



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

10 East Center Street, North Salt Lake, Utah 84054
(801) 335-8700
(801) 335-8719 Fax

NORTH SALT LAKE PLANNING COMMISSION NOTICE & AGENDA February 25, 2020 6:30 p.m.

Notice is given of a public meeting of the North Salt Lake Planning Commission to be held on the above noted date and time in the North Salt Lake City Council chambers located at 10 East Center Street. The agenda will be as follows:

Welcome, Pledge, and Introduction

- 1) Public comments
- 2) Work Session - Review Draft Form Based Code
- 3) Report on City Council actions on items recommended by Planning Commission
- 4) Approval of minutes:
 - a. February 11, 2020

Adjourn

The public is invited to attend all Planning Commission meetings. If you need special accommodations to participate in the Planning Commission meeting, please call the City offices at (801) 335-8700. Please provide at least 24 hours notice for adequate arrangements to be made. Times noted on the agenda are estimates only – the Commission may proceed faster or slower than these estimates indicate.

Notice of Posting:

I, the duly appointed recorder for the City of North Salt Lake, hereby certify that the foregoing agenda was posted on the Utah Public Notice website, at city hall, and sent to the required newspapers this 20th day of Feb., 2020.

Dated this 20th day of Feb., 2020.

Linda Horrocks



1 CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
2 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
3 FEBRUARY 16, 2020

4
5 **DRAFT**
6

7 Commission Chair Ted Knowlton called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and Kent Kirkham led
8 those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.
9

10 PRESENT: Commission Chair Ted Knowlton
11 Commissioner Stephen Garn
12 Commissioner Kent Kirkham
13 Commissioner William Ward
14 Commissioner BreAnna Larson
15 Commissioner Alisa Van Langeveld
16

17 EXCUSED: Commissioner Brandon Tucker
18

19 STAFF PRESENT: Sherrie Llewelyn, Community Development Director; Kate Werrett,
20 Planner; Andrea Bradford, Minutes Secretary.
21

22 OTHERS PRESENT: Dee Lalliss, resident.
23

24 1. PUBLIC COMMENTS
25

26 There were no public comments.
27

28 2. CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED SUBDIVISION TITLE AMENDMENTS
29

30 Chair Knowlton asked for the major reasons behind why the City revised Title 13 Subdivision
31 Regulations. Sherrie Llewelyn replied the major reasons included that the current regulations
32 were not in compliance with State Code in some areas, the current regulations for subdivisions
33 were not all in one area of the code, to make the processes easier and more understandable, and
34 the directive from the moratorium to make better defined PUD standards related to setbacks, etc.
35

36 Sherrie Llewelyn then reviewed each chapter of Title 13 with a brief overview of each chapter.
37 Chapter 1 included purpose, definitions, and method for appeals. Chapter 2 included
38 administration and applications with information on certificate of occupancy and Chapter 3
39 included the conceptual plan process including vesting. She explained that in the current code the
40 concept plan was to be reviewed by the parks, trails, arts and recreation advisory board and asked
41 the Commission if they would like to keep this practice and implement it.
42

43 Commissioner Kirkham asked what would be the easiest process for the City. Sherrie Llewelyn
44 replied that if there was a concept plan with parks space that it be referred to the Parks and Arts
45 Board for review and comment before preliminary plan review. This way only the larger
46 developments with park/open space and trails would be reviewed by the Board. She suggested
47 the wording be changed to “The Planning Commission may refer the concept plan to the Parks
48 and Arts Board if trails and parks are included in the concept plan.”

49
50 Commissioner Ward asked about instances where a park/open space or trail was not proposed
51 but the Parks and Arts board had insight such as a future trail connection. Sherrie Llewelyn
52 replied that staff should know of future plans including the Public Works Director, David
53 Frandsen, who attended both the Parks and Arts Board and the Development Review Committee
54 (DRC) meetings.

55
56 Commissioner Garn asked about the process and if it would take more time if the Planning
57 Commission reviewed a concept plan, the Parks and Arts Board reviewed the plan and then the
58 comments came back to the Commission. Sherrie Llewelyn clarified that the Commission would
59 make recommendations to the City Council with a recommendation that the Parks and Arts
60 Board review the concept plan. The City Council would then receive comments on the concept
61 plan from both the Commission and the Board at the same time.

62
63 Commissioner Kirkham commented that the City was on the right path. Commissioner Van
64 Langeveld said that based on her experience with the Parks and Arts Board that this type of
65 review would help to ensure that the parks met the needs of residents such as a dog park, types of
66 trails, etc.

67
68 Sherrie Llewelyn said that another change to Title 13 included clarifying when the concept and
69 preliminary plans expired. Chapter 4 addressed minor subdivisions and a shortened review
70 process and Chapter 5 focused on major subdivisions including changes to preliminary design
71 plan, the process through to final plat approval, and assigning an address to corner lots based on
72 which direction the home is most likely to front. Chapter 5 also included updates to detention
73 basins, approval of the final plat, and warranty bonds. Chapter 6 included requirements for
74 planned unit developments as well as recreational vehicle and mobile home developments. The
75 main changes to the PUD section included density calculations and setbacks. She said the City
76 Council recommended changing the perimeter setback to 25 feet if the home had more than two
77 stories against the property line to help preserve privacy. Mrs. Llewelyn explained that staff
78 visited many North Salt Lake townhome developments built in the last several years, took
79 measurements of all the spaces, and determined setbacks based off those observations and
80 measurements. She also said the form based code would apply in the town center area while
81 these proposed amendments would apply to other PUDs.

