

LAYTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Bodily, Kristin Elinkowski, Sharon Esplin, Dave Weaver

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeremy Davis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gerald Gilbert, Blake Hazen, Tim Pales

ALTERNATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Dawn Fitzpatrick

OTHERS PRESENT: Staff Members: Bill Wright, Peter Matson, Kem Weaver, Andrew King, Steve Garside, Shannon Hansen, and Councilmember Barry Flitton

City Planner, Peter Matson, explained the form-based code training and field trip to Daybreak to be held on August 3, 2011, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Matson introduced Shannon Hansen substituting for Planning Commission secretary, Julie Jewell.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. GREYHAWK LC REZONE REQUEST – A (Agriculture) to R-M1 (Low/Medium Density Residential)

This 0.606 acre property is located at approximately 2100 East and 3100 North. The applicant and owner is Ed Green.

Planner II, Kem Weaver, presented the request to rezone a .606 acre developable parcel, which remained after the construction of a large regional detention basin at approximately 2100 East and 3100 North. The applicant, Ed Green, is requesting the rezone to R-M1 to build townhomes similar to the ones he is building in the nearby Greyhawk Townhome Subdivision. Mr. Weaver said based on the acreage, nine townhomes would be allowed. The developer would need to manage, with UDOT, the storm drainage from Highway 193. The developer would need to adhere to the 20 foot landscape buffer and solid vinyl fencing required by ordinance along the east property line. Mr. Weaver said that the recommendation for the rezone is subject to the dedication plat for the detention pond being recorded at Davis County.

There were no questions on the rezone from the Commission.

2. BARLOW REZONE – REZONE REQUEST WITH A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – A (Agriculture) to M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing/Industrial)

This 9.6 acre property is located at approximately 275 North King. The applicant and owner is Duncan Barlow.

City Planner, Peter Matson, reviewed the development agreement and uses that would be prohibited on this site. Mr. Matson said, based on comments from the Commission, the following uses had been identified that would not be allowed on the site: electric power plant, water treatment plant, gasoline sales and transfer storage. Commissioner Weaver mentioned that noise control had been a concern. There was a discussion on how to monitor noise from the site. Community & Economic Development Director, Bill Wright, said the City has

nuisance laws that would address the level of noise that is disruptive between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. There was a discussion of business practices that could potentially be a nuisance to the neighbors.

Mr. Matson said that additions to the development agreement require the more intense part of the use to be focused to the northwest portion of the property and the building heights to be limited to 35 feet within 200 feet of both King Street and 275 North.

Mr. Wright said that it would be important not to write a noise mitigation requirement that might be more lenient than the existing laws. Commissioner Weaver asked if it would be possible to consider a sound wall on top of the berms on the north and east sides of the property. Mr. Matson said it may be possible on the south property line if there are no entrances onto the street.

There was a discussion of possible users, and the owner, Mr. Barlow, said that the contract with the user had not been signed. In answer to Commissioner Bodily's question as to whether noise would be an issue, Mr. Barlow responded that he didn't think noise would be an issue but he wasn't sure what the company had planned.

Mr. Matson said he felt the intense part of the proposed business could be kept closer to the intense part of the Smith's location. Commissioner Weaver restated that a sound wall on a berm along 275 North could alleviate some of the concerns of the home owners on 275 North.

Commissioner Weaver asked if there would be an outlet on 275 North. Mr. Matson responded that he had added subsection 4.1.8 to the development agreement stating that access along the 275 North frontage shall be for secondary or emergency purposes only and be limited to one access point as approved by the City Engineer. The intent is not to have an access point for operations on 275 North, and the berm and sound wall would need to be restricted for a typical drive approach clear view.

Mr. Barlow asked if the berm and sound wall requirement could be put in the agreement as a requirement once the use was determined and if the sound mitigation requirements were necessary. He said he didn't have a problem with the uses being restricted.

Commissioner Esplin asked if a notation in the agreement could state that the developer would work with the Staff to mitigate any sound issues during the site plan approval process. Mr. Wright said that verbiage in the development agreement could state that noise emissions would be evaluated at the site plan stage of approval to determine what mitigation may be required and implemented.

