



ROY CITY
Planning Commission Work-Session
July 26, 2022 – 6:00 p.m.
Community Development Conference
Room

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:

Ryan Cowley, Chair
Torriss Brand
Chris Collins
Jason Felt
Janel Hulbert
Jason Sphar
Daniel Tanner

Steve Parkinson, City Planner
Brody Flint, Assistant City Attorney

Excused: Commissioners Samantha Bills, and Claude Payne

Others in attendance: Kevin Homer

Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Tanner

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT

There were none.

2. CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10 ZONING REGULATIONS, AMENDING CH 13 - MIXED USES - 10-13-2 - USES - TABLE 2.1 (1); 10-13-3 - BUILDING TYPES - TABLE 3.1 (1) AND § 8) ROW BUILDINGS – TO ALLOW ROW BUILDINGS WITHIN THE DOWNTOWN GATEWAY ZONE ALONG SECONDARY STREETS.

City Planner Steve Parkinson presented, and recalled at the last meeting they had held a public hearing about amending Chapter 13, which would allow row buildings in the Downtown Gateway Zone. He said an email had been sent out that addressed concerns about the overall height remaining 35 feet rather than 40 feet, and he explained he had put the height limit at 40 feet because that was the limit for the rest of the building types in that area, but he noted the number could be changed. He commented the biggest discussion had been in regards to note number ten, which decided whether or not they should allow certain things on these streets or if they should be restrictive, and he discussed that the problems they had run into were with the parcels that had frontages on the side street. He opened the discussion for questions.

Commissioner Jason Felt said the overall consensus with regards to frontages was that there should be an overall clean look to the businesses downtown. City Planner Steve Parkinson replied the applicant had particular concerns about the specific street their business was on, and the Staff was having problems finding the right wording for the ordinance. Commissioner Daniel Tanner suggested implicating a setback requirement along certain roads in the ordinance. There was discussion about setback distances.

Commissioner Janel Hubert commented she had asked why they could not put mixed-use there after the last meeting, and said the answer had been that it was because of parking. She said

ideally, they wanted mixed-use in that area, and did not understand why that could not be the case.

Mr. Parkinson replied the issue was that with mixed use spaces, their current Code stated commercial should be on the main floor with residential above, and in this case, it would not really make sense to allow commercial on the main floor of a 50-foot right-of-way, hence the request to allow for row homes. He elaborated they were still in the quandary of how to allow for it. He said his thoughts aligned with Commissioner Tanners, in that they should allow for businesses with frontages only along certain roads, and put restrictions on the properties along 1966 and Riverdale Road to not allow them to come within a certain distance of the curbs along these streets. There was discussion about the map and access points.

Mr. Parkinson opined it made the most sense to say that structures could not be allowed within a certain number of feet, and it sounded to him as if the Commission had agreed on 300 feet.

Commissioner Felt stated they didn't want to limit commercial or encourage row housing.

Mr. Parkinson replied if Council liked the idea for side streets, then they would bring in the other two zones for discussion as well, because there was already a lot of residential. He added that farther down on 57 there were many fourplexes with single family homes across from them, and they had the same issue with the mortuary. He thought it did not make sense to require commercial, and he explained if they did the 300-foot limit the question would be whether or not they wanted to include 1950 and only exclude 6000, or exclude 1950 as well.

Commissioner Felt asked if 300 feet left enough space for commercial, because once row houses were built, they would lose that footage.

Commissioner Chris Collins clarified that the whole block would have to be commercial, and he thought that made sense.

Commissioner felt what they had drawn up looked like it kept with the spirit of what they wanted.

Mr. Parkinson agreed that it did if they pushed it to 300 feet.

Commissioner Janel Hubert asked what was behind CVS, and Mr. Parkinson replied there was an MMA weightlifting place, a daycare, a mortuary, a hair salon, and some residences.

Commissioner Collins stated they were commercial right now, and even if they decided to go single family, it was far enough back to where it would not affect anything going on 1900 West.

Mr. Steve Parkinson replied he did not think they would go back to single family.

Commissioner Jason Sphar said he did not want to incentivize single family in one of the few areas they had commercial.

Mr. Parkinson replied if they did not include 1950, it would get rid of the option for that area to be row homes only. Commissioner Janel Hubert said she would not want row homes where they already had businesses.

Mr. Parkinson said if they did not include 1950 in the definition, then they would have excluded it as an option for these parcels. He said the applicant was present and could answer any questions, and added if everyone was okay with the 300 feet restriction, it would allow the applicant to develop a portion of the land that he wanted, while restricting it enough so that other parcels did not become multi-family.

