PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF MEETING

Wednesday, May 9, 2018
7:00 p.m.

A quorum being present at Centerville City Hall, 250 North Main Street, Centerville, Utah. The meeting of the Centerville City Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Cheylynn Hayman, Chair
Kevin Daly, Vice Chair
Kathy Helgesen
Kai Hintze
Gina Hirst
Logan Johnson
Becki Wright

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT
Cory Snyder, Community Development Director
Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner
Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

STAFF ABSENT
Lisa Romney, City Attorney

VISITORS
Interested citizens (see attached sign-in sheet)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

OPENING COMMENT/LEGISLATIVE PRAYER Commissioner Helgesen

PUBLIC HEARING- ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT — CZC 12.55.110 FENCES AND WALLS

Cory Snyder, Community Development Director, introduced the Zoning Text Amendment. He shared that staff was directed by the City Council to consider amending fencing heights to mitigate or buffer after a citizen attended a Council meeting and shared concerns about her neighbor’s horse being able to lean over the fence that separates their properties. Mr. Snyder reviewed several alternative options for the Zoning Text Amendment, carefully reviewing pros and cons of each of these alternatives, and added that staff does not take a position on the matter. Alternative number one (1) would leave the existing ordinance in place, which limits fencing to 6 feet in height. Alternative number two (2) would add A-L and R-L to the 10-foot allowance for other Zones. Alternative number three (3) would add a new section to the ordinance just for A-L and R-L Zones and limit height to 8 feet.

Chair Hayman asked Mr. Snyder if he was aware of any other residents who had asked for higher fences in the A-L or R-L Zones. Mr. Snyder responded that there have not been any requests the same as this one, but that staff does occasionally receive complaints associated
with privacy, especially in situations where there is a grade difference between neighbors’
backyards. Chair Hayman asked if there are other cities comparable to Centerville City that
allow fence heights up to 10-feet. Mr. Snyder said from his experience that there are some
circumstances where heights over 6 feet have been allowed for a buffer in other cities, but that a
10-foot fence is an anomaly.

Commissioner Wright asked for clarification on when building permits are required for
fences. Mr. Snyder clarified that fences 6 feet and under do not require a permit, fences from 6
feet to 7 feet fall in a Permitted Use category, and any fence over 7 feet requires a building
permit. Commissioner Wright asked for clarification on whether a horse putting its head over a
fence on a neighbor's property line could technically be considered trespassing. If this intrusion
could be considered trespassing, Commissioner Wright wanted to know if it would be the horse
owner's responsibility to ensure that their horse did not trespass. Mr. Snyder used an example
of a tree to respond to Commissioner Wright’s question and explained that the owner of a tree is
the person on whose property the trunk resides, so while a neighbor could trim limbs that hung
over their property line, those limbs are still technically the possession of the tree owner. Chair
Hayman commented that there is no damage to a property owner by a temporary intrusion of a
horse's head over a property line, as there would be with a limb of a tree falling into a neighbor’s
yard and damaging their property.

Chair Hayman asked if the character and consistency of existing neighborhoods could
change if the Planning Commission passed the Zoning Text Amendment and property owners
replaced existing fences with taller ones. Mr. Snyder replied that they could.

Commissioner Daly asked how the height of a fence is measured if there is a grade
difference between properties. Mr. Snyder responded that the height would be considered the
average height between the 2 grades. Natural grades of the lot are used for this calculation,
and not grades resulting from added fill to be installed after the fence.

Chair Hayman opened a public hearing at 7:16 p.m., and closed the public hearing
seeing that no one wished to comment.

Commissioner Johnson asked for Chair Hayman to clarify her previous point. Chair
Hayman clarified that if the issue requiring a taller fence is a trespass issue, there are viable
alternatives outside of a zoning text amendment. For example, neighbors could discuss a
solution amongst themselves, and if no solution can be reached there are legal recourses that a
neighbor could use. However, if a horse is just leaning its head over a fence, Chair Hayman
questions what the damage is to the neighbor. She expressed concerns about changing the
Zoning Text over complaints from one citizen, and what such a change could do to existing
neighborhoods. She also agreed with staff's concern about high winds potentially pulling down
higher fences.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the resident had mentioned a problem with allergies in
her comment before the City Council. Mr. Snyder confirmed the resident said she is allergic to
horses. Commissioner Johnson asked if there were other damages to her because of her
neighbor's horse. Mr. Snyder responded that there were not from his recollection.

