



ROY CITY
Planning Commission Work-Session
June 27, 2023 – 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:

Ryan Cowley, Chair
Samantha Bills
Torriss Brand
Jason Felt
Janel Hulbert
Claude Payne
Jason Sphar
Daniel Tanner

Steve Parkinson, City Planner

Excused: Commissioner Chris Collins and Matt Wilson, City Attorney

Others in attendance: Paul Wilson

Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Bills

1. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 23, 2023 WORK-SESSION MINUTES

Chairman Ryan Cowley stated that on line 34 of the May 23rd minutes, the word 'neither' needed to be changed to 'either.'

Commissioner Tanner moved to approve the May 23, 2023, work-session meeting minutes with the correction mentioned. Commissioner Hulbert seconded the motion. Commissioners Bills, Brand, Cowley, Felt, Hulbert, Payne, Sphar and Tanner voted "aye." The motion carried.

2. CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10 ZONING REGULATIONS, AMENDING CH 13 - MIXED USES - 10-13-2 – USES - § 2) DEFINITION OF USES – TO ALLOW STORAGE STRUCTURES AS AN ACCESSORY USE.

Mr. Parkinson presented this item for discussion, and noted it was a continued conversation from the previous meeting, where they had regarded storage structures as their own building types. However, since then, Mr. Parkinson and Mr. Wilson had decided it would be better to categorize storage structures as accessory use, since it was an existing category in the Code. To that end, he explained he and Mr. Wilson had changed the language somewhat in the Code and said they would functionally be considered similar to a parking structure. He specified as well the change in language as to what defined a storage structure.

Mr. Parkinson outlined some of the specifications of storage structure as an accessory use, which included that setback needed to be a certain distance from the main structure and minimum side and rear setbacks had to be at least ten feet. He added storage structures could be no more than 25 feet tall and had to be similar colors and textures to the primary building as well.

Mr. Parkinson discussed details of the facade and went more in depth about what kind of materials could be used on the structures, and noted minimum transparency was 15%.

Mr. Parkinson explained storage structures would only be allowed in the Gateway zone, and indicated on a map where that region was located. He specified they would not be allowed on 1900, and in general storage structures would only be permitted on secondary roads. He went over a map of the City and discussed some exceptions and areas in which storage structures would not be allowed. He showed some commercial properties from an aerial view and indicated where their storage structures would be permitted to be placed, and expressed the intent was for storage structures to be in the back of the building whenever possible.

Mr. Parkinson highlighted the south area of Roy City and noted that commercial properties which faced 200 would not be allowed to have storage structures, since the setback from the road to the businesses was not deep enough.

Mr. Parkinson summarized the intent of his presentation that day was to give the Commissioners something to consider, and clarified they did not need to make any final decisions that evening. He asked the Commissioners what they thought, and he shared his own opinion that back-of-curb was the most reasonable thing but acknowledged that was not always possible. He also thought permitting structures to be 75 feet from the back of the structure rather than from the curb made more sense.

Commissioner Spahr thought they needed to be careful to not cater to a small number of properties. He felt back-of-curb was hard for him to agree with, since their intent was to put things towards the road, and he thought it made more sense to base it off the building rather than the curb.

Commissioner Payne agreed they could do back of structure rather than the curb, but they would need to find the happy medium as to what the minimum distance was. He noted it was difficult since all parcels were laid out in different ways, and in some cases 50 feet might be too much.

Mr. Parkinson pointed out they needed to consider that some old buildings might get torn down in the future as well, which would impact what the setbacks were for the surrounding buildings.

Commissioner Hulbert clarified they did not have to consider parking, since there were still parking guidelines in the Code that any commercial property would be subject to.

Mr. Parkinson confirmed that was correct, and clarified a business would have to have space for both their minimum mandatory parking spaces as well as room for a storage structure in order to build one.

Mr. Parkinson reiterated some buildings might get demolished or rebuilt in a way that would impact the setback distance of storage structures. He said the setback from main buildings did not have to be 50; they could go with 25 feet or whatever else they thought was appropriate.

Commissioner Hulbert wondered which option gave businesses more of an opportunity to be creative with the storage structures.

Chairman Cowley clarified the intent of the structures was storage of the business's own goods.

There was a brief discussion in which it was clarified what kinds of businesses and properties were allowed to build a storage structure, as long as they had the room for one.

Commissioner Hulbert summarized it primarily was stores and service businesses which would be permitted to have structures.

Mr. Parkinson stated it was less important what the use of the building was; the main thing was the way the storage structure interacted with the overall aesthetic of the property and the street.

Commissioner Payne thought 50 feet was the most reasonable thing to do.

Commissioner Hulbert thought they should try to accommodate the growth of businesses as best as possible.

Commissioner Spahr expressed he was okay with going down to 25 feet, as long as it was from the back of the property.

Mr. Parkinson noted in most cases, buildings built new would accommodate space for storage structures, and so whatever standard the Commission set would primarily impact businesses who had to retrofit a storage structure on their property.

Chairman Cowley pointed out new buildings could also just be built in a way which had more storage space inside the main building.

