PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

THE WEST BOUNTIFUL PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD ITS REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2015 AT 7:30 PM AT THE CITY OFFICES AT 550 NORTH 800 WEST

AGENDA AS FOLLOWS:

Welcome. Prayer/Thought by invitation

1. Accept Agenda.
2. Consider Conditional Use Application for a Commercial Business License for Titan Imaging in the Commercial Neighborhood District.
4. Consider Preliminary Plat for Stringham Subdivision at 735 W 1000 North.
5. Discuss Proposed Language Changes in Title 17 to Address Modifications to Nonconforming Structures.
6. Staff Report.
7. Consider Approval of January 27, 2015 meeting minutes.
8. Adjournment

Individuals needing special accommodations including auxiliary communicative aids and services during the meeting should notify Cathy Brightwell at 801-292-4486 twenty-four (24) hours before the meeting.

This notice has been sent to the Clipper Publishing Company, and was posted on the State Public Notice website and the City’s website on February 6, 2015.
Staff received a request for a conditional use permit on January 29, 2015, from Matthew Silva to open a printing business, Titan Imaging. His business will be located at 2208 N 640 West, which is in the Commercial Neighborhood District.

Other than the actual printing, Mr. Silva’s business is conducted in the field. He meets with his customers at their place of business and delivers the product when complete. The attached site plan shows parking spaces in front of his business with access from 640 West.

This business falls under *Printing and Publishing*, which is listed as a conditional use in the Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) zone, Section 17.28.020, and must be approved by the planning commission. Staff has reviewed the application, and believes this request satisfies the requirements of Chapter 17.60, Conditional Uses, and recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit subject to the affirmative findings and recommended conditions listed below.

**Affirmative Findings:**

1. The proposed use is desirable to provide a service that will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood and community;
2. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing in the vicinity, or injurious to property in the vicinity;
3. The proposed use shall not inordinately impact schools, utilities, and streets in the area;
4. The proposed use will provide for proper parking and traffic circulation and be in harmony with the area; and
5. The proposed use will comply with the regulations specified in the C-N zoning ordinance.

**Recommended Conditions:**

1. Fire Inspection approval.
2. No outdoor storage will be allowed

Once the conditional use permit is issued, the applicant can purchase a West Bountiful Commercial Business license.
CONCONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2208 N 640W.
PARCEL NUMBER: ZONE: CN DATE OF APPLICATION: 1-29-15

Name of Business: Titan Imaging
Applicant Name: Matthew Silver
Applicant Address: 1352 Stallion Ln. SLC UT 84116
Primary phone: 801 918 0357 Fax Number:
E-mail address: matthewsilver.com

Describe in detail the conditional use for which this application is being submitted. Attach a site plan which clearly illustrates the proposal. A separate sheet with additional information may be submitted if necessary.
Wide Format Poster Printing

The Applicant(s) hereby acknowledges that they have read and are familiar with the applicable requirements of Title 17.60 of the West Bountiful City Code, pertaining to the issuance of Conditional Use Permits. If the applicant is a corporation, partnership or other entity other than an individual, this application must be in the name of said entity, and the person signing on behalf of the Applicant hereby represents that they are duly authorized to execute this Application on behalf of said entity.

Fee must accompany this application - $20 for Residential Zone, $50 for Business Zone

I hereby apply for a Conditional Use Permit from West Bountiful City in accordance with the provisions of Title 17, West Bountiful Municipal Code. I certify that the above information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date: 1-29-15 Applicant Signature: [Signature]

Application Received Date: 1/29/15 Application Fee Received Date: 1/29/15 Permit Number: 15-002
Fee: $20 Residential / $50 Commercial Permit Approval Date:

Revised June 2012
The West Bountiful Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday, February 10, 2014 at 7:35 p.m., or as soon thereafter as possible, at 550 North 800 West, West Bountiful, Utah, 84087.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive public comment regarding a request for a nine lot subdivision for Wendell Wild at 735 W 1000 North.

A copy of the proposal may be viewed during regular business hours at the City Offices, or on the City website: www.wbcity.org. All interested parties are invited to participate in the hearing. Written comments may be submitted to the City Offices prior to the meeting.