Mr. Matson said the reference to "M-1" on page 3 of the development agreement should be changed to M-2. He also said, with regard to the exterior building design in subsection 4.1.6, that it might be more appropriate to focus on just the front façade of the building and not include the side in this provision. Staff and the Commission suggested that "front" and "side" should be eliminated from subsection 4.1.6 with the requirement be that the side of the building facing the public street must meet the exterior building design requirements. The Commission held the opinion that the building on the corner of 275 North and King Street should meet the design standards on sides of the building that are visible from the streets. Mr. Barlow felt that requirement was too strict. Mr. Wright and Mr. Matson explained that the requirement for all manufacturing buildings is that there are façade shifts. Mr. Barlow asked if an all steel building could be in the corner of the property away from the street, and Mr. Matson replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Matson will add subsection 4.1.10 to the development agreement addressing the noise impacts to be evaluated a site plan stage and present it during the regular meeting.

PUBLIC REVIEW:

3. DISCUSSION OF FENCING TYPES ON LAYTON PARKWAY AND POTENTIAL AMENDING OF 19.16.09 (4)(d)(i) – LAYTON PARKWAY

Mr. Weaver presented examples of the fencing that is being put in along the future Layton Parkway. He said Staff wants to ensure consistency in fencing along Layton Parkway and to ensure any new development adheres to the addition to the ordinance, which requires a six-foot decorative masonry wall along Layton Parkway. Community & Economic Development Director, Bill Wright, explained that the current code requires vinyl fencing along property abutting an arterial road, which would not be consistent with fencing being installed on Layton Parkway. The amendment would specifically identify Layton Parkway to have the requirements of the six-foot decorative masonry wall. Commissioner Pales asked about the vinyl fencing that was already installed along the future Layton Parkway area west of Angel Street. Mr. Wright said that property, as well as the currently vacant Robert Farms Phase 8 property, was already vested in the old code and if the fencing were to be changed out, the City would have to make the change. Mr. Weaver explained that any new developments that have not received approvals would need to adhere to the new code.

Mr. Wright said that Staff had reviewed the ordinance as it would apply to all arterial streets in the City and decided to apply the ordinance to just Layton Parkway, which is a somewhat different in its function. Setbacks and clear view would be considered at intersections.

There was a discussion on the cost difference between masonry walls and vinyl fencing.

4. CREEKSIDE VILLAGE PRUD – SUBDIVISION PLAT AMENDMENT

This property is located at approximately 891 South Main Street in an R-M1 (Low/Medium Density Residential) zoning district.

Mr. Weaver presented the plat amendment for phases 3, 5, and 6 of the Creekside Village PRUD Subdivision. He explained that the building footprints were surveyed on the plat, and a plat amendment is required if the footprint of a building is changed. He said the applicant has found that the three bedroom units are selling better than the two bedroom units on the current plat. The developer is adding two to three feet on each of the building foundations, which changes the footprints and requires the plat amendment.

Mr. Weaver said the common area, parking and number of units remain the same as platted. Commissioner Weaver asked if there would still be enough open space around the buildings, and Mr. Weaver replied that the development was already well over the required open space for the development.

There were no further questions on the item.

5. ESTATES AT MUTTON HOLLOW SUBDIVISION – PHASES 3, 4, 5 – PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

This property is located in an R-1-8 and an R-1-10 zoning district. The applicants/owners, Howard Kent and John Gailey are proposing 85 single family lots on 29.66 acres.

Mr. Weaver presented the request for preliminary approval for the Estates at Mutton Hollow Phases 3, 4, and 5. He said Phases 1 and 2 were currently under construction. Phases 3, 4, and 5 will continue to the east from Phases 1 and 2 on Fairfield Road to Boynton Road. There was a discussion about the future of Muddy Lane.

Mr. Weaver gave an overview of the property, phase location, and zoning as well as the proposed Layton City Park and detention basin on the east side of the property by phase 4 of the subdivision. Mr. Weaver explained that

the developer is responsible for the curb, gutter and asphalt along Boynton Road, and the City is responsible for the park strip and sidewalk.

Mr. Weaver explained the reason lots were configured for the flag lot for Lot 410 by the park was to prevent unused hidden space behind the lot. He also explained that Phases 3, 4, 5 come together at the entrance to the Crestwood Growers business. The developer has been requested to build a public street (200 East) to allow the owner of the business to retain access to his property through his easement.

