

Planning Commission Chair:	Robert Guiller
Planning Commission Vice-Chair:	Glen Woolsey
Commissioners:	Jon Arends
	Scott Dixon
	Brent Stuart
Secretary:	Cheryl White
City Council Representative:	Dave Boothe

UINTAH CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, May 28, 2019
7:00 PM



2191 East 6550 South – Uintah, Utah 84405

(801) 479-4130 Fax: (801)476-7269

Attendees: Glen Woolsey, Jon Arends, Daniel Combe, Brent Stuart, Brett Parke, Debra Wickizer, Dave Boothe, Lori Woolsey, Joshua Chapman, Camille Chapman, William Pope, Casey Christiansen, Lew Vriland, Meg Krusemark, Ryan Krusemark, Linette Arends, Debbie Petersen, Keith Allen and Cheryl White

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Called to Order by Glen Woolsey at 7:00

Pledge of Allegiance led by Lori Woolsey

Roll Call: Daniel Combe – present, Brent Stuart – present, Glen Woolsey – present, Jon Arends – present, Brett Parke - present

Conflict of Interest - Commission members are required by law to file a public disclosure statement with the Secretary listing business interests and investments that could create a conflict of interest with the duties of the Commission Member. When a matter in which a Commission member has a business or investment interest appears on the agenda, the Commission member must publicly disclose that interest. Tim Petty asked the Commission if they had any conflicts of interest with tonight's agenda. There were none.

Agenda Items:

1. **Public Comment (2 minutes per person)** *(recording: 00:01:10)
 - Mayor Cutler expressed thanks to Glen for chairing the meeting. He commended the commission for having alternates available. He then explained that Jon Arends, Brett Parke and himself attended the Public Hearing in South Weber regarding the proposed RV park. He expressed that Jon and Brett represented us well. They presented a letter containing our concerns and asked for a meeting between representatives of the two cities. Mayor Cutler also addressed them and asked for consideration of our citizens regarding noise, traffic and other issues. In the end, the South Weber Planning Commission approved the CUP for the RV park; but afterwards David Larsen, the City Manager, contacted Uintah City's office to set up the requested meeting. He will let members of the Planning Commission know when the meeting is, in case they want to attend. He then expressed his gratitude for everything the Planning Commission does on behalf of the City.
2. **Approval of the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes held April 23, 2019:** *(recording: 00:03:48)
Presenter: Glen Woolsey
 - Brent asked that the invitation to visit Materialized Arms when it is up and running be added to the minutes. No one else had any comments or concerns. He then motioned that the minutes be approved with this addition. Jon seconded the motion. All in favor; motion passed.
3. **Discussion/ Action for review of Conditional Use Permit #16-200 for Joshua Chapman; The Chapman Shop located at 6796 S 1800 E, Uintah** *(recording: 00:05:10)
Presenter: Joshua Chapman
 - Brent started off by asking if the city had received any complaints in the last year. He was told no, but also informed that the Chapman's didn't hold any camps last year either. Joshua also stated that he felt the complaints received previously were untrue. Brent then asked how many camps they would hold this year. He was told only 1. Joshua also stated that they were discouraged by the conditions imposed in previous years and asked that they be reviewed and changed. He said that they have had over 80 children attend their camp over the years, and have had very good results. Because of the exposure, some of the children have gone on to obtain degrees in Mechanical Engineering and Welding at the DATC. He feels the camp is useful and beneficial.
 - Joshua stated that one condition he would like reconsidered is the number of children allowed to attend. Currently it is limited to 18, and his own children count in that number. He has 6 children. Jon asked if his children participate. He was told yes, some participate as students and others are old enough to help. They also have a 2 year old who is too young to attend. Glen asked if he had a number in mind. He was told 20-25, not counting his own. Glen stated that one reason for the limit was that they have to consider the needs of the community. He then asked if the Chapman's had approached their neighbors

to see how they felt about the increase in numbers. They said no, but in the past only 2 neighbors have had a problem with the camp, and one has since moved.

