

**Tooele City Planning Commission
Business Meeting Minutes**

Date: Wednesday, April 27, 2022

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Tooele City Hall Council Chambers
90 North Main Street, Tooele Utah

Commission Members Present:

Melanie Hammer
Chris Sloan
Matt Robinson
Tyson Hamilton
Weston Jensen
Paul Smith
Melodi Gochis
Alison Dunn

Commission Members Excused:

Nathan Thomas

City Council Members Present:

David McCall

City Council Members Excused:

Ed Hansen
Maresa Manzione

City Employees Present:

Andrew Aagard, City Planner
Jim Bolser, Community Development Director
Paul Hansen, Tooele Engineer
Roger Baker, Tooele City Attorney

Minutes prepared by Katherin Yei

Chairman Robinson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Robinson.

2. Roll Call

Melanie Hammer, Present
Chris Sloan, Present
Matt Robinson, Present

Tyson Hamilton, Present
Weston Jensen, Present
Paul Smith, Present
Melodi Gochis, Present
Alison Dunn, Present
Nathan Thomas, Excused

3. Recommendation on a City Code Text Amendment Request by Zenith Tooele, LLC to Revise the Terms of Section 7-11a-18 of the Tooele City Code Regarding Exterior Building Material Requirements for Multi-Family Residential Development. (Continued from December 8, 2021, January 12, 2022, and April 13, 2022 Planning Commission Meetings)

Presented by Jim Bolser, Community Development Director

Mr. Bolser presented information on the City Code text amendment. The Planning Commission tabled it at the previous meeting, asking for a staff recommendation. There are three options to consider with the application. The first proposal is to decline the application and stick with the original text. The second proposal is to recommend approval of the application to the City Council. The third option is to make specification with a percentage of the front façade as the minimum being a specific material. It will provide clarification, establish a percentage that is easy to administer, allows more design for materials and colors. By establishing a higher percentage for front, you maintain the emphasis of the aesthetic on the front façade and provide a balance in the other areas.

The Planning Commission asked the following questions:

Does the third option change the overall percentage?

Due to this change effecting the entire community, could the applicant have applied for just his property?

Could they choose to eliminate vinyl as an option for main supplies?

They applications they had seen previous have mentioned both minimum and maximum. What are they trying to ask for?

How does this effect double frontage properties?

Mr. Bolser addressed the Commission's concerns. The overall percentage would maintain, but the portion of it that applies to the front would change. An amendment applies to any application. An applicant could have done something through a PUD or development agreement in order to apply it only to their project. Maximum was a part of the original application. Through revisions, it is back to minimum with a change to the percentage. When it comes into policy, that material being added, now presents opportunity to be primary and secondary for the entire building. Double frontage is a different part of the code and would not be affected in this change.

Commissioner Sloan motioned to forward a positive recommendation on a City Code Text Amendment Request by Zenith Tooele, LLC to Revise the Terms of Section 7-11a-18 of the Tooele City Code Regarding Exterior Building Material Requirements for Multi-Family Residential Development, substituting option three that discusses the 60% option.

Commissioner Hamilton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”, Commissioner Gochis, “Naye”, Commissioner Sloan, “Aye”, Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”, Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”, Commissioner Smith, “Aye”, and Chairman Robinson, “Aye”. The motion passed.

4. Recommendation on the Hunter Minor Subdivision Request by Kathy Curtis to Create 3 Lots on 0.82 Acres Located at 240 West Utah Avenue in the R1-7 Residential Zoning District.

Presented by Andrew Aagard, City Planner

Mr. Aagard presented a plat for the property located near 230 North Street and Utah avenue. It is currently zoned R1-7. The plat proposes to split the current lot into 3 smaller lots. Sheds and buildings will need to be removed so there are no non-conformities. The applicant has met or exceeds requirements by the R1-7 district. Staff is recommending approval with conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Hamilton motioned to forward a positive recommendation of the Hunter Minor Subdivision Request by Kathy Curtis to Create 3 Lots on 0.82 Acres Located at 240 West Utah Avenue in the R1-7 Residential Zoning District, based on the findings and conditions listed in the staff report. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”, Commissioner Gochis, “Aye”, Commissioner Sloan, “Aye”, Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”, Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”, Commissioner Smith, “Aye”, and Chairman Robinson, “Aye”. The motion passed.