Commissioner Wright said she is not inclined to vote for the Zoning Text Amendment as
she would be uncomfortable with this increased fence height. She expressed her concern for
the structural integrity of the fence in high winds, and said she felt there could be other remedies
for this complaint among the neighbors involved. She also said she feels that because the
property owner is living next to a piece of land that is zoned A-L, it could have been anticipated
that farm animals might be living in the neighbor’s yard at some point. She was concerned
about how this amendment would affect Centerville as a whole, and did not feel that the very
few situations where a taller fence could be beneficial warranted such a drastic change in the
whole community.

Commissioner Hirst agreed with the other Commissioner’s comments and expressed
that she is concerned that the sense of community could be lost. She also mentioned that taller
fences might block out too much sunlight in adjacent lots, especially if they are small, and this
could impinge upon property owners’ abilities to plant gardens or enjoy their backyard as they
might otherwise.

Commissioner Helgesen agreed with what has been previously said and expressed that
she too is disinclined to vote on this Zoning Text Amendment.

Chair Hayman made a motion to recommend denying the request for consideration for
findings one (1) through five (5) from the staff report, as well as finding number six (6) below.
Commissioner Daly seconded the motion. Commissioner Wright made a motion to add finding
seven (7) below. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion. Chair Hayman made a motion to
amend her initial motion to recommend denying the request for consideration for findings one
(1) through eight (8) below. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion, which passed by majority
vote (6-1), with Commissioner Johnson dissenting.

Findings:

1. Generally, it is common knowledge that fencing 6 feet or less do not require a City
permit, adding a requirement for a higher fencing will lead to confusion with the
general public.
2. Additional heights may require structural engineering to withstand the load weights
on the soil or high winds.
3. High winds are a particular problem for Centerville.
4. Higher fencing can potentially and will block/screen adjacent property owners
gardens and plantings from needed sunlight and air circulation.
5. Taller fencing has a visual fortress type of appearance, which may have a negative
visual/social quality to single-family style development.
6. The Zoning Text Amendment would allow for inconsistent and patchwork fencing in
existing neighborhoods.
7. Taller fencing would threaten the sense of community that exists in Centerville.
8. If the concern involves trespass issues, there exists an alternative legal remedy to
address that concern.

DISCUSSION: ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS – PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL
USE PERMITS

Cassie Younger, Assistant Planner, reviewed a chart attached to the agenda, which
outlined current administrative procedures and presented alternatives to streamline them. For
Home Occupations, the Alternative presented was that Conditions could be placed on the
application by the Zoning Administrator and appeals could be made to the Planning
Commission. For Temporary Use permits time limits could be extended, and all Conditional Use
permits could be approved by the Zoning Administrator. For Site Plans any residential
development outside a platted subdivision could go to the Zoning Administrator or could be
amended to a 1-step process.

Commissioner Daly asked for clarification on state rules for Temporary Use Permits. Mr.
Snyder recollected that it was 10 days per month in any one location that was allowed. Chair
Hayman asked Ms. Younger if she had considered adding in a “relief mechanism” for the Zoning Administrator in her alternative proposed for approval of conceptual and final site plans for residential development outside a platted subdivision. This would provide a means for the Zoning Administrator to use his/her discretion to elevate an application to the Planning Commission for approval if needed. Mr. Snyder responded that this could easily be added. Commissioner Wright asked if there is an existing recourse for a citizen who is disgruntled by the approval of a Temporary Use permit. Mr. Snyder verified that nothing would change in a citizen’s ability to appeal the approval of a Temporary Use Permit. Commissioner Wright further asked if Conditional Use Permits for Temporary uses are required by statute to have public hearings. Mr. Snyder responded that public hearings have been held to receive public input as part of the discovery of mitigation. Commissioner Wright asked if there was still a way to receive public input if Conditional Use Permits for Temporary Uses were approved by the Zoning Administrator, as she would still like to give the public the opportunity to comment. Mr. Snyder suggested that public hearings could be held during an appeal if required.

