 LOTS

1. No single lot shall be divided by a municipal or County boundary line.
2. A lot shall not be divided by a public road or alley or other lot.
3. Lot Lines. Side lot lines shall be at right angles or radial to street lines, except where justified by the subdivider and recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.
4. Street Frontage. All residential lots in subdivisions shall front on a public street, ~~or on a private street recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.~~ Private streets are prohibited. Double frontage lots are prohibited unless recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.
5. Buildable Area. A Designated Buildable Area shall be not less than five thousand (5,000) sq. ft. except the lots in the TR-10,000 zone. In that case the lots must meet required setbacks.

ALPINE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

SUBJECT: Fence Ordinance Amendment (Open Style Fence on Retaining Wall)

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 20 June 2017

PETITIONER: Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Amend Fence Ordinance as Proposed

APPLICABLE STATUTE OR ORDINANCE: Fence Ordinance (Section 3.21.6)

PETITION IN COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCE: Yes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Alpine City recently amended the fence ordinance to address fences on top of retaining walls. The intention was to regulate the circumstance where a fence and wall made of similar materials would create a very tall sheer surface that would be unsightly for the neighbors. After a few months of applying these new regulations, it was determined that there could be some further language to help alleviate some specific situations that created safety concerns. This proposed ordinance would clarify a way for someone to put a fence on the same plain as the wall but only if the fence were an open style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

We recommend that Section 3.21.6 of the Development Code be amended as proposed.

3.21.6 FENCES, WALLS AND HEDGES (amended by Ord. No. 2005-02, 2/8/05; Ord. No. 2013-10, 7/9/13; Ord. No. 2015-06, 05/26/15; Ord. No. 2017-01, 01/10/17)

- 3.21.6.1 Requirement.** All fences must be approved by the planning and zoning department and a building permit obtained.
- 3.21.6.2 Front Yard Fences.** Privacy fences, walls and hedges along the street frontage of a lot shall not exceed 3 feet in height when placed within 10 feet of the front property line. Open style fences shall not exceed 4 feet in height when placed within 10 feet of the front property line. Front yard fences may be eight (8) feet in height if they are placed at least 10 feet back from the front property line.
- 3.21.6.3 Interior Side Yard Fences.** Fences alongside yards shall not exceed 3 feet in height for privacy fences and 4 feet in height for open style fences when they are within 10 feet of the front property line. Side yard fences may be eight (8) feet in height when they are located at least 10 feet back from the front property line.
- 3.21.6.4 Rear Yard Fences.** A rear yard fence may be eight (8) feet in height.
- 3.21.6.5 Corner Lot Fences within the Sight Triangle.** The sight triangle on corner lots shall not be obstructed. Privacy fences, walls, or hedges shall not exceed three (3) feet in height, and open-style fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height, when located within the sight triangle on a corner lot. The sight triangle is defined as the area formed by connecting the corner of the property to points 35 feet back along each property line abutting the street.
- 3.21.6.6 Corner Lot Fences outside the Sight Triangle.** Side yard fences abutting the street may be eight (8) feet in height when they are located at least 35 feet back from the front property line, outside the sight triangle. For interior side fence see 3.21.6.2.
- 3.21.6.7 Fences on Retaining Walls.** A [privacy](#) fence that is on top of a retaining wall shall be set back at least four (4) feet from the backside of the retaining wall. Under no condition shall a [privacy](#) fence and wall exceed nine (9) feet on the same plane. [Open style fences such as rail fences, field fences, or chain link fences are permitted to be on the same plane as a retaining wall.](#)
- 3.21.6.8 Agricultural Fences.** Fences on property where an identifiable commercial agricultural product is produced shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height, and shall be an open style fence.
- 3.21.6.9 Fences Along Public Open Space and Trails.** See Articles 3.16, Section 3.16.10.1 and Article 3.17 Section 3.17.10.3.1.
- Fences or borders along property lines adjacent to a trail or open space must meet with the City Planner and meet specific standards.
1. When the width of the open space or trail easement is less than 50 feet, bordering fences may not exceed eight (8) feet in height, and shall not obstruct visibility. (Open style fences such as rail fences, field fence, or chain link are preferable.)
 2. When the width of the open space or trail easement is 50 feet or more, fence standards as specified elsewhere in this ordinance apply.
 3. Fences and hedges must be completely within the boundaries of the private

property.