Chairman Cowley wondered if it was worth it to sacrifice potential future commercial space for the sake of adding these storage structures. Commissioner Payne thought they should vote on it.

Commissioner Tanner pointed out they were creating policies which attracted certain kinds of businesses and said in the areas in which old buildings were demolished he would rather build new commercial areas instead of building storage spaces for existing businesses.

Mr. Parkinson pointed out they were not necessarily zoned to add more commercial buildings in some of the areas they were considering allowing storage structures.

Commissioners Hulbert and Payne expressed they were in favor of 25 rather than 50 feet behind the primary structure.

Commissioner Tanner clarified they could pick any number they wanted; it did not have to be 25 or 50.

Commissioner Hulbert said she liked 25 feet since she thought it gave businesses more options.

Chairman Cowley said he was not worried about the properties that were already there since he thought they could be accommodated, but he did want to incentivize future businesses to come in that were more future-thinking and would be able to grow bigger. Chairman Cowley stated he was more in favor of 50 feet, and Commissioner Tanner agreed with this.

Commissioner Hulbert pointed out with building costs, some people might not be able to purchase larger buildings and properties, and if they could only afford a smaller property then they would not necessarily have space to add a storage structure as well if the minimum was 50 feet.

Chairman Cowley replied there were other places they could store things; storage units did not have to be on the actual commercial property and things could be kept in storage units that were not on-site.

Commissioner Hulbert acknowledged this point, although still felt 25 feet would be fairer to all businesses. She also pointed out if the minimum was 25, property owners could still choose to put the structure 50 feet away from their primary building as well and voiced the opinion 25 feet just gave people more prerogative over their properties.

Commissioner Hulbert spoke about window requirements as well and clarified 15% was just the minimum requirement for windows and they could have more.

Mr. Parkinson clarified the front of the structure was considered to be whichever facade faced the street and said he would work on the language to make that point clear.

The Commissioners briefly discussed they did not think there needed to be strict guidelines on facade requirements for the sides which did not face the street.

Mr. Parkinson summarized that two of the Commissioners were in favor of 25 feet, and two others preferred making it 50 feet. He said while it was not a unanimous decision, it still gave him some direction.

3. DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10 ZONING REGULATIONS, AMENDING CH 9 – PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS, AS PER HB 43 (2023)

Mr. Parkinson summarized this was a state statute, so the Commissioners would not be able to make any changes to this change. He commented the bill was somewhat confusing, since it eliminated the need to post public notices in some places but had added some places as well. Mr. Parkinson specified public notices were no longer required to be in the newspaper, although they could choose to continue to put notices in the newspaper if they wanted to.

Mr. Parkinson said for meetings about the General Plan and General Plan amendments they would eliminate newspaper notices. Mr. Parkinson explained since notices needed to be in three places, those three places would now be the public website, the City Municipal building, and the City official website. He said they would also send notices to all affected entities as well as the applicant.

Mr. Parkinson said for meetings such as this one, where they did not come to any decisions in the meeting, they would just have to be noticed in three places as well. He said for meetings about zoning ordinances, they would be noticed in three places and also emailed to all adjacent cities. He further stated zoning ordinances now needed to be sent out to all affected entities and expressed that would be difficult to realistically do in areas that had a lot of residences. Mr. Parkinson discussed he had spoken with the City Attorney about this and had been told they would be able to identify specific affected areas within a zone and would only need to notify people

within that specific area. He lastly noted there was not a section which addressed re-zones, so he had chosen to keep their exciting practice of mailing notices to people within 300 feet.

Mr. Parkinson said Mr. Wilson had already gone through this document, and said he still had some grammatical issues to work through. He explained this would not go before the City Council for some time; the intent of the presentation was just to bring it to the Commissioner's attention.

4. COMMISSIONERS MINUTE

The Commissioners had nothing to report. They held a brief discussion about a recent internet outage in their area. They also expressed appreciation for Commissioner Payne and his long service to the Commission, as well as his upcoming retirement.

Mr. Parkinson noted once Commissioner Payne stepped down, they would need one more alternate Commissioner. He said he had received one application so far and told the Commissioners if they knew of anyone to have them turn in an application.

5. STAFF UPDATE

Mr. Parkinson did not have any updates, and asked if there were any questions about ongoing projects. One of the Commissioners noted there was a portion of Airport Road near the roundabout which was torn up and the road was closed, and asked if that was part of Riverdale or Roy. It was discussed that it was part of Riverdale, and the Commissioners noted it had been closed for some time.

Commissioner Bills asked if the project on 4000 and 1900 was being done by the City or UDOT, to which Mr. Parkinson replied it was being done by UDOT. The Commissioners quickly discussed this project and debated what the best option for that intersection was.

6. ADJOURN

Commissioner Sphar moved to adjourn at 6:53 p.m. Commissioner Payne seconded the motion. Commissioners Bills, Brand, Cowley, Felt, Hulbert, Payne, Sphar and Tanner voted "aye." The motion carried.

Ryan Cowley
Chair