

**Francis Planning Commission Meeting  
Thursday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021 7:00 p.m.**

This meeting will be held as an electronic meeting without allowing the public to enter the Community Center or another anchor location to participate, pursuant to Governor Herbert's Executive Order 2020-5.

Francis City is inviting you to attend by following the link below or by calling 1-301-715-8592

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83758166495?pwd=UU1SZjhWenJKY2VmWnpuWG9LQVZEZz09>

Meeting ID: 837 5816 6495 Meeting Password: 273469

**You can also comment by email to [comments@francisutah.org](mailto:comments@francisutah.org)**

**Attending:** Chair Brian Henneuse, Commissioners Bob Murphy, Natalie Atkinson and Felicia Sotelo, Planner Katie Henneuse, City Engineer Scott Kettle and Treasurer Mandy Crittenden

**Others Attending:** Nick Berry

**1. Call Meeting to Order**

Chair Brian called meeting to order at 7:07 P.M.

**2. Public Hearing – Code Text Amendment Storage Yards**

Planner Katie read her staff report. She red-lined all the corrections to the current Storage Yard Code and explained the reasonings.

Nick Berry commented on the sign measurements, that it would make more sense to change it to a standard sign size rather than a random number. He said a 32 square foot sign is a common standard size.

Commissioner Felicia did not see a problem with 32 feet.

Commissioner Bob agreed, he does not see an issue with that.

Chair Brian commented that he agreed, sometimes the Planning Commission does not know particulars, and it is nice to have some positive input from someone who has researched the reasonings. Brian recommended that anywhere the code states 30 square feet on signs we do a code text amendment to bump it up to 32 feet.

Chair Brian referred to the fencing part of the code, he questioned that an attractive concrete fence needed to be used on all four sides? He wondered if we should specify what material to use.

Commissioner Natalie commented she would like to use the word privacy fence verse a certain material. She referenced Leavitt's Storage Yard and stated they did not use concrete on all four sides. It was more of a façade on the front and it looks nice. She furthered with concrete is expensive.

Planner Katie questioned Engineer Scott, because it was before her time as planner, the reasoning the City required the concrete before.

Engineer Scott replied that it was because these fences will butt up against residential areas, they wanted it to be something attractive, but that would also not deteriorate like a vinyl, wood slat, or chain-link would. He stated that we needed to be specific, requiring just a privacy fence opens options that are not necessarily the best look for the City.

Chair Brian does not like specifying a certain material but understands Engineer Scott's reasoning. He stated that in the future if something comes up and someone wants to do something different, they can re-evaluate it then.

Commissioner Natalie commented we are trying to reduce the amount of paperwork that comes through the City for approval, so it is a good idea to be more specific to what we want and have one last thing that needs to be evaluated.

Commissioner Felicia asked if we could add something that said an attractive concrete or similar material constructed fence? That would leave room for some prefab rock type fence.

Engineer Scott commented specific to Nick Berry's Premier Storage, the City Council has already approved him using the back of the building with a 25-foot setback to be his fencing, due to access issues to surrounding properties.

Chair Brian stated that is kind of his point, if we can avoid those situations and state it in a broader fashion, it will alleviate people coming in all the time for changes.

Commissioner Natalie agreed with wording it like what Commissioner Felicia stated.

Nick Berry commented his opinion, with being next to residential he would think you would want a vinyl or softer material that would blend with a residential setting, requiring a concrete to him gives an industrial feel that doesn't fit it surroundings. If chain-link is what the City is trying to avoid, why not just write the code to state: An attractive site obscuring fence, chain-link is not allowed or whatever type of material you are trying to avoid just specify that. Instead of listing all that are allowed, specify which materials are not?

Chair Brian responded he sees Nicks point and agrees with that it would be easier to just state chain-link and vinyl slat fences are not allowed. He agreed with Engineer Scotts point on the vinyl not being a great option, it does not hold up that well.

