

MINUTES of the Vernal City PLANNING COMMISSION

Vernal City Council Chambers - 374 East Main Street, Vernal, Utah

November 10, 2015

7:00 pm

Members Present: Samantha Scott, Kimball Glazier, Scott Gessell, Ken Latham, Rory Taylor, Kathleen Gray

Members Excused: Mike Drechsel

Alternates Present: Adam Ray

Alternates Excused: Kam Pope

Staff Present: Allen Parker, Assistant City Manager; Corey Coleman, Building Official; and Sherri Montgomery, Administrative Clerk.

WELCOME AND DESIGNATION OF CHAIR AND MEMBERS: Vice Chair Samantha Scott welcomed everyone present to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 8, 2015: Samantha Scott asked if there were any changes to the minutes from September 8, 2015. There being no corrections, *Kimball Glazier moved to approve the minutes of September 8, 2015 as presented. Scott Gessell seconded the motion. The motion passed with Samantha Scott, Kimball Glazier, Scott Gessell, Ken Latham, Rory Taylor, Kathleen Gray, and Adam Ray voting in favor.*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 6, 2015: Samantha Scott asked if there were any changes to the minutes from October 6, 2015. There being no corrections, *Kimball Glazier moved to approve the minutes of October 6, 2015 as presented. Scott Gessell seconded the motion. The motion passed with Samantha Scott, Kimball Glazier, Scott Gessell, Ken Latham, Rory Taylor, Kathleen Gray, and Adam Ray voting in favor.*

REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CONSIDER A REZONE FOR TREVOR CARTER FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 379 NORTH 500 WEST, VERNAL, UTAH FROM – APPLICATION NO. 2015-015-REZ – ALLEN PARKER: Samantha Scott reported that the rezone request for the property located at 379 North 500 West has been withdrawn by the applicant.

VERNAL CITY MUNICIPAL PLANNING & ZONING CODE TO DISCUSS AMENDING FENCING REGULATIONS – CHAPTERS 16.24, 16.48, 16.50, 16.20 – ALLEN PARKER: Allen Parker reported that there was a conditional use permit on a fence several months ago, and staff found some weaknesses in the Code during the process as it addresses fences which could create potential conflicts. Mr. Parker stated that the Code needs reorganized with the same purpose and intent, but in a more logical fashion. Mr. Parker stated that he wanted the Commission to review the changes he is suggesting, before holding a public hearing and putting it into ordinance form. The changes are highlighted in yellow and will replace the old Code. Mr. Parker mentioned that there is one area that has not been addressed yet under Section (D) “parcels with a non-residential use” which needs to be incorporated. Kimball Glazier referred to Section B 1 (d) “The fence shall not impede the view of

vehicular traffic in a way that would create a hazard to the public” and stated that this sentence seems vague. Mr. Parker stated that he pulled this section out of previous section, but it can be changed. Mr. Glazier asked what everyone’s thoughts are on it being repetitive with Section G. Mr. Parker stated that Section G was put in as a blanket statement to cover all fences and not necessarily pulled from the previous Code. It can be removed. Mr. Glazier referred to Section 2 (b) “The owner of the adjacent multi-family development consents in writing to the waiver of the fencing requirement.” and asked what if it is a HOA type with multiple owners. How would that be handled? Mr. Parker stated that with a multi-family development, it could say owner or a person who is authorized. Mr. Glazier stated that there will be multi-family developments with multiple owners. Mr. Parker stated that you may have a circumstance where there are multiple owners with no condo association. Mr. Glazier asked if you have to have a HOA or PUD for multi-family developments. Mr. Parker stated that you do if you have individual owners. Mr. Parker stated that he will work on that wording and come up with something that covers it. Mr. Glazier referred to Section C 2 (b) and asked what is the impact of a stinky fence. Mr. Parker explained that he had copied and pasted for format purposes from the kennel section and by error that was not caught before being printed out for the packets. Mr. Parker asked if there are any issues to address in Section C. Mr. Glazier asked if the City is now only allowing a four foot front fence. Mr. Parker answered yes, unless it is a see through fence or a temporary fence for construction that must abide for a clear vision triangle. Mr. Glazier asked if someone can still to install a six foot privacy fence on the side of a corner lot. Mr. Parker stated no, they must comply with partials with up to four dwellings with number three limited to a four foot fence, unless they do not obstruct the clear vision triangle. Rory Taylor stated he does not understand the barb wire fence section as it relates to fences which are located on a common boundary between residential lots. Mr. Glazier agreed that it is not the best wording. Mr. Parker explained that this could be amended. The goal is not to change the fencing laws, but to continue with what is already in the Code, but in a better format. Mr. Taylor asked if the barb wire fence for holding animals has to be partial or can it be an entire fence. Mr. Parker explained that there can be a full barbed wire fence for a pasture, but not for residential use. Mr. Taylor suggested modifying the wording to say as part or whole to clarify that it can be all barbed wire. Mr. Parker stated he will work on the verbiage.

