

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE WEST JORDAN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HELD NOVEMBER 19, 2008 IN THE WEST JORDAN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PRESENT: James Dupaix, Nathan Gedge, David McKinney, Justin Stoker, Ellen Smith, and John Winn.

STAFF: Tom Burdett, Greg Mikolash, Robert Thorup, Jennifer Jastremsky, Bill Baranowski, Reed Scharman, and Vicki Hauserman.

OTHERS: Gayle Evans and Ken Olson.

The briefing meeting was called to order by James Dupaix.

Item #2 was recommended for the Consent Calendar. Item #3 will be continued to a date uncertain. The history of Item #4 was discussed. Item #5 was clarified as to the need for specifying recommendations from the traffic engineer.

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

**1. Consent Calendar
Approve Minutes from November 5, 2008**

2. Master Transportation Plan Amendment – Amend the future street classification map in the West Jordan Master Transportation Plan; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20080012]

Staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the Future Street Classification map included in the Master Transportation Plan as described in the staff report, based on the findings in the report.

4. Text Amendment – Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code Title 89 regarding Conditional and Permitted Uses and Daycare and General Instruction Uses as Home Occupations; City-Wide; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20080009]

Based on the findings of fact in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the text amendments to Title 89 as requested.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to move Items #2 and #4 to the Consent Calendar, to approve the Consent Calendar as modified, and to continue Item #3 to a date uncertain.

James Dupaix asked if there were any in the audience to speak on Items #2 or #4. There were none.

VOTE: The motion was seconded by Nathan Gedge and passed 6-0 in favor.

2. Master Transportation Plan Amendment – Amend the future street classification map in the West Jordan Master Transportation Plan; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20080012]

[This Item was moved to the Consent Calendar and given a positive recommendation.]

3. Text Amendment – Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code Sections 89-1-203(a) Definitions and 89-6-603(b)(10) Required parking spaces; City-Wide; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20080011]

Staff recommended that the Planning commission continue this item to a date uncertain to allow staff additional time to ensure that the proposed text amendments are in harmony with the Utah State Code.

MOTION: Justin Stoker moved to continue Item #3 to a date uncertain. The motion was seconded by Nathan Gedge and passed 6-0 in favor.

4. Text Amendment – Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code Title 89 regarding Conditional and Permitted Uses and Daycare and General Instruction Uses as Home Occupations; City-Wide; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20080009]

[This Item was moved to the Consent Calendar and given a positive recommendation.]

5. Text Amendment – Amend the West Jordan Municipal Code Section §89-6-606(b)(1) Giving the Planning Commission the authority to allow an alternate distance between driveways; City-Wide; City of West Jordan (applicant) [#TA20080010]

Jennifer Jastremsky gave an overview of the proposal that would provide an alternative driveway separation width in order to make Section 89-6-606(b)(1) provide the same modifications to design standards as those in subsection (b)(2) of the same section. The proposal was brought forward at the request of City Council. This option could be used in situations where there are lots with small frontages, areas that are highly developed, and other various conditions that might require a modification to the standards. The language in the provisionally approved recodification was changed to allow the traffic engineer the authority to allow for a separation smaller than 50 feet, but staff felt that giving that authority to the Planning Commission would better serve the City and the code as well as match the existing code in subsection (b)(2). There was a discussion in the pre-meeting of some additional language referring to the recommendations of the traffic engineer. However, staff felt that additional language would again make it inconsistent with subsection (b)(2). Any application received to ask for the smaller separation would automatically be reviewed by the traffic engineer, the engineer department, and planning, which would result in a recommendation to the Planning Commission during the site plan or subdivision application.

Based on the findings of fact in the staff report, staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the text amendment to Section 89-6-606(b)(1) as follows:

Unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission, All public driveways accessing a road shall be located a minimum of 50 feet from other driveways or streets. One-way driveways shall have a minimum width of 12 feet. Two-way driveways and all driveways on developments of one acre or larger in size shall have minimum widths of 20 feet.

Further public comment was closed at this point for this item.

Justin Stoker agreed that any application that comes before them includes staff recommendations, and by adding language regarding the traffic engineer it may result in problems. He felt that the proposed language was sufficient.

David McKinney said he would rather put the language regarding the traffic engineer in both subsections rather than eliminate it. He said the Planning Commission should have the specific advice of the traffic engineer on a traffic issue, even if the Commission should take a different position. He suggested the language for both sections to be “Unless otherwise approved by the Planning Commission, with the advice of the City Traffic Engineer, ... “.

Justin Stoker said that an amendment for subsection (b)(2) was not noticed to the public.

Greg Mikolash said the notice was specific to subsection (b)(1).

James Dupaix felt that including the clause for the traffic engineer recommendation was redundant to the process. In order to be consistent, they would have to include it in many more places than just the two sections mentioned. The practice and procedure already includes the engineering recommendations in every application,

and the traffic engineer reviews all applications that are pertinent to traffic situations. He suggested that they recommend the language proposed by staff.

MOTION: Nathan Gedge moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt a text amendment to Section 89-6-606(b)(1) as listed in the Planning Commission packet. The motion was seconded by Justin Stoker and passed 5-1 in favor with David McKinney casting the negative vote.

Tom Burdett updated the Commission on City Council actions. The City Council will be reviewing the sign code relating to real estate signs. He reviewed the status and tasks of the General Plan Committee.

John Winn stated that D & D Toys had been parking vehicles in the street, and he wanted to know if any complaints or citations have been given. He felt that this business had shown total disrespect for the law, the Commission, and the City. Tom Burdett said staff will bring it to the attention of the Code Enforcement department.

There was a brief discussion regarding the construction of the Mountain View Highway, which will initially be constructed without a grade separation. However, the real estate for the interchanges will be acquired. Justin Stoker explained a similar project for a beltway in southern Nevada, which allowed the roadway to be used before the full highway was constructed.

MOTION: Nathan Gedge moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

James F. Dupaix
Chair

ATTEST:

JULIE DAVIS
Executive Assistant
Community Development

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2008