5. Discussion on Proposed Revisions to the Planning Commission Bylaws.

Presented by Jim Bolser, Community Development Director

Mr. Bolser presented the following adjustments, clarifications, and decorum language to the Planning Commission bylaws at the request of the Commission. They are as follows: Section 1: “Organization”, subsection A and C; Section 2: “Rights and Duties of Members”, subsection B, E, F, G, H, I, K, and L; Section 3: “Rules of Procedure”, subsection A, B, F, G, H, I, and J; Section 4: “Decorum and Debate”, subsection, A, B, C, D, E, F and H; Section 5: “Suspension of Bylaws and Rules of Procedure”, subsection B; Section 6: “Amendment of Procedure”, subsection A.

The Planning Commission had a discussion regarding the duties and best practice of an alternate. By allowing the alternate Commissioners to sit next to the Planning Commission, it presents an unfair disadvantage to an applicant or the public. An alternate becomes a Commission member for a meeting if a regular Commissioner is absent. They found it appropriate to have the direction of the alternates written somewhere; even with the base of “it is the chairman’s discretion.”

Chairman Robinson addressed the duties of an alternate. It does fall at the discretion of the chair. The Planning Commission is a body of seven voting members. By having the alternates sit in the front, it shows the impression that there may be nine members. The alternates are required to be

at the meeting and being asked to sit in the audience to provide clarity for the applicants and public.

Mr. Bolser addressed the Commissions concerns. An alternate is attending when there is a full Commission, but there should be a difference. They are not functioning member of the Commission. The perception of the public and applicants could assume there are nine not seven members.

Mr. Baker presented clarification for section G. The Chair gives every Commissioner before and after the motion a chance to say what they want. Once the voting has begun, further discussion, including explaining one's vote, should not be done to convince another Commissioner how to vote. There is time to allow explanation of vote before the voting and without stretching out voting.

The following discussion points from the Planning Commission were in regards to section F. The text is referring to a single speaker if they are being repetitive, not the overall testimony of the public.

Mr. Baker clarified the terms could be referencing a previous speaker, but with a time limit, repetition won't become an issue.

The following clarification were asked for section I.

The Commission may ask questions right to staff or the application. The strike should be extended to help clarify wording.

The Planning Commission shared their positive feedback for subsection 5.

The Planning Commission would like to see the bylaws as a formal action in the next meeting, May 11th.

6. City Council Reports

Council Member McCall shared the following information from the City Council Meeting: The Fire study report, impact facility plan, and the temporary zoning ordinance regarding garage parking in multi-family residential areas.

Mr. Baker gave the City Council the same presentation on the temporary zoning ordinance and asked the Council to approve it.

7. Review and Approval of Planning Commission Minutes for the Business Meeting Held on April 13, 2022

The following changes were asked to be made:

Commissioner Dunn was listed as chairman. Chairman Robinson did not start the meeting.

Commissioner Hamilton motioned to approve the Planning Commission minutes for April 13, 2022. Commissioner Hammer seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Commissioner Hammer, “Aye”, Commissioner Gochis, “Aye”, Commissioner Sloan, “Aye” Chairman Robinson, “Aye” Commissioner Hamilton, “Aye”, Commissioner Jensen, “Aye”, and Commissioner Smith, “Aye”. The motion passed.

8. Planning Commission Training on Water.

Mr. Hansen presented training on water.

9. Adjourn

Chairman Robinson adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

Approved 11th day of May, 2022

Matt Robinson, Tooele City Planning Commission Chair