Mr. Wright related that additional R-1-8 property adjacent to the proposed subdivision has been purchased by the developer to add as phase 6 of the Estates at Mutton Hollow Subdivision.

There was a discussion of neighborhood concerns over possible additional traffic on Boynton Road.

6. QUESTAR GAS COMPANY – CONDITIONAL USE FOR A GAS METERING & TRANSMISSION STATION

This property is located at 260 South Fort Lane (fronting I-15) in a CP-2 zone. The applicant is Questar Gas represented by Will Radford.

Planner I, Andrew King, reviewed the conditional use request for Questar Gas for a regulator station. He said the station would be screened from public view. Mr. King explained the access that would be approved for the site with no access off Layton Parkway. The following are the conditions that are required as part of this conditional use:

1. All requirements and/or conditions from the Fire Department, Building and Engineering Divisions are met.
2. A minimum eight (8) foot decorative masonry wall shall be constructed around the perimeter of the facility.
3. Driveway access to the facility shall be from the north, in the Fort Lane Village Subdivision. The access gate shall also be located on the north side of the facility.

7. SAFETY FIRST AUTO GLASS – CONDITIONAL USE FOR A MOBILE STORE FOR ROCK CHIP REPAIR

This property is located at the Chevron Gas Station at 1971 North Hill Field Road. The applicant is Tyler Telford representing the owner, Ron Martinez, from the Hill Field Chevron station.

Planner I, Andrew King, reviewed the conditional use request for a 10 foot by 10 foot mobile store for rock chip repair. The only concern was the amount of traffic his business might attract. The applicant had indicated that this type of business only attracted 5-10 vehicles per day and that the vehicles would rarely be there at the same time. Mr. King gave an overview of the site plan, which would not obstruct traffic flow and would allow for two customers at a time. Commissioner Weaver asked if the business had to remove the tent each day, and Mr. King responded that that requirement just applied to mobile food stores. Mr. King also said this mobile store and any future mobile store on this particular site will be limited to the northeast corner of the property

There were no questions about this item.

8. DAVID WITKAMP – REVOCATION OF CONDITIONAL USE FOR AUTO SALES

This property is located at 377 North Main Street in a C-H (Highway Regional Commercial). The property owner is the Barlow Corporation represented by Duncan Barlow.

Duncan Barlow explained that the tenant who had applied for the conditional use was no longer residing in his building at 377 North Main Street.

Planner I, Andrew King, reviewed the history of the rezone and conditional use permit for this property. The applicant was required to upgrade the landscaping for the rezone and for the conditional use. The applicant was unwilling to make the landscaping upgrades and has found a new location and is no longer in business for auto sales at the 377 North Main Street site.

There were no questions on this item. Assistant City Attorney Steve Garside asked if the applicant had voluntarily surrendered their conditional use permit. Mr. King replied in the affirmative and Mr. Wright explained that the property owner had stated earlier in the meeting that the Mr. Witkamp was no longer in business on the property. Mr. Garside said that if the applicant had surrendered his conditional use permit in writing, there would have been no need for a revocation of the conditional use permit.



Julie K. Jewell, Planning Commission Secretary

LAYTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Bodily, Kristin Elinkowski, Sharon Esplin, Dave Weaver

ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Jeremy Davis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gerald Gilbert, Blake Hazen, Tim Pales

ALTERNATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Dawn Fitzpatrick

OTHERS PRESENT: Staff Members: Bill Wright, Peter Matson, Kem Weaver, Andrew King, Steve Garside, Shannon Hansen, and Councilmember Barry Flitton

The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chairman Esplin. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and an invocation given.

Chairman Esplin called for a motion to approve the June 14, 2011, June 28, 2011, and July 12, 2011 Planning Commission Work and Meeting Minutes. Corrections requested were as follows:

June 14, 2011, Planning Commission Meeting minutes – Page 3 – Correct Commissioner Fitzpatrick statement regarding exiting the development should read "right turn only onto Antelope Drive" rather than "right turn on Antelope Drive."

June 14, 2011, Planning Commission Meeting minutes – Page 4 – Correct "Commission Bodily" to "Commissioner Bodily."

