



## SMITHFIELD CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES November 20, 2019

The Planning Commission of Smithfield City met in the City Council Chambers  
96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 20, 2019

The following members were present constituting a quorum:

Chairman: Andrew Soelberg  
Members Present: Kelly Luthi  
Jackie Hancock  
Jasilyn Heaps  
Hutch Daniels  
Casey McCammon

Members Excused: Scott Gibbons  
Nathan Wright  
Greg Gardner

City Planner: Shari Phippen  
City Councilmember: Curtis Wall  
Mayor: Jeff Barnes

Attendance: Jeff Jackson, Bryce Goodin, David Lillywhite, Jon Wells, Deon Hunsaker, Louise Karren, Chris Brady, Katie Bell, Chealsey Wiggins, Jay & Sally Karren, Gilbert Smith, Gavin Crossley, Lori Keller, Bennett Keller, Judy Larsen, Alisa Staley, Jake Williams, Debbie Zilles

**6:30 p.m.** Meeting called to order by Chairman Soelberg. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Gavin Crossley.

Mayor Barnes presented challenge coins to two scouts who were in attendance and encouraged them to continue working toward their Eagle Scout.

### **Consideration of consent agenda and approval of meeting minutes:**

After consideration by the Commission, Chairman Soelberg declared the meeting agenda and the minutes from the October 16, 2019 meeting to stand as submitted.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

David Lillywhite stated that there is a great need for affordable housing. He would like to see incentives given to builders and/or developers to build less expensive housing options. There are some properties that may be too small for a regular single-family home to be built with the required setbacks, but might be suitable for a tiny home. He also suggested allowing tiny homes on lots that have a single-family home to provide more affordable rental options.

### **AGENDA ITEMS:**

**PUBLIC HEARING** to receive comment concerning Ordinance 19-15 establishing a Master Planned Community Zone and establishing the regulations therein.

### 6:40 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Deon Hunsaker had the following questions/concerns:

- Clarify the definition of “...*well-defined development theme*...”.
- “*Land with slopes in excess of 30% shall be considered undevelopable and shall not be counted into the gross acreage when calculating base density*” – is this allowed to be used toward the density bonus?
- Dwelling, Two-Family is defined as “...*having only two (2) dwelling units under one ownership*”, he questioned whether the definition of Multi-Family should be two (2) or more rather than the listed “*three (3) or more*” such as in the case of a duplex where both units are rented/owned separately.
- Can a group of developers submit a site plan detailing the intent for the parcel (example: one developer to do single-family development, another might do a 55+ section and another might be interested in doing the multi-family portion).
- He would like to see a 55+ development added under 17.81.050.C Housing Types.
- A development which includes townhomes, 55+ housing and traditional single-family homes should be allowed an added density bonus.
- Concern with parking – many developments, especially multi-family housing, do not have sufficient parking.
- Clarify item 3 in Section Q. Parking that reads “...*no group of required off-street parking shall load or unload directly from, or to, a public right-of-way*”.
- 17.81.110.D.11 “...*set aside for storm water retention or detention, which shall be the responsibility of the MPC*” – does this require an HOA to be established?

Bryce Goodin comments:

- Requiring 60% of the housing to be single-family detached will make it difficult, if not impossible, to achieve the maximum density. Reducing that ratio will help.
- Clarification on minimum lot size for single-family detached homes.
- The required lot width of 16’ for single-family attached is measured from where and what is considered the lot? Usually the foundation walls are considered the lot.
- 17.81.050.Q.1 “...*in addition to any garage parking*” – if a townhome has a 2-car garage and a driveway that can park two additional vehicles, would that count toward the parking requirement? If not, what is the incentive to build a townhome with a garage?
- With these requirements, a 3-bedroom apartment in multi-family would require four (4) parking stalls which seems excessive.
- Lowering the ratio of 60% single-family detached will increase open space.
- 17.81.070.C “*Private right-of-ways shall be constructed to not less than a 50’ total width*” - would this include alleyways?
- The 30% maximum bonus density for off-site infrastructure improvements, if 20% of development costs are paid, then a developer would only get a 16% bonus.

Jeff Jackson comments:

- Agrees with the concern about the requirement for 60% single-family detached housing; it seems to miss the mark. Example based on a 10-acre parcel: 2 acres used for road leaves 8 acres. 8 acres x 6 units = 48 net units on project. 48 x 1.5 (max density) = 72 units. Based on current requirements, 43 of those units would be required to be single-family detached, which are required to be 55 SF lots, would utilize 5.5 acres of the total 8; of which .5 must be open space which leaves 2 acres to put 29 units on. 2 acres divided by 29 = 15 units/acre and townhomes can only be developed at 12 units/acre (which is tight). This does not seem like what this zone is being created for. The ratio of 60% single-family detached will make this zone unusable.
- Parking credit should be given for garage/driveway space.
- Need clarification on lot sizes. Typically, multi-family complexes have one owner, requiring multi-family to be spread out over the project site will be very difficult and will decrease open space.
- This is a good starting point, however, there needs to be further consideration given for some of the elements proposed.

