

**WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021**

The minutes of the Woods Cross Planning Commission meeting held March 9, 2021 by Zoom Conferencing.

**CONDUCTING:**

Curtis Poole

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Curtis Poole, Chairman  
Mike Doxey  
Eric Jones  
Jessica Kelemen

Ryan Larsen  
Joseph Rupp  
Gary Sharp

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Tim Stephens, Community Development Director  
Bonnie Craig, Secretary  
Matt Terry, City Council Member

**VISITORS:**

Nick Brady  
Adam Billings  
Cook  
Greg Seegmiller  
Clayton Cherone  
Xin Zhou

Kim Drake  
Julie Checketts  
Dennis  
Lolo Tenifa  
Cynthia Sahn  
LeGrande Blackley

Mark Turner  
John Glines  
Lyle Mansfield  
Herb Yost  
Aleaha Delaney  
Don Schrader

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairman Poole called for the review of the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held February 23, 2021.

Following the review of the minutes by the Commission, Commissioner Kelemen made a motion to approve the minutes as written with Commissioner Rupp seconding the motion and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**OPEN SESSION**

Chairman Poole then opened the meeting to items from those present that they would like to bring before the Commission that were not on the agenda.

There were no comments for the open session, and Chairman Poole closed the open session.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 2**

**ZHAO URBAN CHICKEN CONDITIONAL USE—1421 WEST 2100 SOUTH—XIN ZHAO**

Mr. Stephens, the Community Development Director, reviewed this agenda item with the Commission. He noted that this applicant is proposing to keep chickens at his home in a residential zone. He reminded the Planning Commission that urban chickens are a conditional use in the R-1-8 Zone and the regulations permit the keeping of up to 10 chickens on a single lot.

Mr. Xin Zhao joined the discussion. Commissioner Sharp asked if Mr. Zhao was alright with the conditions as outlined. Mr. Zhao said he felt like the conditions were reasonable and he was agreeable to the conditions as outlined.

There were no further question and Commissioner Doxey made a motion to approve the Zhao Urban Chickens conditional use for up to 10 chickens. Commissioner Larsen seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**YOST URBAN CHICKENS CONDITIONAL USE—1154 WEST 1850 SOUTH—HERBERT YOST**

Mr. Stephens noted this item was the same as discussed above. He noted Mr. Herbert Yost is proposing to keep chickens at his home in a residential zone. He noted this item is also a conditional use in the R-1-8 Zone and the regulations permit the keeping of up to 10 chickens on a single lot.

Mr. Herbert Yost joined the discussion with the Commission. Mr. Yost was also asked if he was alright with the conditions as outlined and he said that he was alright with the conditions as outlined.

There were no further questions and Commissioner Sharp made a motion to approve the Yost urban chickens conditional use for up to 10 chickens. Commissioner Kelemen seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**NANCE HOME OCCUPATION—2071 WEST 2185 SOUTH—SAMUEL NANCE**

Mr. Stephens then noted this applicant is proposing to operate a general service handyman business from his home. He said the applicant will be focusing on repairing and maintaining HOA owned properties. Mr. Stephens noted Mr. Nance would need a handyman license from the Division of Occupational and Professional Licensing. Mr. Stephens also said the application indicates that shelving has been added to the garage to hold cleanup tools and other items involved with the home business. He said the tools and other supplies will also be stored in the garage. Mr. Stephens said the applicant has indicated that general maintenance, cleanup, and small repairs will not exceed the limits of state licensing for handyman services.

Mr. Nance was not present to discuss this item with the Commission.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 3**

Commissioner Rupp then made a motion to table this item until the applicant could be present. Commissioner Larsen seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**AXIELL ALM CONDITIONAL USE REQUEST—2014 SOUTH 1640 WEST—JEFF GREENLAND**

Mr. Stephens then reviewed this agenda item with the Commission. He noted that Mr. Jeff Green is requesting to operate a software solution and service company at 2014 South 1640 West. He noted the company provides services to entities such as libraries, museums, archives, schools, retailers, and publishers. He said Mr. Green has indicated regular work hours would be from 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday. He also said that his company has upwards of 400 employees globally but only two will be working from the location indicated.