- Brent asked about adult supervision; specifically what is the adult to child ratio. Joshua stated that they could easily have 4-5 adults present for 24 children because parents like to participate.
- Jon asked how long the camp lasts. He was told 2 days, but most students live close enough that they don't stay overnight, and those who stay the night will be inside the home after dark. He then asked where the number limit of 18 came from. It was ascertained that the previous commission felt was representative of a typical school classroom. However, the Chapman's didn't agree, stating that most classrooms today have 25-30 students or more.
- Daniel asked how many restrooms were available. He was told 3. He then stated that he felt this was similar to field trip and schools require a ratio of 1 adult to 4 children. He suggested the same ration for the students at the camp. Joshua disagreed saying they were contained in one place and the students weren't wandering around. However, it was pointed out that they were using power tools, and that requires more supervision in his mind.
- Questions were asked about the acreage and parking situation. The Chapman's have half an acre and a large driveway that can accommodate all the parking necessary. There was also discussion about fire code, and whether or not having that many students would violate code. It was stated that they students would be outside, so the fire code wouldn't be in force, but that the home was 4000 sq ft and therefore could accommodate 20 students if necessary. It was also pointed out that there was no risk of danger from being trapped by a fire, since they would be outside. Jon suggested that it would still be a good idea to have a plan in place in case of such emergencies.
- Josh asked if it was necessary to have a review every year. He was told yes, this is standard practice. He then requested that it be held earlier in the year to accommodate them. He was told that he could contact the city office and request it when it was convenient if he wanted to.
- Jon suggested that they raise the number of children to 20, not including his own. Glen then reiterated the conditions of the permit to be granted:
 - Hours are 7:30 am - 9:00 pm on weekdays, 10:00 pm on weekends.
 - Outdoor sleeping is not permitted
 - All students must attend an orientation
 - Restrooms must be available
 - No on street parking
 - No more than 20 children, not including their own
 - Must have a food handler's permit if serving food
 - Students must stay on the Chapman's property
 - Students must be kept away from any storage or supplies, such as flammables
 - Clean-up is required afterwards
 - 1 adult for every 5 students
- Glen confirmed that they were only doing 1 camp this year, and suggested that they alert the neighbors in an effort to bring them onboard with what would take place in order to avoid hard feelings.
- Brent motioned to grant the CUP based on the above conditions. Jon seconded the motion. All in favor; motion passed.

4. Discussion/ Action on Boundary Line Adjustment at 1591 E 6600 S/1593 E 6600 S *(recording: 00:30:20)

Presenter: Ryan and Meg Krusemark

- Jon asked if the purpose for the adjustment was because they were selling. He was told yes. Both properties have access from 6600 S, but when they bought 1593 E, they took the back half of the lot and tied it into their home at 1591 E. They stated that the backyard of 1593 E was inaccessible because of a power pole in the middle of the driveway. Therefore the boundary line adjustment makes sense.
- Meg stated that they understood the property was small; but with the railroad lease, it would be large enough. Glen stated that they couldn't use RR property to meet the requirement and asked if they had considered moving the pole. He was told yes, that was a possibility. Glen stated that he was concerned about making 1593 E so small, it would be less than a quarter of an acre. He then asked where the septic system was located. He was told they weren't sure, it is in the backyard but they don't know if moving the boundary line would put it on the other lot. Meg stated that if there was a problem, they wouldn't repair the drainfield but replace it; and there was room to the side of the house.
- Brent stated that they were requesting to make a non-conforming lot even more non-conforming and that isn't possible. He stated that part of the reason why they can't agree to the adjustment was because of regulations from the Weber-Morgan Health Dept. He suggested they could look into those rules to see if the proposed place for a new drainfield met their regulations. He also expressed concern that the deed lines on the survey don't match the adjustment lines and this

would affect neighbors on both sides. It was explained that the bold line is the fence line and that is what the adjustment was based off of. Brent stated that they were in essence adjusting the neighbor's lot also, and that made the issue more complicated.

- Brent also expressed the need to revise the checklist given to state that the septic system must be shown on the survey map. He then stated that he didn't think they could say yes to the request. Glen agreed, stating that there were too many unknowns and they would invite more problems when it came time to sell the property.
- Ryan asked if it was possible to have both properties share the same access. He was told that would have to be an understanding between neighbors and not something the Planning Commission could approve unless the right of way was bigger.
- Brent stated that as a Commission they needed to review the guidelines for non-conforming lots. He suggested bringing in someone from the health dept to address the issue of septic systems and the requirements for replacing a drainfield and motioned that the issue be table pending more education on the part of the Planning Commission. Jon seconded the motion. All in favor, motion passed.

