

**Plain City Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
January 8, 2015**

Minutes of the Plain City Planning Commission held on Thursday January 8, 2015 at 7:00 pm., located at the Council Chambers of the Plain City, Hall, Plain City Utah 84404.

Present: Chairman Blake Neil
Vice Chair Buddy Sadler
John Leonardi
Jarod Maw
Ed Hall
Mark Osenbach
Staff Kathy Campbell

Attendees: Erik Craythorne, Cam Preston, James Lamb, Robert Lamb, Cody Rhees, Jeff Hales, Camie Clontz, Tom Henroid, Mark Hampton, Ross Taylor, Kevin Bailey, Liz Taylor, Val Taylor

Called to order: Chairman Blake Neil conducted the meeting, Chairman Neil gave an invocation.

Public Comments: Jim Lamb stated that the developer for Fremont Meadows has ignored the irrigation ditch that goes down 4700 West and that the developer is not developing the roads outside of the subdivision. Therefore the development of the roads will become the burden of the city.

Discussion/Motion: Taylor Parks Final Approval at 2420 N 4100 W

Neil explained that the Planning Commission had already given final approval and that it had been sent to the city council. Then it came to light that there was a civil complaint in 1929 and that a legal reading was needed from the cities attorney. Therefore it was sent back to the planning commission. We have met and the city attorney's finding was that it was only a complaint and that the Taylor Parks subdivision can now go back to the city council for final approval. The commission had a brief discussion about the previous recommendations from the October 13, 2014 planning commission meeting concerning Taylor Parks.

MOTION: Commission member Leonardi made a motion to recommend final approval for the Taylor Parks subdivision located at 2420 N 4100 W contingent on the following items. 1. A 6 foot chain link fence to be put around the perimeter of parcel A with two six foot gates too allow for access. 2. The turnaround located between lots 11-12 on 2400 N be shifted to phase two of this development. 3. Identify the house located North of 2475 N as a legal non-conforming structure according to the city code. Commission member Hall seconded the motion. VOTE: Commission member Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach, voted aye. Motion carried.

Discussion/Motion: S-Curve Estates Subdivision Final Approval at 2325 N 2800 W

Mr. Hales stated that there were two items that he had been ask to clarify, the fence line and the easement for the drainage. Mr. Hales said that he had met with Mrs. Barnes on the fence line agreement and that she had signed the agreement documents. He also stated that he had the easement documents signed for the drainage and he would record those documents the next day. Mr. Hales further explained that 2450 W was extending to the west. Mr. Leonardi questioned the length of the road on 2850 W that the road did not appear to him that the road was following city code. Mr. Leonardi continued that it appeared to him that the road was too long. Mr. Hales responded that a three way intersection counts as a break when doing the measuring for the length with blocks. Mr. Hales also stated that road breaks cannot go to the west due to the fact that within a 100 feet is the canal. Mr. Hales then stepped up to the planning commission and showed them the aerial of the area and further explained that the canal is to the west which makes a 3 way intersections instead of 4 way intersections. Neil referred to the city code 11-5-3 (B-3-a & b). Mr. Hales while pointing to the plat with the planning commission stated that 2450 W was a natural spot for an intersection therefore extending all the way from the other subdivision. Sadler ask that there be a temporary turn around on 2850 W and 2800 W Mr. Hales stated that 2850 W and 2825 W is one lot deep and would not need a turnaround. Sadler explained that they have required turnarounds on other subdivisions and if they do not require Mr. Hales to do the same the subdivisions would be inconsistent. Osenbach ask to explain the difference in the front measurements and the back measurements on Lot 20. Mr. Hales explained that there is a slight curve with the property line. Osenbach also ask Mr. Hales if the paperwork that he had brought to the meeting had cleared everything up for Mrs. Barnes. Mr. Hales responded "yes" and that the paper work was in order. He continued that he had met with Mrs. Barnes and she had signed the documents.

MOTION: Commission member Sadler made a motion to recommend Final Approval for S-Curves Estates Subdivision at 2325 N 2800 W contingent on turnarounds at the end of 2850 W and 2800 W. and all of the requirements from the engineer. Commission member Maw seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach voted aye. Commission member Leonardi vote Nay. Motion carried.

Discussion/Motion: Fremont Meadows Subdivision Preliminary Approval at 1785 N 4400 W

Neil and Sadler stated that the last notes they had from the City Engineer was October 16, 2014 and the last revised plat that the commissioners had received was dated October 9, 2014. Sadler ask Mr. Craythorne if there had been any revised drawing after these dates? Mr. Craythorne responded "yes," that he had gave them to the City Engineer Brad Jensen. The drawings had been turned into the City Engineer and had addressed the previous issues that had been discussed. Mr. Craythorne clarified that the City Engineer had requested a traffic study. The traffic study had been done and completed. Mr. Craythorne ask if the planning commission had received the traffic study that had been requested. The Commission stated that yes they had received the study along with the city engineers report. Neil commented that the city engineer concurred with the findings of the traffic study. Mr. Craythorne stated that they had surveyed the irrigation ditch and had clarified that the irrigation ditch comes in on the east side. Mr. Craythorne stepped up to the planning commission and showed them where the ditch came in on the east side and tied into the irrigation ditch that goes west. Neil ask if Mr. Craythorne had sent the plats to the city engineer. Mr. Craythorne stated that he had and that he ask the City Engineer and the City Attorney what was needed from him concerning the road issues. Mr. Craythorne reported that they had requested that he do the traffic study. Neil clarified that the city council had requested the traffic study and that the city engineering had also requested the traffic study. Neil ask if there was a updated plat of the development. Mr. Craythorne explained that the change on the updated plat was the irrigation ditch. Neil explained that the engineers comments of October 16, 2014 number 4 states that the pedestrian ramps needs to be shown on the

plan. Hall ask if that could be taken care of on the final plat. Leonardi ask about the realignment of the road. Neil explained that he had not seen anything back from the City Attorney after the city council meeting addressing the road. The attorney had said that the code is not consistent. Erik commented that he had also spoken with the city attorney and that there are 3 different areas in the code that differed concerning the roads. Neil recounted that he had spoke with the mayor and that no one else had ever improved the road outside of the subdivision. That the mode of operation had not required that and that the ordnances needed to be changed so that they agree. Leonardi stated that something was needed from the city attorney and Neil agreed. Sadler stated that he was not comfortable giving preliminary approval without the city engineer's comments being addressed. Sadler ask about the 30 foot and 100 foot setbacks on the lot sizes. Mr. Craythorne said that when the plans are on the cad file they do measure at the correct setbacks. Sadler also detailed that on the north side of the 1900 N the property owners had already gave up 30 feet of their property and that they should not have to give up any more property for the road. Mr. Craythorne said that the width on the north side of the road will not change. That the VanMeeterns had already gave up their half width of the road and they would not have to give up any more. He also communicated that when the VanMeeterns had done their subdivision they had not been required to put in curb and cutter. Mr. Craythorne then ask why should the Fremont Meadows subdivisions put curb and gutter in for an existing subdivision, when the previous subdivisions had not been required to put curb and gutter in at all? Mr. Craythorne clarified that they will be dedicating their half of the road width from the south side of the road. That the traffic study was done with the dedication of the other half of the road being taken from the south side of 1900 N. Mr. Craythorne also stated that on Pioneer road the east side of the road will stay as it is now and that the road will not go on to the current property owners to the east. The center of the road will shift to the west and the improvements will take place from the current existing edge of the asphalt on the east and the road will shift to the west. Maw clarified that the road would not be encroaching on the property owners to the east. Mr. Craythorne replied that was correct. Mr. Craythorne remarked that Mrs. Kelley had informed him that she did not to want to lose any more property to asphalt. Sadler and Leonardi ask about lot 2 and the existing concrete Pad. Mr. Craythorne informed the commission that Mr. Hadley had put the dog run in and he understood why Mr. Calvert would say that the pad had been there for 30 years. In doing the subdivision there is enough room to adjust and leave the dog run with the existing home. Sadler stated that with lots 30 and 31 there is not enough footage. Mr. Craythorne explained that the lots would be shifted to add the correct required footage. Leonardi ask that the commission see the City Attorney's legal comments regarding the improvements before final. Maw stated that a lot had been done and that there was enough to go to final and that the commissioners needed a revised plat. Sadler stated that they had taken care of his concerns.

MOTION: Commission member Maw made a motion to give preliminary approval to Fremont Meadows at 1785 N 4400 W . Contingent upon the original review of Wasatch Civil Consulting on October 16, 2014 and legal response in regards to the improvements. Commission member Hall seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach voted aye. Motion carried.

Discussion/Motion: Jackson Ranch Preliminary approval at 1700 N 3300 W

Neil ask Mr. Henroid and Mr. Preston if they had any new drawings since October 24, 2014. Mr. Preston stated that they had met with the public works director and the city engineer in relation to the sewer. Neil responded that there was more than just issues with the sewer, that another access was also needed. Mr. Henroid replied that they have a road stubbed into 1900 N but that it is hard to build on property that you do not own. Mr. Henroid said that they would like to do this development in phases and that they would like to do phase 1 first which is 20 lots that would not require another

access. The access for phase 1 would come from the subdivision on the north. Hall ask for clarification that the access would come from 1700 N. Mr. Henroid replied "yes." Mr. Henroid explained that when they do phase 2 of the subdivision they would work with City Engineer and do a traffic study. He is asking for preliminary approval with the road access coming from the north and the road drawn in on their property going to 1975 N. Mr. Preston detailed that the development had been annexed into the Central Weber Sewer district. He continued that the thought process is to build an infrastructure for all the sewer on the south east corner so that in the future the sewer could go to the Central Weber once the properties are developed. Then it would go back down toward the sewer district and then be pumped. Mr. Preston stated that they had met with the city engineer and public works and this was the consensus. Mr. Henroid said that he would like to refresh everyone's memory that this was originally part of the 4-Mile Parkway project and that they had foreclosed on the property on the west. That originally the 4 Mile Parkway project was going to go to Central Weber Sewer District and that is why the area had been annexed in to Central Weber. He also stated that Central Weber is no longer interested in the sewer now that the 4-Mile project is dead. He continued that he understands that this is a difficult subdivision but they are applying for what the area is zoned for and will build the infrastructure that is required. Originally they had talked about putting a sewer pump on the south west up from that location and send the sewer to Plain City. That was not desired from the public works or the city engineer. They ask that the sewer flow out to the east and that is how it is now engineered. The sewer would then temporarily flow to the south east and be pumped to Plain City. After the properties to the east are developed the sewer would then go to Central Weber. Hall inquired if there would be a pump house station at that location. Mr. Preston clarified that it would be a permanent structure on lot 36 and would pump to 1700 W. Leonard ask if lot 46 would be redone because of the turnaround. Sadler said that he had expressed previously to turn those into a cul-de-sac because the road will never go through or the planning commissioners can make those lots restrictive. Leonard replied that with the next phase Kay Park will be land locked. Mr. Henroid said that they had found out that the code required a full road for access to the Kay Park property. Mr. Henroid expressed that a full road would be almost the full width of that lot and could there be a 20 foot easement instead. Sadler stated that flag lots are not allowed. Leonard cited the city code 11-5-2-E for Flag Lots. Flag lots shall not be created by subdividing property. Mr. Henroid said that they want to be neighborly but could there be a variance or easement for Kay Park. Sadler stated that the same lot has been a problem for around 10 years and that with the current plans for all the phases he did not feel he could give preliminary approval without another access road showing and long roads are against the city code. Another access also needs to be shown as to how traffic is going to get out of the subdivision. Maw explained that 1700 W is a continues road without any intersections, which is against city code. Hall stated that the previous subdivision had also had to do a traffic study. Hall and Maw said that there was a discussion of starting with phase one with the 20 lots. The sewer had been a problem but it sounds like the sewer can be resolved. It was suggested that if Jackson Ranch came with only the 20 lots, the flag lot and the second access would not be a problem. Sadler reminded Mr. Henroid that the trails are also needed on the plat. Mr. Henroid & Mr. Preston looked at the city's master plan for the trails that goes through that area to see where they would be required to put trails in. Neil ask that they look at the general plan. Osenbach stated that he wants to see the secondary access. Sadler said that he wants to know how they are going to get the traffic out of the area. Mr. Henroid said that they want to plan for the future. Hall stated that they need to get it figured out or only go for the 20 lots. Leonard ask what are they doing with secondary water and where will the irrigation water go. There was discussion on what Jackson Ranch wants to do, whether they want to plan for the whole subdivision or go for only 20 lots. They will have to talk and decide what they want to do. The road issues will have to be addressed if they go for all of the phases at once. Sadler suggested that if they go for all the phases that it would be in their best interest to develop the cul-de-

sac at the end of 46, that 1575 and 1700 be put in as stub streets, the secondary access and also address the parks and trails. Sadler pointed out where the trails and parks are along 4 mile.

MOTION: Commission member Maw made a motion to table to Jackson Ranch. Commission member seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach, voted aye. Motion carried.

Discussion: Side Yard

Neil stated that they all had copies of Layton's code. Layton's code involved Swimming Pools, Tennis Courts, Basketball Courts, Skateboard Ramp, and Satellite Dish. Maw did not feel that Plain City needed to go as in depth as the Layton code. Neil ask if there needed to be a change to the cities side yard ordinance. Maw said that the Plain City's current side yard code is 35 feet from any dwelling. Maw read Layton's code stating that it shall not be less than twenty feet (20') from any neighbor or dwelling or fifteen feet (15') from any side lot line of adjacent vacant lot. Sadler ask if the side yard code is changed how will it affect the neighbor and what is Plain City's current side yard setbacks for homes. Plain City's setback for a home is twenty four feet (24') with a minimum of 10 feet on any side. Sadler stated that at the previous meeting there was a discussion of a masonry fence for safety and blocking the view if there is a swimming pool. It was decided that a requirement of a fence would be needed around a permanent pool. Hall stated that Layton's code is a minimum height of six (6'). The Fence shall be constructed to limit any individual from accessing the pool area. The fence shall comply with all current building codes. All gates in said fences shall be self-closing and fitted with a self-latching device located on the interior side of the gate. Sadler stated that there could be noise issues, lighting issues and would there need to be a pump house. The Layton Code for lighting was looked at and it states that above ground pool lighting shall be installed and directed such that the light source or light bulb is not directly visible from any point five feet (5') high along the neighboring property line. Hall said that the accessory building according to code should be 10 feet from the property line. Sadler said that dog kennels are at 10 feet and why would a pool be different. Maw said that he thought the setback for the dog kennel was so that it could be cleaned. Leonardi ask if existing buildings would be grandfathered in if the side yard code changes. Sadler ask about the Layton code (d) that states 'It shall not be less than twenty feet (20') from a neighbor dwelling or fifteen feet (15') from any side lot line of adjacent vacant lot, why is there a difference in the two? Maw stated he thought that it was to protect the development of the vacant lot. The Tennis Court, and Basketball Court code from Layton was looked at. There was discussion that there needed to be four feet (4') walk way around the pool for the fire department. Leonardi ask about (e) on the Layton code stating that "It shall not be less than fifteen feet (15') from any neighbors' non-livable area of their dwelling, which includes, but is not limited to, the garage, carport, or storage areas. It was concluded that (c) on the Layton code would be changed to six feet (6') and an addition bullet would be added stating that there would be a required 4 foot hard surface around the pool, other items on the Layton code would be adopted into the Plain City code as it reads in the Layton Code. Mrs. Campbell is to type up the new code.

Discussion: Retention Ponds Requirements.

Neil stated that he had talked to the Mayor and the Mayor would like to see grass around the retention ponds. Maw commented that many cities are getting away from the grass because of the maintenance of grass. They are going toward what the church did on 3600 West. Neil said that on Center Street they use goats. Leonardi ask if a sprinkler system would be required if grass was to be put in. Hall stated that cobble would be good in some areas but other areas might want grass. There was discussion about the depth of the ponds and weeds that grows in the ponds. Spraying was an option for weeds but it would have to be an aquamarine spray because of the water. If grass is put in who

was going to water it, mow it and maintain the area. Neil stated that the ordinance should clarify who would be responsible for maintaining the retention pond, every item should be clear from the beginning. Sadler said that the fencing also needed to be looked at because of the depth and how steep the sides are can be a safety concern. Neil ask that there be more research on the retention ponds.

Discussion: Community US Postal Mailbox Turnout

Osenbach said that he felt that the turnouts need to be going into the subdivision not when you are leaving a subdivision. Sadler stated that an ordinance is needed stating what we expect for a mailbox turnout, currently we are asking that the developers do a turnout, but without a ordinance we cannot make them put in a turnout. There was a discussion about if there is more than one phase, a larger turnout would be needed because the postal service will want all the boxes together. The turnouts are something that will need to be looked into and also the postal service needs to be contacted to see if they have any requirements. Neil stated that further discussion and information is needed.

Approval of Minutes: December 11, 2014.

MOTION: Commission member Maw made a motion to approve the minutes of December 11, 2014. Commission member Osenbach seconded the motion. Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye.

Commission comments:

Maw stated that a citizen had ask him about the family food production ordinance concerning pigs. He had been unable to find anything and he knew that it had been discussed in the past. The commission felt that it needs to be discussed again. Leonardi said that at looking at Jackson Ranch they could eliminate the cross road unless we required it. The commissioners also discussed the S Curves subdivision and the length of roads. Leonardi had made a good point about the length of the road and Sadler felt that canal changed how the road could be laid out. Osenbach said that he liked the signs in Park City and he would like to see signs like that Park City in Plain City.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Maw made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 p.m. Commission member Hall seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil and Osenbach voted aye. Motion carried.

Neil	Sadler	Osenbach	Maw	Hall	Leonardi
			Jan 15	Feb 5	Feb 19
Mar 5	Mar 19	Apr 2	Apr 16	May 7	May 21
Jun 4	June 18	Jul 2	Jul 16	Aug 6	Aug 20
Sept 3	Sept 17	Oct 1	Oct 15	Nov 5	Nov 19
Dec 3	Dec 17				

Planning Commission Chair

Planning Commission Secretary

**Plain City Planning Commission
Minutes of Meeting
January 22, 2015**

Minutes of the Plain City Planning Commission held on Thursday January 22, 2015 at 7:00 pm., located at the Council Chambers of the Plain City, Hall, Plain City Utah 84404.

Present:	Chairman	Blake Neil
	Vice Chair	Buddy Sadler
		John Leonardi
		Jarod Maw
		Ed Hall
		Mark Osenbach
	Staff	Kathy Campbell

Attendees: Bonnie Bippes, Bob Lewis, Gordon Sorensen, David Winters, Jeff W. Hales, Janice Brown, Jake Rhees, Pete Edwards

Called to order: Chairman Blake Neil conducted the meeting, Commission member Maw gave an invocation.

Public Comments: None

Public Hearing regarding Applewood Subdivision at 4425 West 2050 North, 3 lots, Edgewood Estates Subdivision 2700 West 2225 North, 30 lots.

Discussion: Chairman Neil explained during the public hearing individuals will have an opportunity to comment regarding the specific development.

MOTION: Commission member Sadler made a motion to open a public hearing regarding the proposed Applewood Subdivision at 4425 W 2050 N., 3 Lots. Commission member Osenbach seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried

Gordon Sorenson ask if the property was going to be level and where was the drainage going? Maw responded that the city ordinance will address the drainage. The development cannot do anything contrary to the city ordinance.

MOTION: Commission member Maw made a motion to close the public hearing regarding the proposed Applewood Subdivision at 4425 W 2050 N. Leonardi seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried.

