



ROY CITY
Planning Commission Regular meeting
April 11, 2023 – 6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers/Courtroom
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:

Ryan Cowley, Chair
Torriss Brand
Jason Felt
Claude Payne
Jason Sphar
Daniel Tanner

Steve Parkinson, City Planner
Matt Wilson, City Attorney

Excused: Commissioners Samantha Bills, Chris Collins and Janel Hulbert

Others in attendance: Glenda Moore, Gregg Sorensen and Steve Huntsman

Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Tanner

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT

There were none.

2. TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW APPROVAL FOR NCS PROPERTIES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 6051 SOUTH 1900 WEST

Gregg Sorensen identified himself as the father of applicant Nick Sorensen and explained “NCS” stood for Nick and his wife, Courtney Sorensen. Steve Huntsman indicated he was the representative and partner of the applicant and said he was available to answer any questions to try and get the project approved. He expressed they wanted to do this in the way that the City wanted, and they appreciated the City’s help. Mr. Huntsman shared some photographs of the site plan, and indicated they planned to repaint the whole structure as well as change some of the materials. He shared some of the other changes they planned to make, and said the overall goal was to make the building look nice and presentable. Mr. Huntsman expressed they would continue to rent out the units, and added one of their tenants would be Pest Control. Commissioner Tanner clarified some of the technical specs of the storage space. Mr. Huntsman reiterated they would be willing to do whatever the City thought was best, as long as it was within their budget. The Commissioners expressed appreciation for the applicant’s willingness to work with them.

City Planner Steve Parkinson presented, and gave a succinct overview of the request. He explained the reason it had come before the Planning Commission is because the use would change, and go from retail and repair to service, with the addition of Pest Control. He noted he would have to look into renting out of the bays, and acknowledged in the past service uses had been allowed. He expressed he would have to do more research to make sure they would be in compliance.

Mr. Parkinson also gave an overview of the site, and identified some key points of the surrounding landscaping rules. He also said that because it was a change of use, they would need a letter from UDOT, and their approval may impact some of the landscaping plans.

Mr. Parkinson clarified any changes made by UDOT should be minor, and not significantly change the site plan. He said for this reason, Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Parkinson noted as well their Code allowed for a wide range of materials to be used, and so the applicants would be in compliance with their plans for changing materials on the exterior of the building as well as their plans to re-paint the facade. He summarized Staff recommended approval of the architectural changes.

Mr. Parkinson clarified this was only the approval of the Planning Staff, and emphasized Fire and other departments needed to approve the plans as well. He noted Fire had some additional requirements as far as storm drains were concerned, but they were only concerned with Planning at the current point.

Mr. Parkinson said they were only looking at the landscaping and the architecture at this point, rather than the uses in response to a question from the applicant about being legal non-conforming.

Mr. Parkinson reiterated he needed to investigate the whole issue further.

Commissioner Tanner thought they needed to reconfigure the parking lot.

Mr. Huntsman pointed out even if UDOT closed the southern parking lot, there was another one to the north of the property which could still be used.

Commissioner Payne moved to approve the Site Plan for NCS Properties with the conditions as stated in the staff report. Commissioner Tanner seconded the motion. Commissioners Brand, Cowley, Felt, Payne, Sphar and Tanner voted “aye.” The motion carried.

Commissioner Sphar moved to approve the Architectural review for NCS Properties with the conditions as stated in the staff report. Commissioner Felt seconded the motion. Commissioners Brand, Cowley, Felt, Payne, Sphar and Tanner voted “aye.” The motion carried.

3. DISCUSSION ON ALLOWING PARKING WITHIN THE FRONT YARD DURING THE WINTER MONTHS

Mr. Parkinson presented this item and gave a brief background. He explained in February of that year, the City Council had held a meeting in regard to amending Title Six and allowing parking trailers on the street, which had led to a discussion of parking cars in the front yard. He recalled the conclusion of the Council meeting had been to allow trailers to be parked for 72 hours and clarified the Planning Commission had not been involved with that decision; however, they would be involved with the decision to allow parking on the front lawn in winter months.

Mr. Parkinson said several options had been presented, including allowing cars for up to 72 hours, all the time, or all the time except in the event of snowfall.

Mr. Parkinson clarified no decision would be made that evening; this was simply a chance for the Commissioners to discuss the issue so he could begin drafting a document. He indicated he had identified some parts of their Code which pertained to the issue, including Chapter 19, which was their parking ordinance. He invited the Commissioners to give their thoughts.

Commissioner Tanner did not think there was any validity to this, and recommended they take no action. He thought during the winter months, people needed to find the best solution, which he did not think was parking on the grass. He worried if they allowed parking on the grass in the winter, people would do it in the summer as well. He did not think they should make a change in the ordinance for a minute number of people who wanted to park on the lawn.

Commissioner Payne wondered why this issue had come up, and asked if it was because the previous winter had been so bad.

Commissioner Spahr agreed, and said over the last several years, snowfall had not been so bad that people had been unable to park on the street.

Mr. Parkinson clarified that the front lawn was not people's legal parking spaces, and explained driveways were viewed as an accessory or additional parking pad, with garages being the designated place to park cars.

Commissioner Felt thought this was an issue of too many cars, and said people needed to get storage units if they needed additional storage space, rather than using their garages as storage units and then parking their cars outside. He thought garages were intended to be used for cars, and it should be kept to that. He reiterated he was not in favor of this proposal.

Commissioner Brand asked who the proponent is for this?

Mr. Parkinson indicated the ad hoc committee were the ones in favor of this proposal.

Glenda Moore, citizen – after posting the Agenda on Facebook, received a comment that many are already parking in the Front Yard, and it looks really “crappy”. After parking in Front Yards for even just one day can ruin your yard. At least two of the people in the ad hoc meeting had multiple vehicles, and one had received a citation in the past about parking on their lawn.

Commissioner Spahr expressed he like the idea of a permit or something that expired, but he also agreed with the other Commissioners and voiced was not in favor of allowing people to park on front lawns; however, he did not think someone parking on their lawn for just a couple hours during a snowstorm should be an issue. He did not think any changes needed to be made.

Mr. Parkinson asked for directions. The Commissioners determined they did not think any changes needed to be made and said there were ample opportunities within the existing ordinance to create more space around one's property to park cars.

Commissioner Spahr asked for some clarification on the ordinance in regard to the 72-hour parking for trailers.

Mr. Parkinson gave some history on that ordinance and noted many years ago they had allowed for temporary trailer parking, but at some point, this had been changed and they were now reinstating the rule to permit people to temporarily park their trailers in the street.

4. COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

Chairman Cowley did not have any announcements.

5. STAFF UPDATE

Mr. Parkinson said they were at the tail end of the Station Area Plan, and indicated there would be a joint work session coming up to discuss those plans. He said there was a deadline to get those plans approved by June, and he anticipated it would come before the Planning Commission at their next meeting in May. He commented that the plans were about density in regard to the Front Runner Station, and he briefly discussed the State had not thought their 2017 plan was up to date to their standards, which was the reason the plans needed to be looked at again.

6. ADJOURN

Commissioner Tanner moved to adjourn at 6:36 p.m. Commissioner Payne seconded the motion. Commissioners Brand, Cowley, Felt, Payne, Spahr and Tanner voted “aye”, The motion carried.

Ryan Cowley
Chair