Cathy Brightwell
City Recorder
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
DATE: February 5, 2015
FROM: Ben White
RE: 9 Lot Stringham Farm Subdivision located at 735 W 1000 North

The Wild family is proposing a 9 lot subdivision be constructed on their 3.83 parcel. The property is located in R-1-10 zone and will connect to the two stub streets which were constructed as part of the Moss Farm development. The most notable item with this application is the request to construct two flag lots instead of a cul-de-sac at the northerly end of the project. Flag lots are a Conditional Use in this zone, and I will address those issues later in this memo.

General comments regarding the subdivision include:

1. All lots conform to the zoning requirements.
2. Street and utility layout conform to city standards.
3. Storm drainage design needs to be reviewed.
4. The assumption is the applicant will petition the city for water rights since no water rights have been offered with the application.
5. Finish floor elevations for all homes will be 12” above the street. Finish floor elevations for the flag lots needs to be determined.
6. No new soils report was provided. Assumed to conform to Moss Farm requirements.
7. An access through to the church property is desirable. It is staff’s understanding that the Church is opposed to the connection.
8. The addition of a street light on the street corner is desirable.
9. 1000 North Street will have curb and sidewalk constructed to match the adjoining property (rolled curb and no park strip).

Flag Lot Comments

Flag Lots were included as a Conditional Use in the R-1-10 zone in December 2011. Staff presented to City Council a set of evaluation guidelines to be used by the Planning Commission when evaluating Flag Lot Conditional Use Permits until such time that flag lot criteria could be drafted into Title 16.
The guidelines included:

1. Flag lot staff not be less than 100 feet and not more than 250 feet long. **The staff is less than 100' due to the “knuckle” on the street corner.**
2. The lot area for a flag lot must meet the minimum for the zone not including the staff. **Both flag lots comply with this criterion.**
3. Turn around for emergency vehicles must comply with the current Fire Code. **A turnaround is not required on accesses less than 150’. But an access meeting the fire department’s requirements would be required.**
4. Minimum lot width must conform to the zone. **Both lots meet this requirement.**
5. Front, side and rear setbacks must conform to the zone. **Both lots meet this requirement.**
6. Front lot line shall be the one closest to the staff and perpendicular to the public street. **This requirement is not as straight forward as one would think since the access is off of a street corner. Staff’s suggestion would be that the east-west sides of the lots be the front and rear yards to conform with the other lots along the street.**
7. Lots contiguous to the flag lot staff are to be considered flag lots. (I believe this requirement should only apply to properties that are subdivided to create the flag and not adjoining properties). **Staff does not think this applies to this application.**
8. Culinary water meter shall be placed at the street right of way. **Both lots meet this requirement.**
9. The site shall be graded so storm water runoff from the flag lot does not negatively impact neighboring properties. **On site storm drain pipe and catch basins would be required to meet this requirement. It can be achieved.**
10. Fire hydrant requirements per the current Fire Code shall be met. **This requirement to be reviewed by the fire department.**
11. The minimum unobstructed driveway pavement width shall be twenty feet. No more than two lots may be served by one flag lot staff. Two lots served by one flag lot staff will require a minimum twenty-six feet of driveway pavement. **The two lots can meet this requirement.**
12. Creation of flag lots shall not be used to avoid standard development requirements. **The development does not meet this requirement. The same number of lots can be created without being flag lots.**
13. Flags lots cannot extend beyond the maximum dead end road length of 1000 feet. **This criteria is met.**
14. The staff for flag lots must be perpendicular to the public street right of way and cannot be an extension to a “stub street”. **The development does not necessarily meet this criterion.**

Access to the flag lots is off the public street in a ninety degree corner/intersection. While the corner is not a stub, the flag lot driveways will look like a street continuation. It will become a safety issue at some point for an unfamiliar, less attentive driver who does not notice that the street turns and drives up the driveway as if the street continued. **This scenario becomes even more likely if the driveway is made of asphalt. Snow plowing the knuckle is also problematic when the entire area is driveway. Visitor on street parking will not exist for three homes (two flag lots and lot 6) because nearly the entire frontages will be driveway.**

A determination on the flag lots should be made prior to a recommendation on the subdivision as a whole.

