

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, September 29, 2015 7:00 p.m.
Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Donald Steele, Vice Chair, Presiding
 Commission Member: John Dredge, David Driggs, Jeff Dodge, Craig Clement,
 Steven Thomas
 Absent/Excused: Glenn Dodge, LoriAnne Spear
 Chandler Goodwin, Assistant City Manager
 Courtney Hammond, Transcriptionist
 Trent Augustus, City Council Liaison

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1. This meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:07 p.m. by C. Steele.

2. Public Comment

No comments.

PUBLIC HEARING

Amendments to Title 10, Chapter 5, Regarding Driveways

No comments.

Amendments to Title 10, Chapter 5, Regarding Signs in the Public Right of Way

No comments.

3. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to Title 10, Chapter 5, Regarding Driveways

Chandler Goodwin stated that circular driveways are currently allowed in a front setback area but not in side setbacks. There are a few side setback circular driveways in the city. Staff feels that the circular driveways should be allowed in the side setback. The same conditions apply as for front setbacks with the addition of maintaining a site triangle. The amendments should be in 10-5-5 (A) (13) & (14). Parking in the code is defined as less than 48 hours. It would be a similar definition in this instance.

C. Driggs would like to increase the maximum width to 20 feet.

John Dredge was recognized as a voting member.

MOTION: C. Dredge—To recommend the proposed code 10-5-5 (A) (13 & 14) for approval by the City Council subject to the following: the width of the drive section 14 B be changed to 20 feet in width. Seconded by C. Clement.

C Driggs suggested that the motion state that the language is from the memo in the agenda.

AMEND MOTION: C. Dredge—To amend the motion to include the language founded in the meeting agenda of September 29, 2015 (attached). Seconded by C. Clement.

Yes - C. Clement
C. Jeff Dodge
C. Dredge
C. Driggs
C. Steele Motion passes.

4. Review/Recommendation on Amendments to Title 10, Chapter 5, Regarding Signs in the Public Right of Way

Chandler Goodwin stated that the City Council asked the Planning Commission to examine signs in the public right of way. This came about because the city has been placing informational signs in the roundabout. Some residents complained. Once the signs were taken down there was a decrease in recreation program participation, costing the city close to \$10,000. This amendment proposes an exemption for governmental purposes that are informational in nature. This limits the size of such signs to 3 x 5 feet and the length of posting to 7 days. The sign can be placed no earlier than 60 days in advance of an event. It may be a good idea to have city signs approved and receive the sticker.

C. Driggs stated that he doesn't think a sign belongs in a roundabout for safety reasons. The city may want to add language that limits how many times a sign can be put up over and over again. He would like to add something to stipulate that the signs need to be placed by governmental agencies and used for governmental purposes, rather than just stating governmental purposes. That could be misinterpreted to mean anything political. The last sentence should read "such exemption" rather than exception.

C. Steele stated that there are state regulations to what can go into a roundabout.

C. Thomas stated that he feels that 60 days before an event is too long. He would like to add a reference to temporary signage.

MOTION: C. Clement—To recommend to the City Council the proposed sign ordinance 10-5-26 (B)(4c) as in the September 29 agenda with the addition of the word "temporary" in front of signage in the first and second sentence in the code, that we strike the last sentence, with the language that signage may be posted for no more than 30 days before an event, and that "signage placed by governmental agencies and used for governmental purposes" be added to the first sentence. Seconded by C. Dredge.

Yes - C. Clement
C. Jeff Dodge
C. Dredge
C. Driggs
C. Steele Motion passes.

5. Discussion on Assisted Living Facility Density in Residential Zones

Chandler Goodwin stated that the City Council asked that the Planning Commission to talk about the density of assisted living facilities in the residential zone. The current density limits is based on state code and is capped at 16.

Trent Augustus stated that the City Council's suggestion was to review the density in the zone to see if it warrants a more in-depth analysis or changes.

C. Clement stated that he feels that this code addresses density very well. It is clear and concise.

C. Jeff Dodge stated that he did research into communities that regulate density in assisted living facilities within commercial zones. He did not find much locally. He was able to find more nationally, but each community did it differently. His proposal allows 24 units per acre.

A Special Planning Commission meeting will be held on October 13 at 7:00 p.m. to discuss the Commercial Design Guidelines.

AJOURNMENT

6. This meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m. on a motion by C. Jeff Dodge, seconded by C. Dredge and unanimously approved.

Approved:
October 13, 2015

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC
City Recorder