Engineer Scott commented he thinks they are headed in the right direction; he thinks they should for sure eliminate chain-link or vinyl fences.

Chair Brian stated that eventually all material fences will need maintenance, so we cannot really specify too much on deterioration, but that requiring that it is esthetically appealing is a need.

Commissioner Bob commented he would think to eliminate chain-link, vinyl and wood.

Chair Brian stated that chain-link is the only no-go for him.

Engineer Scott and Commissioner Natalie both agree to list the vinyl as a no go as well.

Chair Brian questioned if we need to address lighting on the signage.

Planner Katie responded the Storage Yard Code references the Commercial Lighting Code that they will need to follow.

Chair Brian just questioned if something to Commercial standards would be appropriate in Ag-1 zoning?

Planner Katie responded she believes yes. All lights are required to be full cut off so they should not be an issue.

***Commissioner Natalie made a motion to approve the Code Text Amendment as proposed by the City Planner adding that an attractive 8-foot site obscuring fence of a substantial nature and durable construction must be used on all sides and highlight that no chain-link, vinyl or residential wood slat material may be used. Also, bump the signage dimensions to 32-foot from its current 30-foot maximum. Commissioner Bob seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

### 3. Premier Storage Landscape Plan – Nick Berry

Planner Katie read her staff report. She explained Nick’s Landscape design as proposed.

Nick Berry explained the layout of his landscape design and clarified the reasoning behind how some of it looked. There is an issue with overhead power lines they had to accommodate, and some wetland issues they had to avoid as well.

Commissioner Natalie commented that she was impressed with the tree key on the plan.

Commissioner Felicia agreed with Commissioner Natalie, she was impressed with the design.

Chair Brian questioned if Nick would do a drip irrigation system?

Nick answered yes.

Commissioner Felicia asked about the trees on the entrance, is there a potential in 10 or 15 years, that they will block traffic or obstruct views on State Road 35?

Nick responded and said he followed the site triangle required by UDOT. He said once it is a reality and they can physically see what it looks like; he will adjust some of the landscaping to correct any issues.

Chair Brian commented based on the types of trees he has proposed he does not see an issue with his knowledge.

Chair Brian asked what Nick’s snow removal plan was.

Nick responded on the site plan it shows where he plans to store it. Also, Tim Crittenden (neighbor) has given him permission to store it on his property if needed through a hard winter year.

***Commissioner Felicia made a motion to approve the landscape plan as proposed. Commissioner Natalie seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

### 4. Application for Final Masterplan and Phase 1 & 2 approval – Hart Crossing (Rusty Webster)

Postponed to a later date.

### 5. Planner Update

Planner Katie informed that the Views went to City Council at last night’s January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting. They decided to not do the public portion but asked for a conversation to get a better idea what the Council wanted to see. They will be coming back to Planning Commission with a new Concept Plan next month that will include more of what they think the Council and residents want to see. Reminded we have a second meeting next Thursday, she said we a lot of items coming up in February that needed addressed. We will be looking at Hart Crossing Master Plan and Phase 1 & 2 approvals. She has been working with the developer on Hart a lot through the last month getting them up to code so they can get a positive recommendation.

Commissioner Bob asked what Hart was still missing?

Planner Katie responded, there was some questions about the maintenance of the Conservation lands, they were not quite meeting the requirements of the City Code.

Commissioner Bob asked if we had any information on the Public Meetings Training yet?

Katie responded that she discussed it with the Mayor and Council last night, originally, they scheduled it the same night as the City Council meeting and that will not work, so they will hopefully have a different date soon. All training will be done online. She also informed Mayor Ames would like to start holding in person meetings again soon, they are working on how to figure that out and make it happen.

**6. Approval of December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2020 minutes.**

***Commissioner Bob made a motion to approve the December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2020 minutes. Commissioner Felicia seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.***

***Chair Brian made a motion to adjourn the meeting. All in favor, motion passed.***

Meeting ended.