5. Discussion/Action for Combe Road Traffic issues *(recording: 00:42:50)

Presenter: Jon Arends

- Jon stated that he's lived here just over a year. In that time, he's had multiple neighbors approach him with concerns about Combe Road. At first, he spoke with Councilwoman Roberts and she suggested that he bring it up with the Planning Commission. He went on to say this has been a problem for over 30 years. The issues he brought up were:
 - Excessive cut-through traffic
 - Excessive speeds
 - Endangering pedestrians
 - Endangering cyclists
 - Careless and reckless drivers
- Jon continued by stating that there are no street lights, the road is too narrow for 2 lanes and there are a lot of 52 foot trucks, as well as concrete trucks and others, using the road in order to avoid Hwy 89. These trucks are doing damage to resident's property. He pointed out that there is a 10 ton limit for traffic using the road. Also, there are officers who let violators go because they know them. He is concerned of the liability because it is only a matter of time before an accident occurs or someone is killed.
- Jon then discussed measures that have been taken, but failed. Speed bumps have been installed, but don't meet UDOT requirements and don't have the desired effect. In fact, kids use them to jump their side-by-sides as they go down the road. Also, the one-way street has been ignored and cars are coming down at a high rate of speed, running people off the road.
- He stated that at this point he has no solutions, but asks that each member of the council think seriously on how to mitigate the problems. Combe Road was intended for the use as a residential street, but currently there are between 3000-6000 cars using it on a daily basis.
- Glen stated that we definitely need to come up with a gameplan and Jon should take the lead. Jon then explained the "DMAIC" process that he proposed they use to solve the problem. "DMAIC" stands for "Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve and Control". In the material handed out, Jon has defined the problem and provided the data (measurements) to support the problem exists. He is asking the Commissions help to analyze the situation and recommend solutions. He pointed out that we cannot control people, only the environment; and therefore should focus efforts in that direction.
- After much discussion of the problem, what has been done and what hasn't worked; it was decided to table the discussion until the next meeting so commission members had time to think about it.
- Jon made a motion to table the discussion until the next meeting. Brett seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

6. Discussion/Action on recommendation for how close an out-building should be to the property line

*(recording: 01:11:34)

Presenter: Glen Woolsey

- Mayor Cutler began by explaining the reason behind his request that the Planning Commission discuss this. Our ordinance allows for outbuildings to be 1 foot from a property line. This has caused issues with neighbors and may not be safe if flammable liquids are stored in the building. He would like the Planning Commission to review the ordinance to see if it is adequate or needs to be changed.
- Brent stated that as a land use, the ordinance was adequate, but that we needed to provide more information about what a landowner needs to do when building that close to a property line. He stated that a building within 5 feet of the property line the IRC code kicks in. Our permit should be updated to reflect this code and it's very likely that landowners will move the building rather than go

to the expense of complying with code. He felt that the problem lies in education rather than the ordinance itself. He doesn't like the idea of limiting someone who is willing to comply with code.

- Jon asked about buildings that don't need a permit. He was told that everyone must follow these rules, whether or not they need a permit.
- Daniel asked about run-off going onto someone else's property. He was told that the IRC code addressed such things.
- Brent also pointed out that there is a problem when finishing the outside of a building that is so close to the property line. In many cases, the landowner must encroach on the neighbor's property in order to put up siding, etc.
- Glen agreed with Brent. He stated that he looked at the documentation provided and it was confusing to him. He said that we need to clarify the rules and present something that the City Council can implement.
- It was also brought up that a site plan was required for a permit, and this would show the distance from the property line. At that point, requirements could be addressed. Jon pointed out that a checklist should be included on the permit so they knew and addressed these issues in advance.
- Glen stated that we didn't need to decide tonight, but it was necessary to change things. We need to learn from what hasn't worked and improve things for the future.
- Brent motioned to table the discussion until next month. Jon seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

7. Discussion/Action on overview of Moderate Income Housing Conference *(recording: 01:32:30)

Presenter: Brent Stuart

- Brent started off by giving some background on moderate income housing (MIH). It is state law that a city general plan must include a section addressing it. However, a new bill passed that has tied transportation funds to compliance with MIH. He stated that we are small enough that we don't have to report, but we need to comply.
- Jon asked if we receive any of this funding. He was told no.
- Brent continued by stating that we comply with MIH because of Cottonwood Estates, but we should look into other ways to support it. He specifically mentioned Accessory Dwelling Units as an option to look into. It was pointed out that this was a solution that wouldn't have a negative impact on septic systems. He also gave an example to show why MIH is important. He said that the median wage in Cache Valley increased 67% from 2001-2016 but cost for housing increased 275%. As a result, people like teachers and police officers are forced to rent because they can't afford to own.
- To summarize, Brent stated that our general plan meets the requirements but in the future we may want to work on strategies that positively impact MIH.

8. Commissioner's Responsibility Reports and follow-up from previous meeting. *(recording: 01:41:56)

- **New Business Licenses – Cheryl White:** Stated that Materialized Arms had a fire inspection. They failed, but are working towards compliance and hope to have the license within a couple of weeks.
- **CUPs – Brent Stuart:** There is a question on whether Tyson Lloyd needs a CUP or not. He has been asked to come to the next meeting to explain his operation so we can determine
- **Commercial Building – Scott Dixon:** None
- **Training – Glen Woolsey:** None
- **Nuisance – Jon Arends:** None
- **Other – Robert Guiller:** None

9. Meeting adjourned. *(recording: 00:00:00)

- Jon motioned to adjourn the meeting. Daniel seconded.
- All in favor, motion passed.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission this 25 day of June, 2019.



Planning Commission Chair