

2

3

4

5 6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24 25

26 27

> 29 30

28

31 32

33

34

35 36

> 37 38

MINUTES

Oakley City Planning Commission Meeting March 1, 2023 **Zoom Meeting Platform** 7:00 PM

AGENDA

- 1. Call the meeting to order
- 2. Public Comment: This is an opportunity for the Public to address the Planning Commission with items that are not listed on the agenda or items which are on agenda but not as a public hearing. Please limit your comments to 3 minutes. Comments may be submitted prior to the meeting to be read in as part of the official record.
- 3. Public Comment regarding City Center: Opportunity for the Public to address the Planning Commission with comments related to City Center design/development.
- 4. Discussion/Possible Action: Approval of meeting minutes 2/2/2023
- 5. Discussion/Possible Action: Final review of Nonconformity Use Certificate for Rocky Mountain K9 business at 650 W. 4200 N.
- 6. Discussion/Possible Action: Oakley Bench Subdivision (~570 W. Weber Canyon Road) update regarding driveway access.
- 7. Discussion/Possible Action: Oakley Diner Signage application
- 8. **Discussion:** Questions for Oakley City Survey and plan to proceed.
- 9. City Planner/Commissioner items:
 - a. Invitation of Commissioners to water presentation to City Council, March 8th at 7:00 p.m. Presentation by Doug Clyde.

10. Adjourn

1. Call to order and roll call:

MINUTES

- a) Planning Commission: Chairman Cliff Goldthorpe; Commission Members: Richard Bliss, Kent Woolstenhulme, Jan Manning (Zoom) Absent: Doug Evans, Steve Maynes
- b) City Staff: Stephanie Woolstenhulme, City Planner; Tristin Leavitt, City Treasurer

 c) Other: Tom Smart, Brent Turner, David Kitchen, Tom Tosti, Nancy Tosti, Wes Harwood, David Diehl, Deb Sheldon, Trish Murphy Cone, Becky Lamphier, Rebecca Roberts

Zoom: Sherrie Keller, Nichole Miller, J Bingham, KC Jones, Katie's iPhone, Kelly Kimber

Public Comment: This is an opportunity for the Public to address the Planning Commission
with items that are not listed on the agenda or items which are on agenda but not as a
public hearing. Please limit your comments to 3 minutes. Comments may be submitted prior
to the meeting to be read in as part of the official record.

None.

 Public Comment regarding City Center: Opportunity for the Public to address the Planning Commission with comments related to City Center design/development.

Tom Tosti asks what the progress is on City Center. **Chairmam Cliff Goldthorpe** responds that we are waiting for them to bring us their new conceptual ideas. Planning Commission is in the process of compiling their list of how things should look.

Rebecca Roberts asks for an update on City Center, unfamiliar with on-goings. Asks who the developer is that the city is waiting on for conceptual ideas. **Chairman Cliff Goldthorpe** responds that the developer is Steve Smith. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** fills the public in on the history of City Center and the surrounding properties. Near Future there will be city survey questions to solicite public comment.

Deb Sheldon asks if Dutch's has been purchased. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** responds that it is under negotiations, but nothing has been finalized.

Stephanie Woolstenhulme gets clarification that he is speaking of the ordinance relating to disposal of city property that just passed. She shares that this question is more on City Council level. It was written to be more in line with State Code. **Councilmember Tom Smart** clarifies that our city code was outdated. It was treated the same way you treat used equipment. Have to put it out there and sell to the highest bidder. The city adopted the same code that 90% of other cities use. **Kent Woolstenhulme** shares that his understanding is that the property has not been sold. When the Master Plan process is done, whoever does it, he believes the city has to accept other offers besides just Steve Smith's. The city does not have to put it out to bid, but other people can come in and make an offer. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** interjects her personal feelings that with the old code they would have to go with the highest bidder which is not always in the best interest of the city. This gives the city more flexibility in doing what is best for the city.

Rebecca Roberts feels that keeping the property as a lease is better for the city rather than selling it. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** makes her aware that if she has thoughts on that, she should share them with City Council because that would be their call rather than Planning Commission.

Nancy Tosti makes a comment to the public in attendance, to make sure the city has their

contact information to receive the survey. Also asks for clarification on the two leases associated with the Diner. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** clarifies that Lease 1 will continue as a long-term lease or be sold due to the permanent infrastructure that is on it. Lease 2 is not just for construction, it will also be used until the full scale development of this property happens. After construction is complete, lease 2 property will probably help with the bottom operations of the Diner until something more permanent happens with the property.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme informs the public that if they want to stay informed of what the city is doing, they can subscribe to the State Noticing website. They will get the notices sent to their inbox.

4. Discussion/Possible Action: Approval of meeting minutes 2/2/2023

Richard Bliss makes a motion to approve the meeting minutes of 2/2/2023. **Kent Woolstenhulme** seconds the motion. **All in favor.**

5. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Final review of Nonconformity Use Certificate for Rocky Mountain K9 business at 650 W. 4200 N.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares the following:

Premise of a Non-Conformity Certificate means we will allow them to operate in compliance with our code.

Proposal:

The applicant wishes to obtain Non-Conformity Certificate for business, Rocky Mountain K9.

Findings of Fact:

- 1. Located at approximately 650 W. 4200 N. Residential lot containing an existing single-family residence and accessory garage.
- 2. Property is RR-1 zoning 1 development right per acre.
- 3. Previous RR-2 zoining prior to map change.
- 4. Business is operated out of residential home as home occupation.
- 5. Current Land Use code 13-4-19 indicates that "Kennels, animal boarding and care" are not a permitted use in RR1. Permitted with Conditional Use Permit in RR2. Not currently permitted as home occupation because code 13-9-3(B)(7) on home occupations requires compliance with code 13-4-19 for home occupations "that correspond to or resemble" the listed uses (Kennels).
- 6. Previous code as relevant: Attachment A below, home occupations.
- 8/31/2022 Planning Commission approved a temporary, 6-month Non-Conformity
 Certificate in order to allow business to continue while full review of history, code, and
 business operations was being prepared. Commission directed certificate to be
 reviewed and final determination made after 6 months.
- 8. 10+ complaints submitted to City Planner from adjacent neighbor via email, phone and Facebook. Complainant referred repeatedly to Summit County Animal Control and Summit County Law Enforcement.

Summit County Animal Control issued verbal warning for barking dogs approximately
 11/4/2022. Given 10 days to rectify. Decibal reader installed.

Background:

Applicant purchased the property in 2/2020. Business receipts showing active dog training/boarding business in 2019. Current code at that time could have been deemed this business a home occupation (see Attachment A) as boarding/kennels were not an allowable use in residential zone. 5/2021 Oakley City adopted a zoning map that changed parcel from RR-2 to RR-1. 8/2022 applicant desired an Oakley Business License. No previous license required or issued for business at this location due to code of home occupations. Kennels/Boarding not currently permitted on the property because property is now in RR-1 per 13-4-19. Non-Conformity Certificate required to continue a previously legal use. Planning Commission duscussed in meeting on 8/31/2022 and approved Non-Conformity Certificate for 6 months to then be reviewed.

Suggested Questions to be Addressed:

- 1. Rocky Mountain K9 indicates business "evolved". Nonconformity requires business to remain within scope of original, legal use. How has the business evolved since it began? Is it possible to return to original type of business? David Kitchen's Answer Dog board and train evolved to grooming located in Kamas which is unrelated. Does group lessons off site so that is unrelated as well. Needs the ability to continue to train dogs bring them in for a couple of nights at a time. Did obtain a Summit County Animal License which allows up to 10 dogs which includes his 3 dogs.
- How many dogs are outside at one time? Would it be functional to restrict number of dogs simultaneously outside to number allowed for a normal residence? David Kitchen's Answer – Was not asked thus not answered.

Possible Conditions of Approval:

- As previous home occupation code in place at the time business was begun required businesses to only operate within the home, and as Non-Conformity Certificate references the legal operations of this business, allow Rocky Mountain K9 to continue to do business within the walls of the home only.
- 2. Allow Rocky Mountain K9 to continue to operate within the scope of business as described by applicant.
- 3. Because Summit County Animal Control laws (noise and kennel licensure) were in place at time business began, Commission may require Rocky Mountain K9 to operate at all times in conformance with County Animal Control laws, in addition to other condiditions.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that the point tonight is to answer if the scope of work is similar enough to the original scope of work to allow to continue.

Chairman Cliff Goldthorpe makes the decision to open it up to the public for comment.

Nancy Tosti questions noise ordinance and why the city is looking at David Kitchen. She lives a couple of doors down and works from home. She hears other dogs barking and running around but never noise from Mr. Kitchen's. Wants to know why the city is looking at Mr. Kitchen and not the other homes. Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme responds that we are not looking at this as the nuisance of a dog, we are looking at it in terms of his business.

183 184 Sherrie Keller (zoom chat) states that if this is approved it is a terrible idea. The Keller's 185 were unable to attend meeting. 186 187 Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that if anyone has problems with result from 188 tonight, either way, the next step is the appeal process through our Appeal Authority. 189 190 Chairman Cliff Goldthorpe entertains a motion for the Non-Conformity certificate. 191 Kent Woolstenhulme makes a motion for the final approval of the Non-Conforming Certificate as contained in the scope of work presented by the applicant. 192 193 Jan Manning seconds the motion. 194 All in favor. 195 196 Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme makes Mr. Kitchen aware that if there are noise 197 ordinance issues it will revoke the Non-Conforming Certificate. 198 199 6. Discussion/Possible Action: Oakley Bench Subdivision (~570 W. Weber Canyon Road) 200 update regarding driveway access. 201 202 **Wes Harwood** presents the following to Planning Commission: 203 Steepness of driveway at 8 or 9% at the steepest 204 Access to cross the ditch – been working with ditch company to obtain an access 205 easement. 206 Not asking for a zone change 207 3 hydrants will be on the property 208 Current driveway does not meet current county code – current driveway is 209 dangerous. 210 Driveway now comes at an angle so you can't see back. 211 Feels a safer driveway is what they are bringing to Weber Canyon Road. 212 He has been cognisant of what the Planning Commission has wanted. 213 Has worked closely with the City Engineer on the driveway. 214 215 Richard Bliss asks where he will be pulling water from. Wes Harwood states that Dallas' 216 recommendation is to pull from North Bench Estates and loop it. Would still like to talk to 217 Dallas, but he will do whatever is needed. Richard Bliss also has concerns with how much fill 218 is over the pipe due to construction traffic. Wes Harwood clarifies that all construction 219 traffic will come up existing driveway. In talking with engineers, the rating on the pipe will 220 hold a cement truck. Richard Bliss questions that Summit County has issued the 221 encroachment permit for a building permit for the road. Wes Harwood clarifies that Summit 222 County issued an encroachment permit and stamped the driveway design. 223 224 Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme asks if the corner has been addressed by the South 225 Summit Fire Marshall. Will it be a problem for fire access. Wes Harwood responds that Kent 226 Leavitt's biggest concern was having the hydrants up there. 227 228 Wes Harwood asks what he will need to change now for the next meeting. Planner

Stephanie Woolstenhulme responds with the following:

230
231
232 233
234
235
236
237 238
239
240
241
242 243
244
245
246 247
248
249
250
251 252
253
254
255 256
257
258
259
260 261
262
263
264
265 266
267
268
269 270

272

273274

275

276

- Driveway looks different on what he presented tonight vs. what was on the original plat.
- Plat note issues from the original Staff Report need to be addressed if they haven't already.
- Include a plat note on the plat stating both easement agreements.
- Show water line easements on plat so that Oakley City is ensured that they have access to the water main.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that once it comes back before Planning Commission with Preliminary Plat, more items can be addressed at that point. Then it will go to City Council for Final Plat which will be a Public Hearing and then go to the County before it can be recorded.

7. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Oakley Diner Signage application

General discussion amongst Plannning Commission members regarding the signage of the Diner.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shows where all the signs will be located and what their sizes will be and makes Planning Commission aware that this does not include security lights or parking lights. Explains that current code allows for four signs due to the square footage on SR 32 and square footage on Weber Canyon Road. Not sure if we can stop four signs, but certain things can be put in place like if they can be made dimmable or have shut off hours put in place.

Jay From Allied Signs offers some clarification for the Planning Commission.

- Signs not set to be flashing
- Possibility to dim any of the LED lights (neon, not bulbs)
- Can control all of the signs through a timer individually or as a group

General discussion between Planning Commission and Public.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme makes it known that sign 1, 2, & 4 are possible per code, just need to determine size. Sign 3 is questionable depending on whether it is a freestanding sign or not. If it is a freestanding sign, it falls within the square footage alottment. The two in question, as far as square footage alottment, are the signs on the building. They are proposed bigger than what the code says for Dark Sky. **Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme** confirms the following conditions with Planning Commission:

- Doing away with sign 3 in favor of keeping the signs on the building as proposed.
- All tubular neon lighting needs to be dimmable 2 on building.
- Timer on free standing sign on SR 32 off by 10 PM.
- Losing right to free standing sign on Weber Canyon Road.

Jay with Allied Signs will have a conversation with the owner tomorrow regarding the conditions and will let him know to bring it back to Planning Commission so it is not one sided.

Richard Bliss makes a motion to approve sign permit with conditions that allow signs 1, 2, & 4 with square footages as proposed and eliminate sign 3 in exchange for the footage overages. The signs be constructed with the guidelines of dimmable lights to be compliant to meet the upcoming restrictions of the Dark Sky initiative. Free standing sign number 2 be turned off by 10 PM in compliance with Dark Sky initiative.

Kent Woolstenhulme seconds the motion.

All in Favor.

8. **Discussion:** Questions for Oakley City Survey and plan to proceed.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme presents the following to Planning Commission:

- Kelly Kimber is working on putting a committee together for Community Engagement.
- First order of business will be the survey.
- Longevity of the committee could be used for emergency communications.
- What questions does the Planning Commission want on the survey especially in regards to City Center.
- Kelly's biggest concern is getting a solid database in place with resident contact information.
- Get list of questions to Stephanie within the next week will constantly be evolving until survey goes out.
- Mayor wants final approval on the questions.
- 9. City Planner/Commissioner items:
 - b. Invitation of Commissioners to water presentation to City Coucil, March 8th at 7:00 p.m. Presentation by Doug Clyde.

Planner Stephanie Woolstenhulme shares that if the majority can't be there, then Doug Clyde would like to present at a Planning Commission meeting. Planning Commission members in attendance tonight are able to make it to the City Council meeting.

10. Adjourn

Richard Bliss makes a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Minutes accepted as to form this_

day of Would 202

Cliff Goldthorpe, Chairman

Tristin Leavitt, City Treasure