



ROY CITY
Planning Commission Work-Session
July 23, 2019 – 6:00 p.m.
Community Development Conference Room
5051 South 1900 West

The meeting was a regularly scheduled work-session designated by resolution. Notice of the meeting was provided to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours in advance. A copy of the agenda was posted.

The following members were in attendance:

Torris Brand, Chair
Don Ashby
Samantha Bills
Chris Collins
Ryan Cowley
Leland Karras
Annette Mifflin
Claude Payne

Steve Parkinson, City Planner

Excused: Commissioner Jason Sphar, and Assistant City Attorney, Brody Flint

Others in attendance: Glenda Moore, Braeden Stander

Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Karras

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT

There were none.

2. APPROVAL OF JUNE 25, 2018, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Collins moved to APPROVE the June 25, 2018 Work Session meeting minutes, as amended. Commissioner Karras seconded the motion. Commissioners Ashby, Bills, Brand, Cowley, Collins, Karras, Mifflin, and Payne voted “aye”. The motion carried.

3. DISCUSSION ON SCREENING REQUIREMENTS

Steve Parkinson, City Planner, explained that there had been some question about the fencing requirements that exist in the City Code. He provided the Planning Commission with all of the code language regarding fencing and screening. The current ordinance allows for six-foot fences, but doesn't require or allow exceptions for taller fencing. Allowed fencing materials include rock, cinderblock, masonry, vinyl, chain link with slats, and chain link. Even a hedge can be considered a fence. The code does not require specific fencing between commercial and residential properties. There were some inconsistencies and contradictions between the various sections on fencing.

Mr. Parkinson then presented the fencing requirements for Clinton, Ogden, and Layton. Each had different methods for determining fencing between uses. He asked the Commissioners to examine these codes and see if there was anything in them that should be included in Roy's City Code.

It was commented that an eight-foot fence could be appropriate in some situations, such as property lines between commercial and residential uses. The code should allow some flexibility. They also felt that the code should account for grade differences between properties. Mr. Parkinson noted that according to the Building Code, anything over six feet requires a building permit, so fences over six feet would require some engineering and other extra cost.

Mr. Parkinson encouraged the Commissioners to observe fencing in Roy and other cities, and to take pictures of things that they liked. They would discuss this again at the next Planning Commission meeting.

There was a brief discussion regarding required landscaping, specifically trees.

4. DISCUSSION ON PLANNING COMMISSION'S POWERS AND DUTIES

Mr. Parkinson presented information regarding the duties and powers of the Planning Commission and stated that there were four duties mandated by State Statute. There was no way for them to change those duties. He then presented the other duties listed in the City Code, and these items could be altered. Some cities still have their Planning Commission take care of site plans, subdivision plats, and conditional use permits, but some cities have given that responsibility to staff. Having staff take over these duties would streamline the process, but it would mean that only one set of eyes was looking at the application. He asked the Planning Commission if they wanted to see any changes.

Chair Brand was concerned that the residents wouldn't have an opportunity to provide input if they eliminated the public hearing before the Planning Commission. Mr. Parkinson said that staff held a DRC meeting for each application, and that could be open to the public. The Development Review Committee included a representative from Engineering, Police, Fire, Building, Planning, and Public Works. From the developer's point of view, it was much easier to just meet with the DRC because the DRC met once a week, whereas the Planning Commission met once a month.

The Commission asked if they could require staff approval for areas in the form-based code, and Planning Commission approval for the rest of the City. Mr. Parkinson wasn't aware of another City that separated responsibilities in this way, but they could look into it.

Chair Brand hadn't found any of the Planning Commission meetings to be onerous to developers. He didn't think that they should change the laws unless they had a compelling reason to do so. He thought the current duties and responsibilities worked well.

Mr. Parkinson encouraged the Planning Commission to examine the current code and think about the options. They would discuss this again at the next meeting.

5. DISCUSSION ON STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Parkinson reported that he attended a brown bag luncheon with other City Planners, and it was mentioned how mundane staff reports can be. They were encouraged to think outside the box when it comes to staff reports. He asked the Planning Commission if they wanted to see anything different in the staff reports. The current template was passed down from previous City Planners, and he hadn't made any changes to it.

The Commissioners expressed a desire to have more explanation from the applicants about their applications. Some applicants gave a detailed description of their projects, and some deferred to Mr. Parkinson. Commissioner Bills suggested that they give the applicants some guided questions to help with their presentation if they didn't know what to say.

6. COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

7. STAFF UPDATE

Mr. Parkinson reported on the progress of a few developments in the City.

8. ADJOURN

Commissioner Mifflin moved to adjourn at 7:08 p.m. Commissioner Cowley seconded the motion. Commissioners Ashby, Bills, Brand, Cowley, Collins, Karras, Mifflin, and Payne voted "aye." The motion carried.

Torris Brand
Chair

Attest:

Morgan Langholf
City Recorder

dc: 07-23-18