82
83 The Commission then discussed minimum and maximum setbacks and Planned (P) Districts
84 related to the proposed ordinance changes.

85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked if the proposed distances would have met the needs of the recent developments that had resident pushback. Commissioner Kirkham felt that the proposed setbacks would have helped but some residents would have disapproved of the development regardless. Chair Knowlton clarified that if the proposed setbacks were applied to every development over the last few years that he would not have been comfortable with the distances such as in the town center area.

Sherrie Llewelyn said that these PUD ordinance changes would be applied to R1-10 to RM-7 zones, etc. Commissioner Ward said the developments that were controversial were P Districts with everything to be negotiated.

Sherrie Llewelyn then reported that another change to the code for a PUD included specifying the standards for establishing an HOA. This would establish a policy for developers to setup the care and funding of an HOA for the first several years of operation including a reserve fund established through a percentage of the closing costs. She said the condominium and mobile home sections were updated to comply with the fair housing act.

Chapter 7 included plat amendments and lot line adjustments. Under the current code plat amendments require a public hearing even though subdivisions do not require public hearings. The amendment would align with State Code and would only require a public hearing for a plat amendment if a public street or trail was vacated.

Sherrie Llewelyn gave the example of a development in which a developer platted 18 units as one lot under a plat amendment. The developer only paid \$500 for staff to review all those units. Changes were made to ensure that a plat amendment was clarified as the rearranging of lot lines and not the creation of a new lot. This would ensure developers were paying their costs and the City was not overburdened.

Chapter 8 included general requirements such as the layout, design, lots, streets, landscaping, etc. One addition to the subdivision ordinance now specifies that each lot would need a buildable area of 5,000 square feet with less than 30% slope.

Chair Knowlton asked how much vacant land was still available for subdivision. Sherrie Llewelyn replied The Cove, several parcels along Redwood Road, and any annexed land.

Chair Knowlton then commented on block length and said the requirements were too loose with a minimum of 400 feet and a maximum of 1,000 feet. He said this may not matter unless there was an annexation but suggested a change to section **13-8-030: Blocks A. Block Length** to read: “Generally blocks shall be a minimum of three hundred feet (300’) with maximum length of seven hundred feet (700’). In blocks over six hundred feet (600’) in length, a dedicated walkway through the block, at approximately the center of the block is required where feasible.”

127 The Commission discussed street widths (public and private) and lot sizes including right of
128 way, alleys and private streets. A comparison was done to existing street widths in areas such as
129 Foxboro and the current code requirements. They determined not to make any changes to the
130 street and right of way widths at this time.

131
132 Other changes in Chapter 8 included not permitting street names to contain a cardinal direction,
133 limiting streets to a maximum grade of 10%, etc.

134
135 Commissioner Van Langeveld asked about the procedure of street naming and if there was a way
136 to encourage developers to name the streets after important people or things from City history.

137
138 Sherrie Llewelyn said that Chapter 9 was related to essential improvements such as design
139 standards, required improvements, curb, gutter, sidewalks, storm drainage, fencing, etc.

140
141 **Commissioner Garn moved that the Planning Commission recommend for approval the**
142 **proposed amendments to the Subdivision regulations and residential zones with the**
143 **following findings:**

- 144
145 **1) The proposed amendment is in accord with the comprehensive general plan, goals**
146 **and policies of the City.**
147 **2) Changed or changing conditions make the proposed amendment reasonably**
148 **necessary to carry out the “purposes” stated in this title.**

149
150 **Commissioner Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by**
151 **Commissioners Knowlton, Kirkham, Garn, Ward, Tucker, Larson and Van Langeveld.**
152 **Commissioner Tucker was excused.**

153
154 **3. DISCUSSION OF FORM BASED CODE AND SCHEDULE OF REVIEW**

155
156 Sherrie Llewelyn asked if the Planning Commission would prefer to review the draft of the form
157 based code once more or if a joint work session should be scheduled with the City Council. The
158 Planning Commission determined to review the form based code again at their February 25th
159 meeting and to tentatively schedule a joint work session on March 10th.

160
161 **4. REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON ITEMS RECOMMENDED BY**
162 **PLANNING COMMISSION**

163
164 Sherrie Llewelyn reported that the City Council adopted the changes recommended by the
165 Planning Commission to the residential zones ordinance. She said next week she would present
166 the subdivision amendments to the Council, the Village Station site plan, the consideration of a
167 vacation of Orchard Drive, a beer license for Maverik, and an amendment to Title 4 related to the
168 noise ordinance and delivery unloading/loading times.

169 Sherrie Llewelyn also said that she had received confirmation from Maverik that they would be
170 closing the Maverik gas station located adjacent to the new Maverik location at 24 North
171 Redwood and potentially selling that property.

172

173 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

174

175 The Planning Commission meeting minutes of January 28, 2020 were reviewed and approved.
176 **Commissioner Larson moved that the Planning Commission approve the meeting minutes**
177 **from January 28, 2020 as amended. Commissioner Van Langeveld seconded the motion.**
178 **The motion was approved by Commissioners Knowlton, Kirkham, Garn, Ward, Tucker,**
179 **Larson and Van Langeveld. Commissioner Tucker was excused.**

180

181 6. ADJOURN

182

183 Chair Knowlton adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

184

185

186

187

188

Chair

189

190

191

192

193

Secretary

Recorder