

PUBLIC HEARING AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, February 25, 2010 7:00 p.m.

Public Safety Building

3925 W Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Cliff Chandler, Chair, Presiding
Commission Members: Donald Steele, Glenn Dodge, Craig Clement, Trent Augustus, Daniel Zappala
Absent: Gary Maxwell
Greg Robinson, Assistant City Manager
Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder
David Bunker, City Engineer
Scott Jackman, Council Representative
Others:

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 7:11 p.m. by C. Chandler.

Note: Daniel Zappala and Trent Augustus were sworn in as first and second alternates respectively prior to the meeting.

2. Public Comment

No comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. City Code Amendments, Title 11, Chapter 1, Section 3, Subdivision Plats Required; Exceptions

No comments.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

4. Approval of Minutes from the January 28, 2010, Regular Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION: C. Dodge - To accept the minutes. Seconded by C. Chandler.

Yes - C. Chandler

C. Dodge

C. Clement

Abstain- C. Steele

Motion passes.

C. Zappala was recognized as a voting member.

5. Review/Recommendation on City Code Amendments, Title 11, Chapter 1, Section 3, Subdivision Plats Required; Exceptions

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson stated this item was previously discussed. The purpose of the amendment is to close a loop hole in the City Code regarding the sale of property by metes and bounds descriptions. Changes include adding a certain square footage, adding a buildable lot cannot be created, and removing the “less than 10 lot” provision. The sale of property cannot produce a building lot solely by metes and bounds. Recently a lot was created by just metes and bounds, and this makes it difficult to track the information because a plat is not recorded. Just a deed with a description is recorded. These changes will require all the subdivision criteria to be met. The point of the new paragraph A is to limit the size. Paragraph G doesn’t allow a building lot to be created. Greg Robinson stated that there is a reason for metes and bounds. The intent is to still allow the sale of property by metes and bounds but in small increments. The City is attempting to force a subdivider to record a plat.

David Bunker stated that staff looked at the zoning and what constitutes a lot to come up with the 10,000 square feet. Paragraph A prevents a lot being added to and then divided without a being done under a Planned Residential Development. The intent of these changes is not to allow a line to be drawn and create a lot. The City needs to know when a buildable lot is created. Currently the City doesn’t have any recourse when property is divided by metes and bounds. He suggested removing paragraph A and adding language that city services will not be extended to lots created by metes and bounds.

Commission Discussion:

- C. Clement stated that if paragraphs A and G are to limit buildable lots, paragraph G does this alone. It feels it will be hard to enforce the 10,000 square feet. The City won’t know if someone splits a parcel by metes and bounds.
- C. Steele stated that if a division by metes and bounds creates a buildable lot, then it must be recorded. There are other issues that can’t be defined at this time.
- C. Chandler stated that removing paragraph A and just keeping paragraph G meets the criteria.

MOTION: C. Clement – To recommend changes to the City Code 11-1-3 by removing paragraph A, adding a buildable lot or parcel cannot be created by exclusively using metes and bounds, and adding City services shall not be extended to parcels created exclusively by metes and bounds.

Seconded by C. Steele.

Yes - C. Chandler
C. Dodge
C. Clement
C. Steele
C. Zappala

Motion passes.

6. Discussion Regarding City Code, Title 10, Chapter 6, Article B, Planned Residential Developments (PRD)

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

Greg Robinson stated that last year the Council asked the Planning Commission to review density levels for the H-1 Hillside Zone. Currently the density is one-acre lots, but that isn't the problem. The higher density comes from the Planned Residential Development (PRD) section in the City Code. Single family units are limited to five per acre with 10,000 square-foot lots. Currently it allows dual dwelling units at three per acre at 12,000 square-foot lots. The Council discussed adding more towards the open space requirement and asked the Planning Commission to address more usable open space. The H-1 Zone is where most of the development will happen in the future. Section 10-6B-8, paragraph C, spells out the type of open space the City requires. The Code reads, "...natural open space (applicable to steep hillside, wetland, floodplain area, etc.), and developed useable open space areas, or a combination thereof." It also states, "...the designated open space area shall include and contain all 100-year floodplain areas, defined floodways, all avalanche and rock falls hazard areas, all areas having a slope of 30% or greater, or any other are of known

David Bunker stated that the steeper the grade the less density allowed. The east bench is in the H-1 Zone. A lot of the property is flat, but a lot is steep. Section 10-6B-4 requires a slope analysis. A developer could come in and identify all the area that is 21% or greater and give it to the city as open space, which is unusable. Then the developer puts all the units entirely on the flatter ground. The City has seen a slope analysis of the hillside. A roadway grade can't exceed 8% except for short distances, which has been defined, can go up to 12%.

Commission Discussion:

- C. Chandler stated that some Council members addressed zeroing in on the open space and the utilization of open space. The Code says slopes of 30% or greater has to be used as open space.
- C. Steele stated that the flat areas are surrounded by steep areas.
- C. Clement stated that slope isn't defined in the Code. It needs to be defined within certain feet.
- C. Zappala stated that some portion of the open space needs to be useable.

Discussion:

Accesses, parking, and wildlife corridors need to be created to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and also the Forest Service land. These points of access will be addressed when a development is proposed. Useable open space is usually parks and trails and extracted by the City differently. Useable open space could be defined as 10% or less. The City needs to be able to negotiate with regards to open space. Language could be added to Section 10-6B-8, paragraph C, stating that a certain percentage has to be useable. Extraction is done either through an ordinance or the General Plan. The Commission would like to see a slope map of the hillside area at the next meeting and discuss the issue further.

7. Discussion Regarding the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on City Streets

See handouts.

Staff Presentation:

David Bunker stated that the question is how much Average Daily Traffic (ADT) can a cul-de-sac support. The City needs a definition and requirements for ADT on all cul-de-sacs in the City or developments outside the City that enter city limits through a cul-de-sac. The City currently allows a 1,000-foot cul-de-sac with a minimum lot frontage of 80 feet. You can get approximately 25 lots on a cul-de-sac in the H-1 Zone. In a regular subdivision a cul-de-sac is only 400 feet with the most lots being ten. The Code needs to define what ADT a cul-de-sac can accommodate. If something happens to the access, how many ADT's are stopped from getting to a street? Residential units equal ten ADT with one trip out as a trip and one trip back as a trip. This is definition is widely accepted by traffic engineers. No more than 250 ADT would be allowed on a 1000-foot cul-de-sac. The issue is where the traffic comes into the City. City facilities at the end of the cul-de-sac would not count against the ADT.

Commission Discussion:

The consensus of the Commission is to move forward and make changes to the City Code to adopt an Average Daily Traffic maximum on cul-de-sacs. The only exemption would be for City facilities. David Bunker will draft the language.

8. Committee Assignments and Reports

No reports.

ADJOURNMENT

9. Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m. on a motion by C. Clement, seconded by C. Dodge and unanimously approved.

Approved by Commission:
March 25, 2010

/s/ Kim E. Holindrake
Kim E. Holindrake, City Recorder