Mr. Stephens said the address proposed for this business use appears to be in an aircraft tee hangar situated within a large building housing aircraft tee-hangars which are individually owned. Mr. Stephens noted with the development of aircraft hangars, due to their type of construction and the waivers granted to them from architectural and landscaping requirements, they are usually approved with a conditional use permit which restricts them to the storage and maintenance of aircraft and aviation related uses only. Mr. Stephens said that in the past as the city has received requests to repurpose aircraft hangars, the aircraft hangar owner has been required to meet as closely as possible the architectural design standards for non-aircraft hangar buildings. Mr. Stephens said there was also a concern over whether this building type would permit this type of business use within it per the fire code and fire marshal. Mr. Stephens also said tee-hangar project which the subject hangar is within does not have parking directly in front of the subject hangar, but it is provided onsite on the other side of the hangar building. Mr. Stephens also noted this complex had been originally approved for aircraft hanger use through a conditional use permit granted by the Planning Commission with the anticipated use being the storage and maintenance of aircraft. He said that due to the building construction style, there may be issues with using or converting this space to office occupancy.

Following the review by Mr. Stephens, Commissioner Rupp asked Mr. Stephens if there were any other hangars in this area that were being used for something other than what was originally approved. Mr. Stephens said he was not aware of any. He said there were some hangars that had upgraded their buildings but that was all he was aware of.

Commissioner Rupp asked if this building could be upgraded to meet the architectural standards for a building that would be used for something other than aviation. Mr. Stephens said this was a metal building and it is mostly bi-fold doors so there would be no way to meet the architectural requirements.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 4**

Commissioner Rupp asked what had been originally approved for this building and Mr. Stephens said they would have needed a conditional use and a site plan approval then had a plat recorded for the use of aircraft.

Commissioner Larsen asked if there was a condominium association associated with the building and if they would have covenants and restrictions that would be required.

Mr. Stephens said there may be an HOA associated with the building and that they could be more restrictive with covenants and restrictions but not less restrictive than what city ordinance would allow.

Commissioner Sharp said there are other business entities south of the property, but they are not aircraft hangars.

Mr. Stephens said there are other businesses in the surrounding buildings but if the hangar use was changed, they had to meet the architectural design requirements.

Commissioner Sharp asked if this building would be able to change the architectural design and Mr. Stephens said no the metal building would not meet the architectural requirements. Mr. Stephens said as the applicant was not present at tonight's meeting, he could talk to the applicant further and see exactly what is being proposed for the building and have him clarify things for the Commission.

It was also noted there are mezzanines located in some of the aircraft hangars that could possibly be used for an office area with desks.

Chairman Pooled asked the Commission for their thoughts on this item if it was used for an aircraft would they feel differently about using it for office space.

The Commission noted they felt like if nothing similar had been passed to operate in this area they did not feel like they wanted to set this as a precedence.

Commissioner Jones also said he was concerned about parking in the area and that even though there was a plane being housed in the hangar he would not want to approve it for the business use.

Commissioner Rupp said he felt like it could cause issues with others who would want to come in and do the same thing.

Chairman Poole said he agreed and did not want to allow additional uses that could become a problem in the future.

Commissioner Kelemen and Commissioner Sharp said they also agreed with what had been discussed and the concerns that were being raised.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 5**

Mr. Stephens said he would talk to the applicant and let them know what had been discussed at the Planning Commission meeting so the applicant could make a decision on what they would like to do in the future knowing the feelings of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Rupp then made a motion to table this item and asked staff to address some of the Planning Commission concerns with the applicant before the applicant returns to the Planning Commission for consideration. Commissioner Sharp seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

Commissioner Rupp was excused from the meeting at this point the time being 7:05 P.M.

**PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO PERMIT SIX-FOOT FENCING WITHIN THE FRONT YARD SETBACK (CODE REFERENCE 12-21-109) WITHIN THE SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATION CHAPTER—CLAYTON CHERONE**

Mr. Stephens then reviewed this agenda item with the Commission. He noted that Mr. Clayton Cherone is proposing a text amendment to the city's fencing regulations. Mr. Stephens noted Mr. Cherone has a home on a corner lot on 1850 South. He said the front door of the home faces 800 West and Mr. Cherone desires to fence this area in with a six-foot fence. Mr. Stephens said that it was explained to Mr. Cherone that a fence in the front yard can only be erected to four feet (non-sight obscuring) or three feet (sight obscuring). Mr. Stephens said that eventually Mr. Cherone made the case that the front of his house faces 1850 South. Mr. Stephens said the portion of the front yard that faces 800 West would then be considered a side yard and could have a six-foot fence constructed. Mr. Stephens said that Mr. Cherone has insisted that the six-foot fence should extend all the way to the street corner enclosing part of the new designated front yard along 1850 South. Mr. Stephens said he had explained to Mr. Cherone that this area would now be part of the front yard along 1850 South and would need to meet the 3 or 4 foot fence regulation. Mr. Cherone decided to fill out a zoning text amendment with his proposed fencing language for your review.