### 6:57p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Discussion and consideration of Ordinance 19-15: An ordinance establishing a Master Planned Community Zone and establishing the regulations therein.

Chairman Soelberg asked that notes from the comments, and any other concerns anyone might have, be forwarded to Ms. Phippen, who will then distribute them to Commission members to review for the next meeting.

Ms. Phippen met with Mr. Goodin today about some of his concerns. As far as minimum lot sizes/frontages, she believes there should be a reference made regarding where the lot width will be calculated from.

Commissioner Heaps thanked the individuals for their remarks, it is nice to get feedback regarding what does and does not make sense for this ordinance.

Ms. Phippen will work on the concerns that have been presented and be able to provide more information at the next meeting.

**MOTION:** Motion made by Commissioner McCammon to **continue** discussion to December 16, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Daniels seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously (6-0).

#### Vote

Aye: Luthi, Hancock, Heaps, Soelberg, McCammon, Daniels

Discussion and consideration of a conditional use permit and business license for a home occupation (energy work) located at 563 E. 420 S. (Applicant: Judy Larsen)

Judy Larsen explained that she will be helping clients overcome past experiences that may be causing grief or turmoil in their lives. There is sufficient parking in front of her home and in her driveway for client visits. She will only have one client at a time.

**MOTION:** Motion made by Commissioner Luthi to **approve** a conditional use permit and business license for a home occupation located at 563 East 420 South. Commissioner Heaps seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously (6-0).

Vote

Aye: Luthi, Hancock, Heaps, Soelberg, McCammon, Daniels

Discussion and consideration of a conditional use permit and business license for a home occupation (esthetician spa) located at 1091 East 480 South. (Applicant: Chealsey Wiggins)

Chealsey Wiggins explained that the request is to provide in-home esthetician services (waxing, eyelashes, facials, etc.). She is licensed by the State of Utah DOPL. There is enough room in front of her home and in her driveway for client parking.

**MOTION:** Motion made by Commissioner Heaps to **approve** a conditional use permit and business license for a home occupation located at 1091 East 480 South. Commissioner Hancock seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously (6-0).

Vote

Aye: Luthi, Hancock, Heaps, Soelberg, McCammon, Daniels

**Workshop:** Discussion of an ordinance updating animal land use in Smithfield City.

Ms. Phippen clarified that this will not be taking away any existing rights, if anything, it will be providing more flexibility with the types of animals people can have. She confirmed for Chairman Soelberg that anything previously approved can continue as a legal nonconforming use if that use has not been abandoned for a period of more than 12 months.

Commissioner Heaps said this makes sense and seems simple and straightforward.

Ms. Phippen said she advised that the ordinance will be presented in draft form for the next meeting.

**MOTION:** Motion made by Commissioner Heaps to **set a public hearing** for this ordinance at the December 16, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Hancock seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously (6-0).

Vote

Aye: Luthi, Hancock, Heaps, Soelberg, McCammon, Daniels

There will be a holiday dinner provided prior to next month's meeting.

Ms. Phippen is actively working with other City staff to review the current ordinances and better streamline and clarify the process.

She advised that subdivision requests do not require public hearings. The procedure is for the developer to present a concept plan which is reviewed by the Subdivision Technical Review Committee (STRC), comprised of staff from various departments. Once that is complete, a preliminary plan is prepared and submitted for Planning Commission review. The final plat is then submitted, which is reviewed by the legal department. The Commission then reviews and forwards a recommendation for approval or denial to the City Council. Plans go through quite a bit of review before they are presented to the Planning Commission. She pointed out that a rezone is the key action, once a property is zoned for a use, they have the right to develop it based on the permitted guidelines. Annexations provide an opportunity for the greatest ability to discuss and/or place conditions on a property.

Commissioner McCammon pointed out that although there will be no defined public hearing for subdivision proposals, there is public comment at each meeting where citizens can express their concerns. Ms. Phippen agreed and said there are many ways residents can stay informed about what is happening. All the information is noticed and put on the City's website.

**MEETING ADJOURNED** at 7:32 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Debbie Zilles

---

Andrew Soelberg, Chairperson

---

Attest: