LAYTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 12, 2019

PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Tricia Pilny, Commissioners Clint Morris, Trevor Steenblik, Robert Van Drunen, George Wilson, Brian Allen, Jeremy Manning, Tyson Roberts

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chairman Brett Nilsson

OTHERS PRESENT: Staff: Asst. City Attorney Mason Kjar, CED Director Chad Wilkinson, City Planner Tim Watkins, Planner II Kem Weaver, City Traffic Engineer Steve Jackson and Planning Commission Secretary Brittney Whitecar

The work meeting was held in the Chambers Conference Room of the Layton City Center at 5:30 PM.

1. WELCOME & ANNOUNCEMENTS (5:30 PM)  
Chairman Nilsson welcomed the Commission to the meeting.

2. PLANNING COMMISSION TRAINING (5:35 PM)  
In the interest of time due to a large agenda, Mr. Mason Kjar cancelled the training.

3. WINDSOR MEADOWS PHASE 2 AMENDED - SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT  
Planner II Kem Weaver explained that the applicant intends to further subdivide by separating one lot into two. This proposal aligns with the Layton City General Plan and the lot size standards for the zoning district.

4. WILLOW TREE PHASE 1 AMENDED - SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT  
Planner II Kem Weaver showed a narrow 16’ wide strip of land between two residential properties that will change ownership. The homeowner to the east currently owns the strip and intends to sell it to the owner of the west lot to increase their buildable area.

5. RC WILLEY 2ND DETACHED SIGN - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
City Planner Tim Watkins showed the intended location of a second sign on 1400 West. Layton City Code allows for one detached sign per business, and any additional sign requires a conditional use. The proposed primary pole sign, and secondary monument style sign will be 850 feet apart, which exceeds the minimum sign distance requirement in the Layton City Code. The secondary monument sign will be internally lit and outside of the clear view area.
6. **LAYTON TEMPLE - PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION**

Planner II Kem Weaver showed the proposed plat with two lots and some areas along street frontages to be provided for right-of-way dedication. The temple will be on lot #1, with an existing home remaining on lot #2. The current residents of the home on lot #2 will stay until the home is vacated, at which time the lot will be dissolved into the temple lot as a consolidation of the two parcels. For the time being, there is an easement on lot #2 to allow for added parking and a landscape buffer.

Per the recent traffic study, acceleration/deceleration and curb & gutter are to be added on Rosewood Lane and Oak Hills Drive.

7. **LAYTON TEMPLE - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

City Planner Tim Watkins shared renderings of the building while pointing out setbacks that allow for the proposed 75’ building height. The building has spires that exceed 75’. Per Layton City Code, architectural features such as steeples, spires and parapet walls are permitted to exceed the maximum building height.

615 parking spaces are provided as shown on the plans which meets the standard for a religious structure of this size.

Landscape and lighting consistent with City standards are proposed surrounding the building and throughout the parking area. Lights are designed pointing onto the building and inward toward the interior of the lot to limit light exiting the property.

City Traffic Engineer Steve Jackson showed the proposed Gentile Street/Oak Hills Drive/Rosewood Lane intersection. 1350 East will become a hammerhead dead end in order to create more of a standard 4-way intersection at the location, with the addition of turn lanes. Homeowners on 1350 East have been alerted and will be further informed about the plans before the road is blocked.

Oak Hills Drive is owned by the Utah Department of Transportation. UDOT has determined that a traffic light will not be added to this intersection in the near future. UDOT does not anticipate adding a crosswalk on Oakhills Drive because of the safety hazard presented by the high speed limit proximity to the Fairfield/Oak Hills intersection.

8. **PLEASANT HILLS LOT #825 PRUD – REZONE**

Planner Tim Watkins introduced the item. This PRUD adheres to the PRUD Zoning Ordinance prior to the recently passed text amendments because the application was received by staff before the PRUD text amendment was passed.

The strip of land behind the home located at 2490 North 950 West will be divided, creating 4 new lots that will be accessed by a shared 26’ wide private drive adjacent to the existing home. An open detention basin that doubles as green space will be provided at the East end of the new lots. The existing garage at 2490 N 950 W must be removed to make way for the private drive. Snow removal and trash collection as well as utilities are to be maintained by an HOA.

9. **C-TH ZONING DISTRICT - TEXT AMENDMENT**
Staff is preparing changes to the design standards in the C-TH chapter of the municipal code. Limited Common Space is proposed that could supply individual units with a private outdoor area that has limited visibility to the public through appropriate application of fencing and landscaping.

The Planning Commission discussed whether the proposed limited common space and landscape guidelines are too specific and would push developers to rezone to Mixed Use because the MU zone has less restrictive landscaping and fencing requirements.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6:55 PM, Vice Chair Pilny closed the work session to prepare for the regular meeting.

Brittney Whitecar,
Planning Commission Secretary
November 12, 2019

PLANNING COMMISSION

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Brett Nilsson, Vice Chair Tricia Pilny, Commissioners Clint Morris, Trevor Steenblik, Robert Van Drunen George Wilson, Brian Allen, Jeremy Manning, Tyson Roberts

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioners Brian Allen & Robert Van Drunen

OTHERS PRESENT: Staff: Asst. City Attorney Mason Kjar, CED Director Chad Wilkinson, City Planner Tim Watkins, Planner II Kem Weaver, City Traffic Engineer Steve Jackson, and Planning Commission Secretary Brittney Whitecar

The meeting was held in the City Council Chambers of the Layton City Center. Vice Chair Pilny called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM. The pledge of allegiance was recited and an invocation was given by Commissioner Roberts.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: NONE

PUBLIC REVIEW

Commissioner Manning motioned to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Morris seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

1. WINDSOR MEADOWS PHASE 2 – SUBDIVISION 1ST AMENDMENT

The applicant, Cindy Nielsen, is requesting to amend Lot 23 of the Windsor Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision located at 1050 North 2925 West. Lot 23 is surrounded by other R-1-6 lots within the Windsor Meadows Subdivision to the east, north and south. To the west is Clearfield City with single family developments.

Planner Kem Weaver introduced the item.

Background: When the subdivision was developed, the City required a fire turn around be platted as part of Lot 23. This requirement resulted in making Lot 23 the size of two R-1-6 lots. The fire turn around right-of-way is no longer required due to the street being improved and extended further to the south.

The applicant is the owner of Lot 23 and is requesting to split the lot into two R-1-6 lots and remove the platted fire turn around from the lot. The City encourages the amendment to remove the turn around right-of-way from the lot and provide an opportunity to build another home.
Both lots will meet the R-1-6 zoning requirements with regards to area and street frontage or lot width. Lot 201 has an existing home that is owned by the applicant. Lot 202 is vacant property with the opportunity to build a home on the lot once the amended plat is recorded.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the amended plat for Windsor Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision, 1st Amendment subject to meeting City requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums.

**Public Comment:**
No Comments were made.

**Planning Commission Discussion:**
No Comments were made.

**MOTION:**
Commissioner Roberts motioned that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the amended plat for Windsor Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision, 1st Amendment subject to meeting all City requirements as outlined in staff memorandums. Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

2. **WILLOW TREE PHASE 1 – SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT**
   The applicant, Erik Craythorne, is requesting to amend Lot 104 of the Willow Tree Phase 1 Subdivision located at 600 West 450 South. Lot 104 is surrounded by other R-1-8 lots within the Willow Tree Subdivision to the north, west and south. Single family residential development with R-1-10 zoning is to the east.

   Planner Kem Weaver introduced the item.

   **Background:** The applicant is the owner of Lot 104 and is requesting to combine this corner lot with an approximate 16 foot strip of land to the east of the lot. The desire is to combine the remnant parcel with the corner lot to provide a larger buildable lot area. The current lot meets the R-1-8 zoning requirements with regards to area and street frontage or lot width.

   **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the amended plat for Willow Tree Phase 1 Subdivision, 1st Amendment subject to meeting City requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums.

   **Public Comment:**
No Comments were made.

**Planning Commission Discussion:**
No Comments were made.

**MOTION:**
Commissioner Wilson motioned that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the amended plat for Willow Tree Phase 1 Subdivision, 1st Amendment subject to meeting all City Requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums. Commissioner Manning seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

3. **RC WILLEY’S 2ND DETACHED SIGN – CONDITIONAL USE**

   The applicant, Leon Deitlaf, is requesting a conditional use permit for a second detached sign for the New RC Willey Store located at approximately 2205 North 1400 West. RC Willey’s primary detached sign is proposed be located along I-15 for visibility to motorists traveling along the freeway. The second sign is proposed along 1400 West for visibility to motorists traveling north/south along 1400 West.