4. Hedges or shrubs must be maintained to the same height requirements as fences.
5. The owner of the fence or hedge must maintain the side facing the open space.

3.21.6.10

Conditional Uses for Interior Fences. A conditional use permit may be approved by the City Planner for an interior fence over eight (8) feet in height for such things as sports courts, gardens and swimming pools. A conditionally approved interior fence shall not exceed twelve (12) feet in height and shall be an open style fence. (Ord. No. 2015-06, 05/26/15)

**ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AT
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah
June 6, 2017**

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. Welcome and Roll Call:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chairman Steve Cosper. The following Commission members were present and constituted a quorum.

Chairman: Steve Cosper

Commission Members: Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, John Gubler

Staff: Jason Bond, Marla Fox

Others: Councilman Ramon Beck, Councilman Roger Bennett, Brenda Webb, Randy Austin, Leslie Austin, Megan Hacking, Blair Buswell, Julie Buswell, Lucas Mueller, Boston Hill, Vickie Mueller, Gale Ruldolph, Ed Bush, Jessica Smuin, Arlene McCulloch, Rose Fjeldsted, Chrissy Hannemann, Will Jones, Scott Hacking, Cheri Palsson, Richard James, Lisa Southwick,

- A. Prayer/Opening Comments:** John Gubler

- B. Pledge of Allegiance:** A Scout, Lucas

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

No Comments.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. General Plan Update – Lambert Park Master Plan

Jason Bond explained that Lambert Park was a very important asset to Alpine City for several different reasons. It was the location of several important City utility facilities and often used for several different types community events and recreational activities. Ideas to improve the park were expressed regularly by passionate residents and non-residents, City Council members, Planning Commission members, staff, etc. Hundreds of volunteers regularly made a difference by doing service in the park to maintain trails and address noxious weeds. There were several common goals for the park but also some conflicting opinions. The Planning Commission and City Council needed to create a new master plan for the park that would provide clear direction on what the City would like to see done to enhance, maintain and preserve Lambert Park for the future.

In the past, the City had officially taken action on specific changes within the park (i.e. signage, boulders, retention areas, etc.) but there had not been a broad master plan for the park adopted or updated since June 25, 2002. The existing plan was relatively simple and many of the items in the plan had already been realized. The minutes from the meeting when the plan was adopted and the plan itself are attached.

1 One of the biggest action items that the City Council had taken on Lambert Park in recent years
2 was the sale of a very small section of the park (8,110 square feet) on the west side next to
3 Moyle Drive. It was sold for \$200,000. The City Council decided that 40% of that money
4 would be used for some flood mitigation projects and 60%, or \$120,000, would be used for other
5 improvements to Lambert Park. None of that money had been spent yet and it should be
6 considered in the future plans for the park.

7
8 Some recent changes and ideas discussed by the City Council for Lambert Park included, but
9 were not limited to, the following:

- 10
- 11 • New restroom at south end of park
- 12 • Discussions about trailhead parking area at south end of park
- 13 • Discussions about a split-rail fence in areas to delineate the boundary of the park
- 14 • Discussions about implementing appropriate signage for the trails
- 15 • Discussions with the Division of Natural Resources about a deer revegetation project
- 16

17 Jason Bond recommended breaking their actions into three sections: establishing a vision,
18 creating a plan, and implementing that plan. Previous discussions about Lambert Park had been
19 scattered and no action was ever taken, which was why he felt the need for a plan. The master
20 plan should be a living document that was continually revisited and updated. He said the City
21 Council would be more involved in the implementation part of the plan because they would need
22 to budget for the future projects. One thing the City Council was anxious to do was to define the
23 boundaries of the park, and they asked the Planning Commission to give a specific
24 recommendation on that.

25
26 Jason Bond asked the Planning Commission to discuss their general vision for the park. He
27 would take their direction and begin work on a master plan.

28
29 Steve Cospers said that the City hadn't drifted too far from the goals listed in the General Plan
30 that was adopted in 2002. He felt that the Moyle Park Master Plan had been successful and
31 suggested creating something similar for Lambert Park. Jason Bond said that they needed to
32 discuss general goals, get something on paper, and work from there. One issue that needed to be
33 discussed was the poppies, because that area of the park was being abused. He asked the
34 Planning Commission what they wanted to see happen to Lambert Park.