550 North 800 West, West Bountiful, UT 84087  (801) 292-4486
WILD PROPERTY - PRELIMINARY PLAT
735 WEST 1000 NORTH
PARCEL 06-037-0024
LOCATED IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 24, T.2N., R.1W., S.L.B.&M.
WEST BOUNTIFUL CITY, DAVIS COUNTY, UTAH

VICINITY MAP

1. TYPICAL 50' ROADWAY X-SECTION
   - 2.5' Curb
   - 30" Concrete Back Curb & Gutter
   - 4" sidewalk over 4" compacted road base (typ.)
   - 30" Concrete High-Back Curb & Gutter over 6" compacted road base (typ.)
   - 2:1 maximum cut/fill slope
   - 10' P.U.E. along street frontage
   - 10' P.U.E. around perimeter of the subdivision
   - Other P.U.E. as shown

2. BUILDABLE AREA
   - 1000 NORTH TYPICAL ROADWAY X-SECTION
     - 2.5' curb
     - 30" concrete back curb & gutter
     - 4" sidewalk on 4" untreated base
     - 3" asphalt on 8" road base
     - Saucut 2' min.
     - Existing improvements
     - 5' sidewalk
     - 33' sewer
     - 19.5' septic tank
     - 10.5' power
     - 4" concrete walk on 4" untreated base

3. SYMBOL LEGEND
   - New 3" asphalt over 8" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 30" concrete roll curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 48" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 60" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 30" concrete high-back curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.

4. BOUNDARY
   - Begin at a point which is located south 67'/21' east from the north quarter corner of section 13, township 2 north, range 1 west, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running:
     - 1257' north along 1000 north street 237.60 feet to the west line of the office of the Davis County Recorder.
     - 660.32 feet to the north line of Moss Estates Plat, Davis County Recorder.
     - Thence along said north line the following three calls:
       - 148' south line of 750 west street.
       - 252.62 feet to the east line of 750 west street.
       - 675' south line of 1000 north street, and the point of beginning.

5. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS
   - South Davis Sewer District
   - West Bountiful City Public Works
   - Storm Drain - West Bountiful City Public Works
   - Irrigation - Weber Basin Water
   - Power - Rocky Mountain City Power
   - Natural Gas - Questar
   - Telecom - Qwest / Comcast

6. BUILDABLE AREA
   - Vicinity Map
   - Subject Property
   - Typical 50' Roadway X-Section
   - Typical, N.T.S.
   - TYPICAL 50' ROADWAY X-SECTION
   - 1000 NORTH TYPICAL ROADWAY X-SECTION

7. SYMBOL LEGEND
   - New 3" asphalt over 8" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 30" concrete roll curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 48" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 60" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 30" concrete high-back curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.

8. BUILDABLE AREA
   - Vicinity Map
   - Subject Property
   - Typical 50' Roadway X-Section
   - Typical, N.T.S.
   - TYPICAL 50' ROADWAY X-SECTION
   - 1000 NORTH TYPICAL ROADWAY X-SECTION

9. SYMBOL LEGEND
   - New 3" asphalt over 8" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 30" concrete roll curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 48" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 60" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
   - New 30" concrete high-back curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.

10. BUILDABLE AREA
    - Vicinity Map
    - Subject Property
    - Typical 50' Roadway X-Section
    - Typical, N.T.S.
    - TYPICAL 50' ROADWAY X-SECTION
    - 1000 NORTH TYPICAL ROADWAY X-SECTION

11. SYMBOL LEGEND
    - New 3" asphalt over 8" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 30" concrete roll curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 48" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 60" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 30" concrete high-back curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.

12. BUILDABLE AREA
    - Vicinity Map
    - Subject Property
    - Typical 50' Roadway X-Section
    - Typical, N.T.S.
    - TYPICAL 50' ROADWAY X-SECTION
    - 1000 NORTH TYPICAL ROADWAY X-SECTION

13. SYMBOL LEGEND
    - New 3" asphalt over 8" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 30" concrete roll curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 48" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 60" concrete sidewalk & 4" compacted road base per West Bountiful City specs.
    - New 30" concrete high-back curb & gutter per West Bountiful City specs.
TO: Planning Commission

DATE: February 5, 2015

FROM: Cathy Brightwell, Ben White

RE: Noncomplying Structures 17.56.030

The City Council recently denied a variance request for an addition to a very old home in the city that did not comply with the required yard regulations. The Council was sympathetic to the property owner, but still denied the request based on the current language in our city code. The Council expressed the desire to have some flexibility in cases such as this.