   Planner Tim Watkins introduced the item.

   **Background:**

   The applicant, Leon Deitlaf, is requesting conditional use permit approval for a second detached sign to provide signage along 1400 West. RC Willey’s site is over 10 acres in size and has more than 800 feet of street frontage, which makes it a candidate for a second detached sign as it meets the 5 acre minimum zoning code requirement, and it is a corner lot. Corner lots, no matter the size, are eligible to apply for a conditional use permit for a second detached sign. RC Willey’s primary detached sign is proposed be located along I-15 for visibility to motorists traveling along the freeway. The second sign is proposed along 1400 West for visibility to motorists traveling north/south along 1400 West.

   **Staff Review:**

   The second detached sign is a monument-style sign that is internally lit. The sign measures 16 feet tall from the average grade to the top of the cornice. It is also 16 feet wide from the base of the sign to the top. Because the base of the sign is wider than 2 feet it must be outside of the clear view area. The proposed site plan shows the sign setback 15 feet from the public right-of-way.

   **Sign Regulations for Monument Signs taller than 6 feet**

   CP-3 Sign Height Limit - 35 feet above average grade (Proposed Sign is 16 feet tall)

   Minimum Setback - Signs that are in total area larger than 200 square feet shall be setback a minimum of 10 feet from the property line. (Proposed sign is setback 16 feet).

   Clear View Area – Signs with a base greater than 2 feet wide are not allowed in the clear view areas. (Proposed Sign is not in the clear view area).

   Maximum Size – Both signs combined shall not exceed 300 square feet total. (Both signs combine to an area of 280 square feet).

   **Sign Regulations for a Second Detached Sign**

   Separation between Detached Signs – The distance between detached signs shall be no less than 200 lineal feet. (The separation between the detached signs is 850 ft, which meets the minimum separation requirement.)

   **Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends approval of the second detached sign subject to the following conditions:

1. All required permits shall be obtained before construction begins.

2. The sign shall meet all City ordinances and staff requirements from the Fire Safety, Engineering and Planning Divisions.

3. The combination of both detached signs shall not exceed three hundred (300) square feet.

4. The 200-foot minimum separation between detached signs on the same lot shall be maintained.

5. Electronic Message Centers shall only operate between 6:00 am and 10:00 pm.

Electronic Message Centers shall have a minimum of three (3) second intervals between screen changes, which does not allow for video animation.

The primary sign is located in the Freeway Sign Corridor area, where signs are allowed up to 45 feet tall. The primary sign will have an electronic message center that will be used to advertise to motorists traveling on I-15. The second detached sign is proposed to be a monument sign that will not include an electronic message center. Both signs are below the 300 square foot maximum size for all detached signs.

Public Comment:
No Comments were made.

Planning Commission Discussion:
No Comments were made.

MOTION: Commissioner Steenblik motioned that the Planning Commission grant conditional use approval for the second detached sign subject to the applicant meeting City requirements as outlined in staff reports. Commission Morris seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

4. LAYTON UTAH TEMPLE – PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT
The applicant, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints is requesting preliminary plat approval for the Layton Temple Subdivision located at approximately 1400 East Oak Hills Drive. The proposed subdivision is adjacent to single family and multiple family residential uses to the west, single family residential and church uses to the north, and residential with agriculture / vacant areas to the south and east.

Community Development Director Chad Wilkinson stated that there are two separate items regarding the temple; a preliminary plat as well as a conditional use. They will be handled separately by staff. The City engineer is present to address traffic and utilities. This is a conditional use on the property, meaning that, per Utah Code, it is an allowed use on the property with a conditional use permit.
Planner Kem Weaver introduced the preliminary plat.

**Background:**
The primary purpose for the plat is to dedicate street right-of-way for Oak Hills Drive and Rosewood Lane. The dedication consists of a 12.5-foot strip of land along the frontage of both Lots 1 and 2 on Rosewood Lane. The dedication also consists of a 10-foot strip of land along the frontage of Lot 1 on Oak Hills Drive.