There were no other corrections or additions. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item. Commissioner Elinkowski moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Commissioner Bodily seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

Chairman Esplin called for a motion to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Bodily moved to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Elinkowski seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. GREYHAWK LC REZONE REQUEST – A (Agriculture) to R-M1 (Low/Medium Density Residential)

This 0.606 acre property is located at approximately 2100 East and 3100 North. The applicant and owner is Ed Green.

Planner II, Kem Weaver, presented the request to rezone a .606 acre developable parcel, which remained after the construction of a large regional detention basin at approximately 2100 East and 3100 North. The applicant, Ed Green, is requesting the rezone to R-M1 to build townhomes similar to the ones he is building in the nearby Greyhawk Townhome Subdivision. Mr. Weaver, said based on the acreage, nine townhomes would be allowed. The applicant has not yet submitted a conceptual plan, which would determine the number of units and the layout of the development. The developer would need to manage, with UDOT, the storm drainage from Highway 193. The developer would need to adhere to the 20-foot landscape buffer and solid vinyl fencing along the east

property line required by ordinance. Mr. Weaver said that the recommendation for the rezone is subject to the dedication plat for the detention pond being recorded at Davis County.

Mr. Weaver said Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Council to approve the rezone request.

Commissioner Weaver asked what type of fencing would be required, and Mr. Weaver responded that a solid vinyl fence would be required.

A member of the audience, Pam Larsen, 2028 East Redtail Way, expressed concerns as follows:

- Lack of a conceptual plan
- Number of units in a small area
- Quality of the homes
- Public notice appearing small and obscured by weeds

The developer, Ed Green, said the retaining wall that would be required would reduce the buildable area; therefore he would propose six units which would be comparable with the existing buildings in the area.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission or the audience. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Weaver moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Council to approve the rezone subject to the plat for the detention pond being recorded at the County. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Davis, and the voting was unanimous.

2. BARLOW REZONE – REZONE REQUEST WITH A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT – A (Agriculture) to M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing/Industrial)

This 9.6 acre property is located at approximately 275 North King. The applicant and owner is Duncan Barlow.

City Planner, Peter Matson presented the request for rezone with the accompanying development agreement. Mr. Matson noted that a correction needed to be made to the development agreement on Page 3, correcting the zoning from M-1 to M-2.

Mr. Matson reviewed the development agreement and listed some of the more intense uses of the M-2 zone that would be prohibited on this site such as an electric power plant, water treatment plant, gasoline sales and transfer storage.

Mr. Matson listed the following requirements in the development agreement on the property proposed for rezone

- Maximum height of buildings within 200 feet of street frontage would be 35 feet.
- Exterior design criteria would be required for facades facing the public street.
- The main access would be on King Street with a secondary access, for emergency purposes only, on 275 North lining up with 75 West.
- Truck traffic would be from King Street and north only with no truck traffic to or from the development allowed south to Gentile Street.
- Subsection 4.1.10 under the Owner's Undertakings section of the development agreement will be added to mitigate noise if necessary

A member of the audience, Jeff Carter, 734 West 100 North, stated he was opposed to the development. He said that the Smith's business in the area is currently a noise problem and he didn't want any additional noise in the

neighborhood. He said there was no sidewalk on King Street and that he didn't want the value of homes to be decreased due to the development.

Mr. Matson addressed the sidewalk issue, stating that the developer will be required to install curb, gutter and sidewalk on King Street as part of the development.

Commissioner Weaver asked if there would be a 20-foot landscape buffer, and Mr. Matson replied in the affirmative. There was a discussion regarding the secondary access, which would be required by the Fire Department. This access and route would be determined by the layout and use of the new development.

Commissioner Davis asked Mr. Matson to address the impact of the development on the residents. Mr. Matson said the development agreement adds guidelines and regulations that are above and beyond the zoning requirements already established. He also reviewed other requirements of the development agreement.

There were no further questions or comments. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Davis moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Council to approve the rezone request with the development agreement. Commissioner Elinkowski seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

Chairman Esplin called for a motion to close the Public Hearing and open Public Review. Commissioner Weaver moved to close the Public Hearing and open Public Review. Commissioner Bodily seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

PUBLIC REVIEW:

3. DISCUSSION OF FENCING TYPES ON LAYTON PARKWAY AND POTENTIAL AMENDING OF 19.16.09 (4)(d)(i) – LAYTON PARKWAY

Mr. Weaver presented a discussion only item regarding fencing types on Layton Parkway stating that the amending of Section 19.16.09 (4)(d)(i) would be formally presented to the Planning Commission at a later date. He said the City is recommending a 6-foot masonry wall with a landscape buffer be required for new development along Layton Parkway. He showed wall samples and said the walls would be stained an earth tone color.