35
36 Troy Stout said that Lambert Park had protection under super majority from the City Council,
37 which meant that it would take four out of the five votes to propose or pass any major change to
38 the park. He was a little insecure with that because he wanted to see the park permanently
39 protected as a wild open space. He considered Lambert Park as the crown jewel of Alpine City,
40 as the park was a wild open space, uninterrupted by development, and currently accessible to the
41 public. Another concern was that there was some private property in the area that was being
42 confused as part of the park. The property owners had been gracious in allowing public access to
43 the trails that run through their properties, but the City needed to be cautious. He suggested that
44 the borders of the park be properly delineated, that they establish the main points of access to
45 the park, and they create parking areas. He also proposed that the City extend some sort of
46 recognition to the land owners who had allowed access to the park through their properties.

1
2 Troy Stout said that the City should create trailhead parking to the east of the Stake Center. He
3 would like to see the park remain semi-improved without paving but rather bringing in a road
4 base, and without removing the trees. He said people could continue to park at the rodeo
5 grounds and possibly in the park at the end of Moyle Drive. He showed on a map the boundaries
6 of the park and identified the trails running through private property.
7

8 Troy Stout suggested ways to delineate the boundaries of the park. He said he wanted to see a
9 large arch across the entrance of the park with a split rail fence. Troy Stout again referenced the
10 map and identified the different points of entry to the park.
11

12 Troy Stout reported that people were coming from Spanish Fork, Sandy and every point in
13 between to visit Lambert Park. It was a beautiful, well-known park and a great place to ride
14 bicycles. Jason Bond said the park was roughly 255 acres.
15

16 Troy Stout suggested including some language about the use of fire arms near Lambert Park on
17 Forest Service land. The City needed to take a solid stance on that issue. It was also suggested
18 that the City prohibit motorized vehicles. Steve Cosper said that the firearms issue was
19 controversial and it should be discussed another night. Troy Stout said his goal was to preserve
20 the park as a wild, natural park that should not be disturbed unless it served the City's needs,
21 such as drilling a well.
22

23 Ramon Beck said the City should leave the park as it is, but make it more accessible for
24 everyone.
25

26 Jason Thelin said he would like to see an actual plan brought to the Planning Commission and
27 then make changes from there.
28

29 Steve Cosper felt that the City may need some help from professional architects, as was done
30 with Moyle Park. Jason Bond said he needed to hear their ideas first so that he could put it down
31 on paper. After that, the City could seek professional assistance with the road. Jane Griener
32 asked if the City should form a committee to help create the master plan. Steve Cosper
33 recommended starting with establishing the boundaries, parking, and trails.
34

35 Jason Bond said the City budget would be adopted at the next City Council meeting and they
36 wanted to know the Planning Commission's recommendation on what those monies should be
37 used for. Troy Stout said the City already had \$120,000 to spend in the park and that money
38 didn't have to be budgeted for a specific project.
39

40 Jason Thelin asked Will Jones if there was still a plan to connect the trails into Corner Canyon.
41 Will Jones said the connection was already happening and it was going to be incredible.
42
43

44 **B. PUBLIC HEARING – The Corridor Open Space Land Swap**

45

1 The Alpine City open space, referred to as “The Corridor”, had a few stretches of trail that were
 2 currently on private property. Work had been done to coordinate with property owners to ensure
 3 that those areas were either within the City’s open space or within a dedicated easement. Some
 4 sections of the trail had already been rerouted and other sections of the trail were expected to be
 5 acquired in the form of an easement.

7 The attachments show a section of trail that was on the property located at 175 West Canyon
 8 Crest Road. The property also had part of their landscaping on Alpine City open space. It was
 9 the City’s understanding that the development of the trail and landscaping was coordinated
 10 between the original developer of the site and Alpine City. Unfortunately, an easement for the
 11 trail was never recorded and the property had since changed hands a few times. The current
 12 property owner would prefer to adjust the property line and do a 1:1 trade of property, which
 13 would place the trail/bridge on Alpine City property and the landscaping on the private property.

15 Section 3.16.4 required that land in open space shall not be disposed of in any manner or used for
 16 any other than specified in the ordinance except after a recommendation of the Planning
 17 Commission and a public hearing and by a super majority vote of the City Council (four positive
 18 votes are required).