The preliminary plat consists of two lots. Lot 1 is a larger 11.87 acre property to be used for the temple site with frontage on both Oak Hills Drive and Rosewood Lane. Lot 2 is 0.90 acres, and will continue to be used as a legal, non-conforming single family residential use with direct frontage on Rosewood Lane. The Church has ownership of Lot 2 and is placing a parking easement on the east portion of the lot to include as the temple’s parking count and buffering. This easement area will be improved with parking and landscaping with the site development of the temple.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the preliminary plat for the Layton Temple Subdivision subject to meeting City requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums to the developer.

**Public Comment:**
No Comments were made.

**Planning Commission Discussion:**
Commissioner Roberts asked what the purpose of the parking easement on lot #2 is. Mr. Weaver stated that lot #2 would not meet the minimum lot size for the zone without the easement incorporated as part of its lot size.

**MOTION:**
Commissioner Manning motioned to approve the preliminary plat for the Layton Temple subject to meeting all City requirements as outlined in Staff memorandums. Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

5. **LAYTON UTAH TEMPLE – CONDITIONAL USE**
The applicant, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints is requesting conditional use permit approval for a new temple to be located on 11.87 acres located at approximately 1400 East Oakhills Drive, with access from Oak Hills Drive and Rosewood Lane.

Planner Tim Watkins introduced the item.

**Background:**
The applicant, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints is requesting conditional use permit approval for a new temple to be located on an 11.87 acre site, with access from Oak Hills Drive and Rosewood Lane. Oak Hills Drive / State Route 109 is an arterial street/ highway that serves as an east-west connector between Highway 89 to the east, and Fairfield Road, Fort Lane and Main Street to the west.
Surrounding uses include single family and multi-family residential with R-M1 zoning to the west, single family residential development and a church site to the north of Oak Hills Drive with R-1-10 zoning, and low density single family homes with vacant/agricultural land to the south and east zoned as A (Agriculture). This vacant/agricultural property is designated as Neighborhood Residential in the General Plan Land Use Map.

The current zoning of the property is A (Agriculture) which allows for Church/Temple/Rectory as a Conditional Use. A religious structure such as a Temple fits the Zoning Ordinance definition of a “Community Use” which is to serve an educational, recreational, religious or governmental need of the community in general.

As shown on the attached site plan, the temple building will be located at the center of the site with pedestrian walkways leading to outdoor plaza spaces next to the temple and building entrances. The site and landscaping plans features substantial landscaping with numerous trees and shrub areas proposed along property boundaries, streets and between parking areas.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the conditional use for the Church meetinghouse with the following conditions.

1. All parking light lamps shall be shielded to ensure the lighting remains on the site.

2. Any lighting used to highlight architecture, landscaping or signs shall be focused to the interior of the site, with no beams of light extending beyond the site property or pointing to any surrounding properties or street right-of-way areas.

3. The site and building shall meet all Fire, Engineering and Building requirements as written in memorandums for site plan reviews.

**Planning Commission Discussion:**

Commissioner Morris asked if the two proposed entrances to the temple site are sufficient to accommodate access to over 600 parking spaces. Engineer Steve Jackson stated that an additional entrance to the South is a possibility in the future as the road develops.

City Engineer Steve Jackson explained the proposed changes to Oak Hills Drive and its connection to Gentile Street and Rosewood Lane. He showed the hammerhead proposed at 1350 East and said that extensive traffic studies have been done that have led to this design. Traffic flow numbers have not met UDOT’s standards that would warrant construction of a traffic light at the intersection.

Commissioner Steenblik asked what will happen when the Highway 89 interchange is constructed at Oak Hills Drive and how that additional traffic will be addressed. He asked if the possibility of the road widening has been addressed. Mr. Jackson said that UDOT and the applicant have discussed and worked that possibility out.

Commissioner Pilny asked for clarity on how heavy traffic leaving the temple and wishing to make a left turn out of Rosewood would be accommodated. Steve Jackson said that people may choose to travel West on Rosewood and turn left or right onto Fairfield Lane.
Public Comment:

City Attorney Mason Kjar gave the public guidelines about the purpose of the conditional use and the type of comments that are helpful. This item presents the Planning Commission an administrative decision, meaning that per State Law, the Planning Commission must approve this item as long as the application meets City Code. The Planning Commissions job is to make sure that the application meets code via discussion and public comment.