The proposed text changes in only affects nonconforming properties. Grammatical and formatting changes are proposed for the sections addressing nonconforming uses. The modifications to nonconforming uses section are not intended to be material which would change the substance or meaning of the code.

Paragraph 17.56.030.B(3) is new. The intent of this paragraph is to allow some flexibility for modifications to structures that were legally conforming at the time of their construction, but due to changes in the code, are now considered nonconforming. Attached is a list of properties throughout the city this code modification could potentially apply. These properties are either (1) old structures possible built prior to zoning codes or (2) structures built at a time when side yard setbacks were less than the current ordinance.

The addition of paragraph 17.56.030.C provides a mechanism for the Planning Commission to impose mitigating conditions similar to a Conditional Use Permit.

Staff reviewed Bountiful, North Salt Lake and Salt Lake City’s codes regarding nonconforming structures. Their codes are all similar to the language we currently have that restricts the expansion the noncompliance portion of a structure.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
DATE: January 28, 2015
FROM: Ben White
RE: Non-Conforming Yard Regulations

The following properties would be affected by providing a means to expand nonconforming structures by reducing the setback requirements.

688 W 400 N
710 W 400 N
817 W 400 N
1081 W 400 N
380 N 1100 W
705 N 800 W
675 N 800 W
595 N 800 W
567 N 800 W

To a limited degree:
700 W from 1000 N from 1600 N
675 W from 1000 N from 1600 N
725 W from 1175 N from 1550 N
560 W north of Pages Ln
17.56.030 Additions, enlargements and moving.

A. A building or structure occupied by a nonconforming use and/or a building or structure nonconforming to height, area or yard requirements shall not be added to or enlarged in any manner, or moved to another location on the lot, except upon issuance of a permit as provided in subsection (B)(1) of this section.

B. The planning commission, after public hearing, may issue a permit authorizing a building or structure occupied by a nonconforming use or a building or structure nonconforming to height, area or yard regulations may be added to, or enlarged, or moved to a new location on the lot upon a permit authorized by the planning commission, which may issue, provided that if the commission, after public hearing, shall finds:

1. That the addition or enlargement of or moving of the building proposed change will not be in harmony with one or more of the purposes of this title or the policies expressed in the city’s general plan;

2. That the proposed change does not impose any unreasonable burden upon the lands located in the vicinity of the non-conforming use or structure nor does it violate the development policies adopted in the master plan of the city. (Prior code § 9-16-3) That the proposed change will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity of the nonconforming use or noncomplying structure; and

3. In the case of an addition to or enlargement of a building or structure noncomplying as to yard regulations that was legally complying at the time of construction, the magnitude of any nonconformity of the addition or enlargement with the yard regulations will be less than one-half of the nonconformity of the noncomplying structure; but in no case shall the applicable required yard be reduced below eighty percent (80%) of the requirement. (For example, if the required side yard were ten feet and a noncomplying structure is located six feet from the property line within the applicable yard, the addition or enlargement may encroach be located no more than two feet within the same required yard or eight feet from the property line.)

C. The planning commission may attach conditions, such as landscape or buffering requirements, to any permit authorized under this section in order to mitigate the detrimental effects of the proposed change or otherwise achieve the purposes of this title.
West Bountiful City

Planning Commission

Posting of Agenda - The agenda for this meeting was posted on the State of Utah Public Notice website and the West Bountiful City website, and sent to Clipper Publishing Company on January 23, 2015 per state statutory requirement.

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of West Bountiful City held on Tuesday, January 13, 2015, at West Bountiful City Hall, Davis County, Utah.

Those in Attendance:

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Chairman Denis Hopkinson, Alan Malan, Mike Cottle, Laura Charchenko, Terry Turner and Corey Sweat (Alternate). Councilmember Kelly Enquist.

STAFF PRESENT:  Ben White (City Engineer), Cathy Brightwell (City Recorder), and Debbie McKean (Secretary).

VISITORS:  Mayor Ken Romney and Steve Croft.

The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Hopkinson. Chairman Hopkinson gave a prayer.

I. Accept Agenda.

Chairman Hopkinson reviewed the agenda. Mike Cottle moved to accept the agenda as presented. Terry Turner seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor among members present.