20 Steve Cosper opened the Public hearing.

22 Ramon Beck asked if there was a lien on the subject property. Jason Bond said the land owner
 23 was looking into that and would take care of any issues.

25 Steve Cosper closed the Public Hearing.

27 **MOTION:** Jane Griener moved to recommend that the proposed land swap of a segment of
 28 Alpine City open space and a segment of property located at 175 West Canyon Crest Road be
 29 approved.

31 John Gubler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous with 5 Ayes and 0 Nays. Jason
 32 Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, and John Gubler all voted Aye.

35 **C. PUBLIC HEARING – General Plan Update – The Corridor Master Plan**

37 The City open space that runs along Dry Creek and Fort Creek had been discussed previously by
 38 both the Planning Commission and City Council. The open space was now being referred to as
 39 “The Corridor”. Direction had been given to staff to start working on improvements to the trail
 40 within the open space. With the central location in the City, this trail and open space had
 41 incredible potential to be a venue for community events, create a variety of recreational
 42 opportunities, and support future development on adjacent vacant land.

44 Jason Bond explained to the residents how the trail came about and how it related to the zone
 45 that they were currently living in. He said he would like this trail to be an urban trail that would
 46 be eight feet wide and paved with asphalt. He said he hoped that this trail would one day
 47 connect with other major trails in the City.

1
2 Jason Bond said the City was currently working on the trail and working with other owners to
3 obtain easements where the trail deviated off of City property. He referenced the map and
4 identified the accesses to the trail, the parking areas, and a trail head parking area at the south
5 end. Jason Bond pointed out locations that would be ideal for a natural playground and a few
6 workout stations along the trail. He also identified the location of a bridge and an area for a
7 possible gazebo.

8
9 Steve Cospers opened the Public Hearing.

10
11 Brenda Webb, a resident, was concerned that the plan was already in motion before it had been
12 presented to the residents. She said that the existing pathway needed some work, but it should
13 not be widened, paved, or lighted. These improvements were unnecessary and unwanted. She
14 said she would like to see a more natural path and emphasized the importance of regular
15 maintenance. Mrs. Webb explained that the trail was not appropriate for strollers or wheelchairs,
16 as it ran very close to the river and there were some steep areas. She did not like the exercise or
17 playground ideas because of potential liability issues and unwanted drug problems. She was also
18 opposed to adding extra parking at the trailhead. Mrs. Webb encouraged the Planning
19 Commission to preserve the natural resources in the area.

20
21 Rose Fjeldsted, a resident, addressed the erosion of Dry Creek, which ran next to her property,
22 and the danger associated with it. She requested that some maintenance be done to the area
23 when the Creek dried up.

24
25 Steve Cospers said Alpine City could not address the creek because it was under the protection of
26 the State. Jason Bond said they would have to get a stream alteration permit from the Division
27 of Water before they could touch the stream.

28
29 Chrissy Hannemann, a resident, said that the trail was very valuable but she would rather see the
30 current parks properly maintained rather than having this trail developed. She liked the idea of
31 having parking at the trailhead to help with traffic, but she wanted that area to be gravel rather
32 than asphalt. She said that the City had enough asphalt and they couldn't maintain what they
33 already had.

34
35 Randy Ostler, a resident, said that paving the trail would encourage more on-street parking,
36 which was a safety issue. He also said that the erosion problems needed to be addressed before
37 more people were invited into the area by the trail.

38
39 Blair Buswell, a resident, said that the City needed to put gravel on the trail and maintain the
40 other park areas. He talked about how the brush and branches were overwhelming the area, and
41 suggested ways that the trail could be better maintained.

42
43 Richard James, a resident, explained where the Bonneville Shoreline Trail existed in Alpine and
44 asked how the City was planning to maintain that trail. He commented on the poor condition of
45 the trail. He also said that the trail ran across an aqueduct owned by the Federal government.
46 Mr. James offered information about contacting the Federal government about that aqueduct

1 should the City start working on the trail. Mr. James also spoke about traffic along the road and
2 parking issues.

3
4 Steve Cosper closed the Public Hearing.

5
6 Jane Griener asked if the property was designated as a park. Jason Bond said it was listed as
7 natural open space.

8
9 Jason Thelin said he liked to run on this trail, but it would be difficult to run on asphalt. He said
10 he would rather see the trail left unpaved.