Harold Ray 2177 E. 250 N., Layton UT – Harold said he has heard that things are being “Looked at” as far as traffic, but there does not seem to be any solidarity. Harold stated that he had seen the Layton City 2015 traffic master plan, which shows a roundabout at this location on Oak Hills Drive, which doesn’t appear to be present on this plan. Steve Jackson addressed that the City has met with UDOT regarding how this specific application will affect Oak Hills Drive. The previously discussed roundabout does not prove feasible at this location, given the now present addition of the temple and the traffic impact that it presents.

Richard Chesarek 813 E. Gentile Street, Layton UT – Asked if the conditional use for the temple would still be approved without changing Oak Hills Drive. Steve Jackson said yes, the road functions at a C level, which is not ideal, but it is acceptable. Richard asked about what happens when Oak Hills widens into a 4-lane road. Mr. Jackson stated that UDOT has already acquired an extra 5 feet of land on either side of the Oak Hills to accommodate the future road widening.

Richard expressed his opinion that a third entrance/exit is necessary for such a large building for safety and that the fire department should not allow for only two exits. Mr. Jackson said that a third entrance may be developed in the future but for the time being, City Staff has approved the two entrances as shown on the plans. Richard expressed his concern about light and how it will shine onto surrounding properties. Chad Wilkinson stated that Layton Code details that light must shine toward the interior of a property as to avoid directly shining onto adjacent properties. Light reflection is not detailed in the code, as it is not possible to avoid light reflecting off buildings.

Robert Newbold 274 N 1550 E., Layton UT – Stated that he lives on the opposite side of Oak Hills Drive and intends to walk to the temple. He asked why he does not see a crosswalk or traffic light that would allow for pedestrian travel. Traffic Engineer Steve Jackson stated that UDOT has determined that this intersection does not meet criteria for a light, and a crosswalk would be unsafe without one because of the high speed limit on Oak Hills Drive.

James Lindeman 1352 E. Rosewood Lane – Expressed his concern about the increased traffic on Rosewood Lane, which is a narrow road with limited sidewalk access. City Attorney Mason Kjar stated that addressing other parcels is not in the scope of the Planning Commission’s abilities. Traffic Engineer Steve Jackson stated that per the traffic study, most of the traffic came from Oak Hills Drive. Only 10 per cent of the vehicles in the area turned onto or off of Rosewood Lane. The City cannot force the applicant to make improvements to Rosewood lane where it is not directly adjacent to the property at hand.

J.T. Whitworth 1368 E. Maple Way, Layton UT – Asked if the applicant has submitted all the proper documentation and information to secure this Conditional Use Permit. Vice Chair Pilny said yes and it may be approved this evening.
Ron Richins 1580 E. Oak Hills Drive, Layton UT – Asked if there is a traffic light proposed at the sight. Steve Jackson said no because the results of the recent traffic study do not require one.

Richard Chesarek 813 E Gentile, Layton UT – Spoke about about how fast people drive on Oak Hills and said that not putting a light in is criminal. He said that the police department does not seem to patrol this road. Vice Chair Pilny said that UDOT is to keep their eye on Oak Hills but the City has no control over the light.

Harold Ray, 2177 E. 250 N., Layton UT - Asked if the traffic study that continues to be reference was performed by Layton City or by UDOT. Steve Jackson said that the applicant hired Hales Engineering to do the traffic study. Applicants are often required to hire an outside engineering firm to perform traffic studies where traffic impacts are foreseen. Their findings are weighed against UDOT’s regional transportation plan for the area.

Applicant Discussion:

Brent Morgan with Ensign Engineering said he heard a concern about Rosewood Lane. He stated that Rosewood is currently 35 foot wide but will be extended to 60’ at the ingress/egress and curb and gutter will be added.

MOTION:

Commissioner Manning motioned to approve the conditional use for the Layton Temple with the conditions as listed in Staff recommendations. Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:08 PM, Commissioner Wilson motioned to close the public meeting. Commissioner Roberts seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned.

-----------------------------------------------------------------

Brittney Whitecar,
Planning Commission Secretary