Public Hearing regarding Edgewood Estates Subdivision 2700 West 2225 North

Pete Edwards ask if the development was going to build a road along the east side of the canal. His concern was that if they did not build a road the canal cannot be maintained. He would like to see what they had done in Farr West copied. Neil ask that developer Jeff Hales to explain what they were going to do along the canal. Neil explained that the development would be required to have an access easement to the canal. Mr. Hales explained that they would duplicate what they had done in Farr

West. Mr. Edwards inquired if they will have proper drainage because currently with the irrigation water there is not good drainage. Mr. Hales stated that when they stop irrigating the water level will change on the property. Mr. Edwards ask if anyone will check the canal prior to the subdivision being built?

MOTION: Commission member Leonardi made a motion to close the public hearing regarding the proposed Applewood Subdivision at 4425 W 2050 N. Hall seconded the motion. Vote: commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried.

MOTION: Commission member Osenbach made a motion to open a public hearing regarding a Re-Zone from A-1 to R-20 of the Thomas M Ramsey property located at 5100 W 1820 N. Commission member Hall seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried.

There was no public comment.

MOTION: Commission member Osenbach made a motion to close the public hearing regarding a Re-Zone from A-1 to R-20 of the Thomas M Ramsey property located at 5100 W 1820 N. Commission member Maw seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried.

Discussion/Motion: Extend preliminary approval of River Crossing Subdivision:

Mr. Jeff Hales requested extending preliminary approval of the River Crossing Subdivision for another year. Mr. Hales said that they had started to do something with that property and make some changes according to the last minutes of January 23, 2014. Neil ask Mr. Hales what kind of changes are being made? Neil said that the planning commission would need to re- look at the plats again after the changes had been made. Mr. Hales stated yes he understood that the planning commission would have to re-look at the plans. Mr. Hales said that the changes were being made according to the last minutes and the memo that the city engineer had sent. Mr. Hales continued to explain that there would be an eliminations of a few things like the pathways and a few other items. He also stated that on the previous plans there was an emergency exit access on the east side of the lots going into the main entrance. Mr. Hales explained that they are trying to negotiate a deal with the land owner to the west so that the easement could be moved from the back yards of those lots making the lots to the east a little more desirable if the easement is moved. Mr. Hales continued with after the changes are made he would resubmit the changes to the city engineer and the city. Leonardi spoke to Mr. Hales about the left-hand turning lane being the responsibility of the developer. Mr. Hales ask if that was on 1500 N? Neil stated that his question to Mr. Hales was that if the planning commission extends the preliminary approval and if the changes Mr. Hales is making is according to the engineers last memo then those changes would be an amendment to the preliminary approval. Sadler confirmed that it would be an amendment to the original preliminary approval.

MOTION: Commission member Maw made a motion to approve the extension of the River Crossing Subdivision located at 4973 W 1500 N Commission member Leonardi seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Hales addressed the commission and ask when he could have the public hearing for preliminary on the Ramsey Estates. The planning commission concluded that Ramsey Estates could be put on the March 12, 2015 agenda. Mr. Hales said that he would bring the plans in the next day.

MOTION: Commission member Leonardi made a motion to have the public hearing for Ramsey Estates Subdivision located at 5100 W 1820 N March 12, 2015. Commission member Hall seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler, Neil, Hall and Osenbach all voted aye. Motion carried.

City Council Report – Commission member Maw

Jeff Hales had thanked the City Council for approval of the S Curve subdivision. The City Audit had shown an increase in property taxes and there had been a decrease in the impact fees for 2014. Approval had been given to Hidden Hollow, Taylor Parks and S Curve subdivisions. The Council ask that the Planning Commission look at the sign ordinance and open space ordinance. Maw stated that the Planning Commission was waiting for a response from the Weber County Sherriff Department. The Founders Day and July 4 celebration are moving forward and being planned.