VERNAL CITY MUNICIPAL PLANNING & ZONING CODE TO DISCUSS AMENDING PRE-MANUFACTURED HOMES – CHAPTERS 16.04, 16.24, 16.46, 16.56 – ALLEN PARKER: Allen Parker stated that the City was approached by an owner of a trailer park here in town to ask the Planning Commission to consider changing the Code to allow them to do what they are doing in other communities by upgrading and moving pre-manufactured homes built prior to June 15, 1976. Corey Coleman stated that there is a specific checklist to modify and bring up to Code the pre-1976 manufactured homes. Mr. Coleman explained that the 1976 federal government standards for manufactured homes had no inspections on record. They were all done in house by quality control by a different manufacture. Mr. Parker added that there was no specific standard. Mr. Coleman stated that the gentleman who has approached the City knows what he is doing; however, what we do for one, we have to do for all. The Code currently must comply with 1976 sub standards. Mr. Parker explained that the reason for the request to change the Code is mostly to be able to move the homes. Mr. Coleman explained that he currently cannot permit a pre-1976 manufactured home to be moved. Therefore, the homes stay there until they rot into the ground. Mr. Coleman reported that Uintah County is in the same position where they do not accept pre-1976 manufactured homes, but Duchesne County does with the check list completed. Mr. Coleman stated that the State of Utah used to have someone who was in charge of certifying them before local jurisdiction, but he is not employed anymore and has not been replaced. Mr. Coleman asked do we allow pre-1976 manufactured homes or stay with the current standard. Mr. Parker stated that the gentleman who requested the change is not here tonight to explain what they are hoping to do and will try to have him here at the next meeting. Mr. Parker stated that he

wanted to give the Planning Commission a heads up and to give it some thought on whether this is something the City would be interested in changing. Do we let pre-1976 manufactured homes melt into the ground or do we allow them to be renovated and moved. Scott Gessell asked how many of these homes are still around. Mr. Coleman stated that because most cities are ruling them out, there is a surplus of them. The gentleman who has approached the City wants to buy 80 of them. Due to most cities not accepting them, the prices are fairly low. Mr. Parker explained that these renovated homes look more like a modern manufactured home. Mr. Coleman added that they install new siding, new roof, new carpet, etc. Mr. Coleman explained that what is nice about this company that has approached the City has an engineer on staff that recertifies them all and an electrician on staff. Kimball Glazier asked if these were manufactured or modular homes. Mr. Parker stated that they are not pre-fab, they are manufactured. Mr. Glazier asked if this company was looking at bringing more of these renovated manufactured homes into our community. Mr. Coleman answered yes, at least 20, if not more. Mr. Parker stated that they own one specific trailer park in Vernal called "East Meadows" on 500 East, and there are some pretty good looking homes in there. This would be a good thing for the Planning Commission to consider one way or another as it is important for the future of the City. Mr. Glazier asked if this change would bog down the building department. Mr. Coleman explained that with this builder not necessarily, but in general yes. Mr. Coleman explained that he recently attended a manufacture home class, and there is not an engineer in the State of Utah. Mr. Parker stated that the Code could be left the way it is or it could be changed to allow pre non HUD homes that have been modified with state standards and placed in the City. If we do not adopt the change and stay with the current standards, the pre-1976 manufactured homes will either stay stuck in the same place while it is habitable, or they can be taken to another community that allows them. Mr. Parker stated that it would be nice to provide cost effective housing in the City that is safe and certified if that is what we want in our community. Rory Taylor asked if the state has a checklist method of certifying the homes. Mr. Coleman explained that the staff member for the State who certified them in the past is no longer employed with the State, and his position has not been filled. Mr. Glazier stated that he is concerned with making any changes without the State having that position filled. Mr. Parker stated that he has met with the builder from Logan and has confidence in his work. However, anyone would be able to buy one of these homes and fix it up themselves, which could have the potential of being a nightmare scenario. Mr. Parker stated this was a good introduction to this issue, and this item will be placed on the next agenda. Mr. Parker added that he will invite the gentleman to the meeting to present the his concept and how it is done in other communities.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS EXPIRING TERMS – ALLEN PARKER: Allen Parker explained that there are several Planning Commission members whose terms are expiring at the end of the year. Those members are Rory Taylor, Scott Gessell, Kam Pope, and Adam Ray. Mr. Parker asked the members if they would like to continue to serve on the Planning Commission. This would be another four year term. Rory Taylor stated that he would like to stay on. Scott Gessell stated that he would like to stay on, but will know more in a few weeks if that is possible. Adam Ray stated that he would like to stay on. Mr. Parker reminded the Commission that there are still three vacancies to fill if anyone has any ideas. .

ADJOURN: There being no further business, *Rory Taylor moved to adjourn. Kimball Glazier seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous vote, and the meeting was adjourned.*

Samantha Scott, Planning Commission Vice-Chair