Business Discussed:

II. Public Hearing to Receive Comments Regarding Proposed Changes to Title 17, Clarifying Definitions Related to Density in Planned Unit Developments.

Chairman Hopkinson introduced the proposed changes to Title 17 regarding clarifying definitions related to density in PUDs. Ben White pointed out a correction that needed to be made changing 30 X 50 square feet to 30’ X 50’.
ACTION TAKEN:

Alan Malan moved to open the public hearing at 7:35 pm to receive public input regarding proposed changes to Title 17, clarifying definitions related to density in PUDs (Planned Unit Developments). Laura Charchenko seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No public comment.

ACTION TAKEN:

Terry Turner moved to close the public hearing at 7:38 pm. Alan Malan seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

III. Consider Conditional Use Application for a Commercial Business License for a HVAC/Gas Fireplace Repair and Maintenance Business in the Commercial Neighborhood District.

Included in the Commissioner’s packets was a memorandum from Cathy Brightwell, dated January 23, 2015 regarding Conditional Use Application for Steve Croft Service Co., 2232 North 640 West. The memorandum stated that Mr. Croft would like to open a HVAC repair and maintenance business with most of his work taking place in the field. Customers will come by appointment only. A site plan was included with his application.

Staff stated in their memorandum that this business falls under Contractor: general, electric, mechanical and plumbing, which is considered a conditional use in the C-N zone. Staff has reviewed the application and believes that it satisfies the requirements of Chapter 17.60 and recommends approval subject to the affirmative findings with the following recommendations.

- Fire Inspection approval
- No outdoor storage allowed

Cathy Brightwell stated that all information was included in the Commissioner’s packet and noted that 99% of the business will be off site. She added that the condition for Fire Inspection approval has been met.

Chairman Hopkinson invited Steve Croft to the stand. He introduced himself and explained his background in HVAC and fireplace repair. He does mostly service and a little installation. The backup generator is on display because he is a Briggs and Stratton authorized dealer as well and would like to have a demo on display, but the main focus is for fireplace repair.

Commissioner’s Comments included:
• Alan Malan asked about the standby generator display. Mr. Croft responded that he is a Briggs and Stratton Dealer and would like to have a display to show those who may want to see one before purchasing, although it will be by appointment only.

• Laura Charchenko, Mike Cottle and Corey Sweat had no concerns.

• Terry Turner reiterated that he would mostly do service and not sales.

**ACTION ITEM:**

Laura Charchenko moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for Steve Croft Service Co. located at 2232 North 640 West as allowed in Chapter 17.60 with the following affirmative findings, the proposed use is desirable to provide a service that will contribute to the general well-being of the neighborhood and community, will not be detrimental to health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing in the vicinity, or injurious to property in the vicinity, shall not inordinately impact schools, utilities, and streets in the area, will provide for proper parking and traffic circulation and be in harmony with the area, and will comply with the regulations specified in the C-N zoning ordinance, and meet the condition that no outdoor storage is allowed. Terry Turner seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

Mr. Croft wanted clarification on outdoor storage. He informed them that he has a few trailers that may be parked on site. Mr. Hopkinson saw no problem as long as he used the designated parking stalls for his business.

**IV. Consider Clarifications in Title 17 Related to Definitions of Density in PUDs**

A copy of proposed Density Definition language was included in the Commissioner’s packet. Mr. Hopkinson asked the Commission to make comments on the language change and noted the only item to change would be the 30’ X 50’ language noted by Mr. White earlier in the meeting.

Commissioner Comments:

All the Commissioners gave their approval on the document. The document has been approved by city legal counsel.

**ACTION TAKEN:**

Alan Malan moved to approve the language in Title 17 for Density Definitions and forward the recommendation to the City Council for their review and approval. Mike Cottle seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor.

**V. Discuss Proposed Language Changes in Title 17 to Address Modification to Nonconforming Structures.**

Commissioner’s received a memorandum dated January 23, 2015 from Cathy Brightwell and Ben White regarding nonconforming structures. The memo explained that residents, Clint and Christy Straatman, requested a variance for property they own at 688 W 400 North that would allow them to have a setback of nine feet instead of our ten feet minimum for an addition they
are building attached to the rear of their home. The couple appeared before the City Council last week asking for a variance to be able to accommodate their needs. Their Request did not qualify under the variance ordinance so they are not allowed to do this. City Council thought that there may be a way to review our nonconforming ordinance to allow requests meeting certain criteria. Steve Doxey drafted some language incorporating the ideas suggested from the City Council.