Mr. Stephens did say that fencing regulations, particularly in the front yard, usually have two purposes: One is aesthetics, and the other is for safety and clear vision. He said he had asked the city's engineer of JUB Engineers to review this text amendment with one of their traffic and transportation engineers.

Mr. Greg Seegmiller, the city's engineer from JUB joined the discussion. He noted that AASHTO, which stands for American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, is the standard that is used to govern intersection sight distances.

The City Engineer noted the following:

“The “Clear Vision Area – Corner Lots” 30 foot sides of the sight triangles are based on Section 9.5 of the **AASHTO Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 7th Edition,**

**OFFICIAL MINUTES**  
**WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**MARCH 9, 2021**  
**PAGE 6**

which governs intersection sight distances. This is done in order for a driver to see an on-coming vehicle at an intersection. Section 9.5.2 states that specified areas along intersection approach legs and across their included corners should be clear of obstructions that might block a drivers view of potentially conflicting vehicles. These specified areas are known as clear sight triangles. The dimensions of the legs of the sight triangles depend on the design speeds of the intersecting roadways and the type of traffic control used at the intersection. These dimensions are also intended to protect pedestrians and bicyclists on the sidewalk.

“We recommend that the ordinance remain unchanged as it complies with the **AASHTO Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets**, for uncontrolled or yield control intersections and with driver expectations. Its intent is to protect citizens from accident or injury.”

Mr. Seegmiller said he would be happy to answer any questions the Commission might have for him regarding this item.

Mr. Stephens said that in addition to what had already been given to the Commission in their packets regarding this item, Mr. Cherone had submitted additional information to the staff but the staff did not have a chance to review the new information and would like to be able to do so before the Commission might make a decision.

Chairman Poole then invited Mr. Clayton Cherone to join the discussion. Mr. Cherone said he was seeking a text amendment as it had been presented to the Commission by Mr. Stephens. He said he had given the additional information showing pictures of non-sight obscuring fencing so he could show the Commission how visible it would be if this type of fencing were to be placed on the corner in question. He said he felt like you could see everything on the other side of the fence, and he felt like there could be something worked out to be permitted instead of going to the extent of a text amendment. He said he had given all of the information he had to the Commission for their review.

Commissioner Sharp said he noticed the property already had a fence located on the property and wondered what Mr. Cherone was planning do with the current fence. He asked Mr. Cherone what it was he was looking to do on the property with the new fencing proposal.

Mr. Cherone asked to have the arial view of the property shown to the Commission. He explained what he would like to see done with the proposed new fencing and where he would like it located. He said at present he does not have anywhere else to fence an area off. He said the corner is a high-traffic area and there is trash and other unpleasant things left on his lawn. He said he did not really have a backyard and he did not want to put up two fences. He said he was trying to achieve two goals with one fence by restricting pedestrian traffic and to have an area that would serve as a backyard.

Commissioner Sharp asked if Mr. Cherone was planning on installing a chain link fence as shown in the pictures he had presented.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 7**

Mr. Cherone said he would put up whatever type of fencing the Planning Commission recommended.

Commissioner Jones asked why Mr. Cherone wanted to put in a six-foot fence. Mr. Cherone said a four-foot fence would not keep in a dog and the purpose of a fence for a backyard would be to secure things like a BBQ grill and chairs without having to worry about them being taken overnight by someone.

Commissioner Sharp said it looked like Mr. Cherone could have a partial fenced yard but it would not be as large as Mr. Cherone is proposing.

Chairman Poole asked why Mr. Cherone wanted a fence in the front yard of the property.

Mr. Cherone said because it was almost to the corner of the property and it is where the yard ends. He said other areas of the property are driveway.