Commission comments:

Maw stated that it had been brought to his attention at the city council meeting that the remodel on the old confectionary was more extensive that the commission had originally been told. They are making it better, but when there are changes to the structure, electrical or Hvac then those items need to drawn up by an engineer. The fire marshal and a city council member brought it to Mr. Maws attention. Maw continued that it would be up to the building inspector to make sure that the remodel is done to city code. Osenbach ask about the demolition of the old Plain City elementary? Maw said that he heard it was to be down by May. Sadler ask Mr. Hales who was in the audience was ask if he had any information regarding the demolition of the school? Mr. Hales stated that the last permit had been submitted to the state and that they had needed a lot of permits to do the demolition of the school which included a clean air, demolition and some other permits that had been needed. Each permit taking about 10 days. Osenbach ask Mr. Hales when they would start demolition? Mr. Hales said that they had started several times and with that in mind they hope to start as soon as they receive the last permit back from the state, which should be in about 10 days. Osenbach confirmed that in 10 days the demolition should start? Mr. Hales said yes, he continued that another one of the problems had been that the natural gas had been disconnected from the building but not disconnected from the street. Maw ask about the asbestos in the building. Mr. Hales said that was one of the permits that they had to get and that a state inspector has to look at the building to get the permit. Osenbach stated that he was looking at the Park City Sign Ordinance and was working on getting something drawn up. Neil said that Mrs. Campbell had typed up the Layton code for the side yard ordinance. He wanted to confirm that the commission was not keeping the Skateboard Ramp and Satellite Dish regulation on the Plain City ordinance. The commissioners agreed that those two items would be deleted from the side yard ordinance. Mrs. Campbell reported that she had gave the side yard ordinance to Ken Martin the building inspector and he had suggested changing the hard surface the 6' for structural reasons. The commission had used that 4' because of the suggestion from the fire department and felt like 6' would give the fire department more room. Osenbach stated that he was looking at the Park City sign ordinance. Neil commented that the Frog-Pond pre-school was looking at taking one of the office areas that the Whitelocks are currently remodeling. The pre-school is not what that space was originally approved for. Hall stated that the area had already been a day care. The commissioners discussed that the door would be very close to the confectionary and that the fire codes and the ADA codes would be required. The Plans need to be improved upon with more detail and to scale. Neil said that he had met with Shad Christensen. Mr. Christensen was buying property that on North Plain City road from Hodson's. Mr. Christensen was putting his house on the back of the property and was asking how much concrete he would be required to put in for a

driveway. Sadler said that Mr. Christensen should look at driveway ordinance and that should answer any questions that he has. Maw said that the setbacks also have to be taken into consideration. Neil said that he had also met with Dereck Jensen about 7 acres that he had purchased across the street from the Plain City Elementary and North of the Church on 3600 West. Mr. Jensen would like to subdivide the land and build houses on the property.

Chairman Neil said that he had ask Osenbach to take the lead on lighting and signs. Neil was asking each member to take the lead on one of the items that the planning commission had been addressing and working on that item. Leonardi was ask to clarify intersections and blocks. Maw was ask to do the animal ordinance concerning the swine and horses, Sadler detention ponds, Neil U.S. Postal mailbox turnaround. Hall informed the planning commission that he need to get off of the planning commission to spend more time with his family. Maw ask Mrs. Campbell if she could find the minutes from 2011 on the animal ordinance and send them to Mr. Maw so that he could have something to reference.

Adjournment

MOTION: Maw made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Commission member Leonardi seconded the motion. Vote: Commission members Leonardi, Maw, Sadler and Osenbach voted aye. Motion carried.

Planning Commission schedule to attend 2015 City Council Meetings

<u>Neil</u>	<u>Sadler</u>	<u>Osenbach</u>	<u>Maw</u>	<u>Hall</u>	<u>Leonardi</u>
			Jan 15	Feb 5	Feb 19
Mar 5	Mar 19	Apr 2	Apr 16	May 7	May 21
Jun 4	June 18	Jul 2	Jul 16	Aug 6	Aug 20
Sept 3	Sept 17	Oct 1	Oct 15	Nov 5	Nov 19
Dec 3	Dec 17				

 Planning Commission Chair

 Planning Commission Secretary