Chairman Hopkinson expressed his desire for all the Commissioners to have reviewed the old and new parts of this document. He explained the document was straight forward as it is. He explained that what needs to be considered is opening up a way that would allow conditional use to be approved.

**Commissioner’s Comments:**

- Corey Sweat likes things to be clear and have no gray areas in the language or understanding of the document. He does not like to change code for one individual.
- Mike Cottle disagrees with changing the ordinance to accommodate one individual, and Terry Turner agreed.
- Laura Charchenko felt that the language does not need to be changed but she is fine either way.
- Alan Malan explained that the situation that brought this to their attention is an existing non conforming issue. He noted that the City Council did not think that it was a big deal changing the language. He explained that he thinks we will probably have more than one situation that this will affect and it would be good to be able to deal with them, but he felt that coming up with the right language could be difficult.
- Chairman Hopkinson reminded the Commission about a previous request from a resident not long ago that was similar in principle. He feels as long as the language stays in the nonconforming section only he is okay to make a change that could work and make the document more understandable.

Ben White explained the difference in each situation. The one request was conforming while this recent request is non-conforming. Zoning Codes did not exist when the current home was constructed 125 years ago. The resident only needed an extra six inches to a foot to make an addition to their home work. He noted that the City Council was very understanding but legally could not use the variance as a vehicle to grant that permission. They felt that the language is not real clear in the current ordinance and could use some changes to clarify and make conditions that could be considered for approval.

Mr. White noted that we need to be careful what we include and do not include in the document because both will matter greatly. Some discussion took place regarding the development of the property when it was first built. Ben White informed the Commission that the County recorder even had a hard time distinguishing the property lines.

Mayor Romney commented that he does not know of any City in the area that allows less than 8 feet for a side setback without being a PUD situation, and wondered if setting a minimum distance, such as 8 feet, would be an easier way to handle it. He asked if we know how many properties this could potentially affect. Mr. White responded that there could be a lot of
properties that could fit into the 8 foot setback on their property that are not 100 year old homes and older.

Chairman Hopkinson thought it was very important that a minimum value be included in the language and that it is clear the changes are only for nonconforming properties.

Chairman Hopkinson tasked the Staff with doing a bit more research from other cities and bring that information and research back to them for review along with any other suggestions that they feel need to be changed.

Alan Malan noted that it is important to include a requirement for a public hearing in these situations.

Staff Report

Von Hill visited with Ben White regarding the Wild Property for development. Mr. White noted the different opinions of the Police and Public Works department regarding two versions of proposed set ups of the subdivision (flag lot or cul-de-sac option). He asked which option would be preferred among those present tonight. Most were in favor of the cul-de-sac plan or had no recommendation either way. Mr. White pointed out that this is a nine lot subdivision with the existing home to remain on the ninth lot. There will a public hearing scheduled for the next meeting.

400 North overpass closure is still scheduled for the end of February or first part of March and will last 90 days.

Economic development will be a City Council item in the near future with the announcement that Shopko is closing.

The development owner is still planning to replace the Burger King and Wingers buildings. It appears to be held up because of terms in the lease agreements with existing tenants giving them a say in how the area is designed and when construction can occur.

Holly Refinery has a Phase I and Phase II in their expansion plan. Due to lower oil prices, they may delay at least parts of the Phase II development. They have had a surprise high sulfur laden oil delivery to the refinery through a pipeline. The high sulfur content fouled equipment resulting in problems this past month that they are still working through. They were actually shut down for a few weeks as a result.

VI. Approval of Minutes for January 13, 2015

ACTION TAKEN:

Alan Malan moved to approve of the minutes dated January 13, 2015 as presented. Mike Cottle seconded the motion and voting was unanimous in favor among those members present.
VI. Adjournment

ACTION TAKEN:

Laura Charchenko moved to adjourn the regular session of the Planning Commission meeting at 8:35 pm. Terry Turner seconded the motion. Voting was unanimous in favor.

The foregoing was approved by the West Bountiful City Planning Commission on January 27, 2015, by unanimous vote of all members present.

_______________________________
Cathy Brightwell - City Recorder