The applicant, Jaden, said they had tried to use that space for a multitude of different options, and they had not been able to get anything to fit that would be worth the cost of developing such a small portion of land. He said they would be losing money on this one, but that was okay because their incentive was to house some of their employees, which he said were mostly high school and college aged kids that needed a cheap place to live. He said if they lost the ground floor, they would have eight apartments, and he pointed out that would not make financial sense to do. He added their civil engineer had said that because of the way water drained to that site, they would have to install an underground retention system of some kind, which also took up some space for what they could do. He said all of these things had played into the site plan which had been submitted.

Assistant City Attorney Brody Flint clarified that as the Code was, they could put residential above a commercial building.

Mr. Parkinson clarified they had agreed to exclude 1950 and 6000, and said they had reached a hybrid of what had been previously discussed with the allowances with a little bit of restriction.

The Commission agreed the 300-foot limit was an appropriate footage restriction, and take out 1950 and 6000.

Mr. Parkinson said he would bring it to the next Council meeting for a vote.

3. TRAINING

Assistant City Attorney Brody Flint presented this item. He said the Planning Commission rules were online and that they had talked a lot about conflicts, but very rarely was it an issue. He said one thing he wanted to touch on briefly was decorum and why the rules mattered, and it was important to pause and remember there were rules for a reason.

Mr. Flint encouraged Commissioners to go through the rules even though they seemed redundant, it was important, especially with social media because people were a lot more vocal with their opinions online. He said there had not been any problems with this group, but it was still important to consider what was and was not appropriate to post online. He asked for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Flint said it was important to always remember what stage of the process they were in when they started to ask people questions. He said it was important to put oneself in the shoes of the applicant, and reminded the Commission to keep questions relevant to the applicants and their projects. He opened the floor for questions.

Commissioner Daniel Tanner commented that they could take the public input, but they did not work for the public.

Mr. Flint commented that the Planning Commission was an elected body, and was a recommending body for the City Council.

Commissioner Hubert said the Commission had to follow certain rules, and the Council had other rules.

Mr. Flint clarified the City Council was elected, and the Planning Commission was not.

Chairman Ryan Cowley said he felt like the Council did not understand the role that the Planning Commission played, and it felt disrespectful at times. He thought both bodies could educate each other to help better understand their roles. He felt disrespected sometimes by the way the Council reacted to some of the recommendations they made.

Mr. Flint asked if Council had work sessions like the Planning Commission did, and asked if it would be appropriate for Council to invite Commissioners to those work sessions.

Mr. Parkinson said they could try to do joint meetings, but it was hard to coordinate since everyone had busy schedules. He said they could schedule a joint meeting if it worked out for everyone.

Mr. Flint suggested Staff find a better way to relay information through Council packets or other mediums.

Mr. Parkinson commented there were two Councilmembers that consistently watched the Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Flint told the Commissioners to come up with ideas that could improve the flow of information between the two bodies.

Commissioner Hubert suggested making the language more understandable to the layperson, because there are concepts that are difficult to understand through the language of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Parkinson replied that the language he used in his presentations was directed at the Planning Commission, and not the public, so it would be difficult for him to modify the language.

Mr. Flint elaborated they had to say things in a certain way so that they got done properly. Commissioner Janel Hubert said she understood that, but thought the legalese and technical jargon was the reason for a lot of public misinformation.

Mr. Flint said if any of the Commissioners thought of anything, to send him an email and he would see what he could do to help relay information to the general public.

Mr. Parkinson told the Commissioners to write down any questions they had for the next training session so they could be addressed.

4. COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

Commissioner Torris Brand commented that the Farmhouse at Saccos was open and recommended the Commissioners stop by and check it out.

5. STAFF UPDATE

Mr. Parkinson said the two items on next week's agenda were the building height limits, and the tattoo and body piercing shop. He said the row buildings that had been discussed this evening would be discussed at the next Planning Commission meeting, and then he would take the issue to Council. He announced Holiday Oil was opening, and currently, only the entrance on 43 was accessible, due to some issues with UDOT. He said there had been a few pre-construction meetings, one for the townhomes on 43, and one for another project that was starting, the name of which he had forgotten. He then updated the Commission that the Rail Runner had submitted their second set of plans, and those were being reviewed. He lastly announced they had another project called the Royce, which was a 250-unit residential building with commercial on the bottom, and would be located south of the Harmons.

6. ADJOURN

Commissioner Brand moved to adjourn at 6:52 p.m. Commissioner Tanner seconded the motion. Commissioners Brand, Collins, Cowley, Felt, Hulbert, Sphar, and Tanner voted "aye," The motion carried.

Ryan Cowley
Chair