11
12 The Planning Commission had a discussion about the condition of the trail and determined that
13 they wanted to remove the paved trails, acquire land or easement, work to control erosion, and
14 better maintain the existing trails. They also discussed the lighting plan and Jason Bond said that
15 lighting could come in several years down the road. Having a conduit there would provide the
16 opportunity for lighting in the future. Steve Cosper recommended that the conduit be removed
17 from the plan as well.

18
19 **MOTION:** Jason Thelin moved to recommend approval of the proposed master plan for “The
20 Corridor”, with the following changes:

- 21
22 1. No paved trails
23 2. Remove electrical conduit
24 3. Remove natural playground
25 4. Address stream erosion
26 5. Grade trail
27

28 David Fotheringham seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 Ayes and 0 Nay. Jason
29 Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, and John Gubler all voted Aye.

30
31
32 **D. PUBLIC HEARING – Amendment to the Appeal Authority Ordinance (Article**
33 **2.3)**
34

35 The purpose of the proposed amendment was primarily to discontinue having evidentiary
36 hearings (except on variances) and only have arguments based on the record of proceedings.
37 This would make for shorter and less expensive hearings. The amendment would require that the
38 Zoning Administrator keep and prepare a good record of all proceedings. It would also be
39 important for the City to adopt findings of fact for important decisions so that City records made
40 sense. The amendment also attempted to update other provisions of the code to conform to new
41 State Laws.

42
43 The Planning Commission asked why the change was being proposed. Jason Bond explained
44 that the change would make it so the City did not have to start from scratch on an appeal, but
45 they could utilize records from previous proceedings.
46

1 Steve Cospo opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments. Steve Cospo closed
2 the Public Hearing

3
4 **MOTION:** David Fotheringham moved to recommend that Article 2.3 of the Development Code
5 be amended as proposed.

6
7 John Gubler seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 Ayes and 0 Nay. Jason Thelin,
8 David Fotheringham, Steve Cospo, Jane Griener, and John Gubler, all voted Aye.

9
10
11 **E. Amendment to the Site Plan to Comply Ordinance (Article 4.14)**

12
13 Site plans for single family residential dwellings not located in an approved subdivision were
14 required to go to both Planning Commission and City Council for approval. Many site plans for
15 single family residential dwellings were straightforward but the process for approval could be
16 cumbersome for the applicant. The proposed amendment would allow the City Planner and City
17 Engineer to approve site plans for single family residential structures and streamline the process.
18 Therefore, time would be saved for the applicant and the Planning Commission, and staff would
19 be able to spend more time on other issues.

20
21 The proposed amendment would also clarify the site plan process for commercial structures in a
22 separate section from single family residential dwellings. There were no proposed changes to
23 the approval process for commercial structures.

24
25 Jason Bond presented the ordinance and explained what language had been altered. He said that
26 if a site plan was out of the ordinary or if serious problem arose, staff would still be able to bring
27 the site plan to the Planning Commission for approval.

28
29 Jason Thelin was concerned that some developers may have favor with staff and be treated
30 differently because of those relationships. Jason Bond said that staff members did everything
31 they could to be professional and follow the ordinances.

32
33 Roger Bennett said if an application met the ordinances, whether it went to the staff or to the
34 Planning Commission, the City had to approve it.

35
36 **MOTION:** John Gubler moved to recommend that Article 4.14 of the Development Code be
37 amended as proposed so that Site Plans for single family residential dwellings not located in an
38 approved subdivision may receive final approval from the City Planner and City Engineer.

39
40 David Fotheringham seconded the motion. The motion passed with 4 Ayes and 1 Nay. David
41 Fotheringham, Steve Cospo, Jane Griener, and John Gubler, all voted Aye. Jason Thelin voted
42 Nay.

43
44
45 **IV.COMMUNICATIONS**

1 There were none.
2
3

4 **V. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES: May 16, 2017**
5

6 **MOTION:** David Fotheringham moved to approve the Planning Commission Minutes for May
7 16, 2017, as written.
8

9 Jane Griener seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 Ayes and 0 Nays. Jason Thelin,
10 David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, and John Gubler, all voted Aye.
11

12 **Adjourn**
13

14 Steve Cosper stated that the Planning Commission had covered all of the items on the agenda
15 and adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.