Commissioner Elinkowski asked who would be responsible for maintaining the landscape buffers. Mr. Weaver replied that the subdivision home owner associations (HOA) are typically required to maintain landscape buffers along their subdivision boundaries. Commissioner Elinkowski also asked if the wall would be finished the same on both sides, and Mr. Weaver replied in the affirmative.

The Commission had no further questions or comments. Ed Green, a developer of land in the area of Layton Parkway asked if this requirement would apply to his Roberts Farms development. He said he was required to put in about a half mile of Layton Parkway at a 66-foot width, although no homes can front on Layton Parkway. He felt the masonry walls would be a substantial additional cost to the developer. He doesn't feel that a developer should have to pay for a road that benefits everyone in the City.

There were no additional questions or comments.

Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item. Commissioner Bodily moved that Staff be directed to proceed with the ordinance amendment to 19.16.09(4)(d)(i). Commissioner Weaver seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

4. CREEKSIDE VILLAGE PRUD – SUBDIVISION PLAT AMENDMENT

This property is located at approximately 891 South Main Street in an R-M1 (Low/Medium Density Residential) zoning district. The applicant, Shawn Strong, is requesting to move the building footprints for Buildings 1, 2 and 6.

Mr. Weaver presented the plat amendment for phases 3, 5, and 6 of the Creekside Village PRUD Subdivision. He explained that the building footprints were surveyed on the plat, and a plat amendment is required if the footprint of a building is changed. He said the applicant has found that the three bedroom units are selling better than the two bedroom units on the current plat. The developer is adding two to three feet on each of the building foundations, which changes the footprints and requires the plat amendment.

Mr. Weaver said the common area, parking and number of units remain the same as platted, therefore, Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Council to approve the Creekside Village PRUD Subdivision plat amendment.

There were no questions or comments from the Commission or the audience. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Elinkowski moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Council to approve the Creekside Village PRUD Subdivision plat amendment. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

5. ESTATES AT MUTTON HOLLOW SUBDIVISION – PHASES 3, 4, 5 – PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

This property is located in an R-1-8 and an R-1-10 zoning district. The applicants/owners, Howard Kent and John Gailey are proposing 85 single family lots on 29.66 acres.

Mr. Weaver reviewed the history and zoning of the property including the December 2, 2010, annexation by Layton City of 47.78 acres with an annexation agreement, which included this property. He presented an overview of the roads in the area. He reviewed the number of lots and zoning in each phase and said the lots being proposed meet the requirements of the General Plan and the annexation agreement. He said the applicant is required to build a regional detention pond (minimum of eight acres in size) at the northeast corner of the development, which will be designed to accommodate a regional park. The City compensated the owner for 3.5 acres of the property, and the property owner will be required to dedicate the remaining 4.5 acres to the City with the recording of Phase 4.

Mr. Weaver said all the streets will be 58 feet in width and stated that the block lengths meet the ordinance requirements for the underlying zone. Mr. Weaver pointed out the current easement access for Crestwood Growers and two other property owners. He said that easement would remain in place and become a public street as part of the development. This does not meet the block length requirement, so an exception is being given for a block length to retain this easement.

Mr. Weaver explained how Boynton Road, curb, gutter, sidewalk and park strip would be completed in conjunction with the City.

Mr. Weaver said Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the preliminary subdivision plat for Estates at Mutton Hollow Phases 3, 4, and 5 subject to meeting all Staff requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums.

Commissioner Weaver asked how many homes would be added with the additional parcel under contract. Mr. Weaver said there would be 85 lots in Phases 3, 4, and 5 and possibly 20-30 lots could be added from the new parcel under the R-1-8 zoning.