Chair Hayman opened a discussion on proposed Home Occupation changes. Commissioner Johnson said that he is in support of making the changes that staff has suggested. Commissioner Johnson asked if the Zoning Administrator could be granted the authority to send certain permit applications to the Planning Commission to examine. Chair Hayman agreed that she would like to empower the Zoning Administrator to use his/her discretion to send things to the Planning Commission to review if needed. Chair Hayman asked how the Commissioners felt about not providing notices to the public regarding Conditional Use Permit applications. Mr. Snyder said that noticing would still be done, but the Commissioners would need to decide how to deal with any comments received from the public. Commissioner Wright asked if there is a way to design a comment section on the City’s website. Chair Hayman suggested that perhaps if one (1) or more members of the public made a comment then the CUP approval could be elevated to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Daly said he wanted to clarify the type of comment that would trigger an issue being elevated to the Planning Commission, and suggested that he would like the Zoning Administrator to be given the discretion to decide if public concerns warranted elevating the application to the Planning Commission. Chair Hayman asked Mr. Snyder how staff would feel about being given this discretion. Mr. Snyder said that very little is problematic with Home Occupation permits and it should be reasonable for the Zoning Administrator to use his/her discretion when examining public comments. Commissioner Johnson asked what the recourse would be for citizens who feel the Zoning Administrator made an unfair decision. Mr. Snyder responded if a permit was illegally approved it would be invalidated immediately, but reinforced that these issues do not typically come up in Home Occupation Conditional Use Permits. Chair Hayman asked if the Commissioners were generally comfortable with the structure of the proposed changes to the Home Occupation Conditional Use permitting process. Commissioner Helgesen said she is generally comfortable but that she is concerned about the public still having an avenue to be heard in person, and is also concerned about just having an online forum for making public comments when some people are not online. Chair Hayman expressed again that she would like to create a way for a member of the public who has concerns to be able to elevate an application to the Planning Commission so that a public hearing could be held. Commissioner Daly expressed again that he is afraid of the potential for the public to abuse the option to send things to the Planning Commission. The Commissioners requested that staff prepare a list of Conditional Home Occupation Uses so that they can decide whether to move all of these to the new process that has been proposed, or to parse out certain uses that will remain with the Planning Commission for approval.

Chair Hayman moved to a discussion on the proposed changes to Site Plan approvals for residential development outside a platted subdivision. Mr. Snyder suggested leaving on-site
detention issues in the hands of the Planning Commission and moving to a 1-step approval process. Chair Hayman directed staff to prepare language to that effect.

Chair Hayman moved to a discussion on the proposed changes to Temporary Use permit approvals for Conditional Uses. She expressed that she is inclined to defer to staff’s judgement on time extensions for Temporary Use permits. Chair Hayman directed staff to provide the Commissioners with recommendations on extending time limits on Temporary Uses.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S REPORT

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2018.

Mr. Snyder discussed items that will be on the agenda in the next Planning Commission meeting.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Mr. Snyder reviewed recent decisions made by the City Council.

Mr. Snyder asked the Commissioners who could be present at a Work Session on May 22, 2018 at 5:45 p.m. Commissioner Daly and Commissioner Wright said they cannot be present, but the other five (5) Commissioners verified they are available for the meeting.

MINUTES REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE

The minutes of the April 11, 2018 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed and accepted as amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a motion to accept the minutes. Commissioner Hirst seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

The minutes of the April 25, 2018 Planning Commission meeting were reviewed and accepted as amended. Commissioner Helgesen made a motion to accept the minutes. Commissioner Hintze seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:27 p.m. Chair Hayman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (7-0).

Cheylynn Hayman, Chair

Avalon Comly, Recording Secretary

Date Approved