The following members of the audience expressed comments and concerns:

William Lythgoe, 1901 East 75 North
Alan Craig, 181 Boynton Road
Curtis Mondfrans, 238 North 200 East (201 East Mutton Hollow Road)
Ron Watts, 223 Mutton Hollow Road
Tom Winegar, 199 East Mutton Hollow Road
Brian Schwarz, 1904 East 75 South

The following is a list of comments and concerns:

- Lack of access on to Mutton Hollow Road from the development
- Mutton Hollow unincorporated status
- Increased traffic on Boynton Road
- Street design leading to speeding
- Alignment of roads causing lights to shine on existing homes
- Environmental impact
- Impact on home values
- Lack of sidewalk on Boynton
- Safety issues
- No opposition to development but street issues needing to be addressed before City Council review
- Future plans for 200 East and request for traffic regulators
- Public road traffic merging onto a private lane (200 East)
- Development possibly land locking 5.5 acres
- Development of access to farmland
- Water pressure decreasing

Commissioner Elinkowski asked if Phases 3, 4, and 5 would have access from Fairfield Road, and Mr. Weaver replied that there would be access through Phases 1 and 2. Commissioner Davis expressed concerns about additional traffic on Boynton and asked how the road would be completed in the County portion of the roadway. Mr. Weaver responded that the City Engineer is in discussion with the County regarding this issue. Mr. Davis also asked about 200 East which would go from a paved to a dirt road. Mr. Weaver said 200 East would not remain dirt but would have to be half built to maintain access.

The developer, Howard Kent, 261 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, said the master plan for the development does not use 200 East as an access. He said he anticipated the majority of the traffic would not use Boynton Road, but flow to Fairfield Road.

There were no further questions or comments. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commission Weaver moved to approve the Estates at Mutton Hollow Phases 3, 4, and 5 preliminary plat subject to meet all Staff requirements. Commissioner Bodily seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

6. QUESTAR GAS COMPANY – CONDITIONAL USE FOR A GAS METERING & TRANSMISSION STATION

This property is located at 260 South Fort Lane (fronting I-15) in a CP-2 zone. The applicant is Questar Gas represented by Will Radford.

Planner I, Andrew King presented the conditional use request for a gas metering and transmission station. Mr. King explained that there would be no access to the site from Layton Parkway.

The following are the conditions required for this conditional use permit:

1. All requirements and/or conditions from the Fire Department, Building and Engineering Divisions are met.
2. A minimum eight (8) foot decorative masonry wall shall be constructed around the perimeter of the facility.
3. Driveway access to the facility shall be from the north, in the Fort Lane Village Subdivision. The access gate shall also be located on the north side of the facility.

There were no questions from the Commission or the audience. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Bodily moved to grant conditional use approval based on the applicant meeting all conditions which are hereby adopted as requirements. Commissioner Elinkowski seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

7. SAFETY FIRST AUTO GLASS – CONDITIONAL USE FOR A MOBILE STORE FOR ROCK CHIP REPAIR

This property is located at the Chevron Gas Station at 1971 North Hill Field Road. The applicant is Tyler Telford representing the owner, Ron Martinez, from the Hill Field Chevron station.

Mr. King presented the request for conditional use for a mobile store for rock chip repair. The following are the conditions required for this conditional use permit:

1. All requirements and/or conditions from the Fire Department, Building and Engineering Divisions are met.
2. All planning and zoning regulations are maintained including but not limited to buffers, signage for mobile stores and lighting.
3. Mobile stores on the site shall be limited to locating at the northeast corner of the lot.

There were no questions or comments from the Commission or audience. Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Davis moved that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use request subject to the applicant meeting all conditions which are hereby adopted as requirements. Commissioner Bodily seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

8. DAVID WITKAMP – REVOCATION OF CONDITIONAL USE FOR AUTO SALES

This property is located at 377 North Main Street in a C-H (Highway Regional Commercial). The property owner is the Barlow Corporation represented by Duncan Barlow.

Planner I, Andrew King, reviewed the history of the rezone and conditional use permit for this property. The applicant was required to upgrade the landscaping for the rezone and for the conditional use. The applicant was

unwilling to make the landscaping upgrades and has found a new location and is no longer in business for auto sales at the 377 North Main Street site.

There were no questions or comments from the Commission or the audience.

Chairman Esplin called for a motion on the item.

Commissioner Elinkowski moved to revoke the conditional use for auto sales at 377 North Main Street. Commissioner Davis seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

Chairman Esplin called for a motion to close the Public Review and adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Bodily moved to close the Public Review and adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Weaver seconded the motion, and the voting was unanimous.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.



Julie K. Jewell, Planning Commission Secretary