Commissioner Sharp asked Mr. Cherone if he was buying the home or if he was renting the home he is living in. Mr. Cherone said he was renting the home, but he was making this request on behalf of the owner of the home and the owner had agreed with what Mr. Cherone was proposing.

Commissioner Poole then explained the process that would be followed for the public hearing and asked that the public express their concerns and give their comments and the Commission would take notes on those comments. He said after the public hearing was closed, those comments and concerns would be addressed as a way to keep the public hearing moving in an efficient manner. Commissioner Poole also reminded everyone that when there is a text amendment being considered, it deals with the whole city, not just one property.

Chairman Poole then opened the public hearing.

Mr. LeGrande Blackley addressed the Commission. He said about every corner lot in the city would have this similar problem. He said it would be setting a precedence if there were to be an amendment change that could affect all corner lots. He said there would be more front yard fences if the text amendment were to be approved. He said the clear zone needed to be considered so you can see cars that would be coming up and down the street.

There were no further comments and Chairman Poole closed the public hearing.

Chairman Poole asked Mr. Cherone if he had anything further he wanted to add to the discussion. Mr. Cherone said he wished he would have sent out the pictures to the Commission earlier for their review. He said he had taken them at various angles and the pictures show what it would look like from these angles. He said it seems to him there are pretty clear views through the chain link fences.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 8**

Chairman Poole then asked the Commission for their thoughts on this matter.

Commissioner Jones said he agreed there were two components to this issue, aesthetics, and safety. He said he has concerns that chain link fencing could be distracting to drivers even if it was non-obscuring. He also said he did not prefer the aesthetic look of six foot fences in front yards. He said he did not see a reason to modify the zone as it is written now. He said he agreed with the current text as it is.

Commissioner Kelemen said she also has concerns about safety if a six-foot fence were to be put in at this location. She said after reading through the recommendations by the City Engineer, she felt like the safety recommendations should be adhered to.

Commissioner Sharp also said he agreed with the recommendations of the City Engineer and he had concerns the City would be culpable if something were to happen at a corner with a six-foot fence on it.

Mr. Seegmiller then added that everything that is in place right now in the city ordinances addressed the national standards for safety. He said it is a safety concern and that is why they are recommending the text stays as it is written. He said while new technology is good for fencing at this time, they are still quite visible. He also said there is more safety concerns with fencing when there are weeds that grow through fencing as well as bushes that might be planted along fences, and also problems with seeing through a fence that has snow on it and that is why he is recommending keeping the ordinance as it is written.

Chairman Poole said he was in agreement with what the other Commissioners and Mr. Seegmiller had expressed and said there are aesthetic and safety concerns that need to be considered regarding this item. He also said he felt like it would close off the city if many of these six-foot fences were to be put into place throughout the city.

**CONSIDERATION TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL  
REGARDING PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO FENCING REGULATIONS—  
CURTIS POOLE**

Following the above discussion, Commissioner Jones made a motion to recommend to the City Council the denial of the text amendment for reasons as discussed. Commissioner Larsen seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

Chairman Poole reminded Mr. Cherone he would still have the opportunity to address the City Council at their meeting that would be held the first Tuesday in April if he would like to do so.



**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 9**

**PUBLIC HEARING: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED 1486 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD FROM R-1-8 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK—JOHN GLINES**

Mr. Stephens then reviewed this agenda item with the Commission. He said this applicant owns several acres adjacent to the former Woods Cross City Public Works Shop on 1500 South Redwood Road. He said the majority of the property lies adjacent and directly west of the former Woods Cross city shops. He said there are two parcels adjacent to the north side of the shops that are used to access this property from Redwood Road. He noted that the westerly strip is also owned by Mr. Glines who is requesting the rezone. He said the easterly strip that connects directly to Redwood Road is owned by an adjacent property owner on which Mr. Glines has a right of way to access his property from Redwood Road.

Mr. Stephens went on to explain that prior to the development of the Mountain View Estates Subdivision, the two properties were landlocked and only accessible by the right of way connecting them to Redwood Road. He said the development was extended from Redwood Road westward and adjacent to the subject property. He said the property owner has never utilized 1500 South to access the property and continues to use the granted right-of-way to access these parcels from Redwood Road. He said that presently, there is a small storage building or shop building on the property with some associated vehicles or trailers stored on the property which is assumed to be for the personal use of the Glines family.

Mr. Stephens said the subject property is presently zoned R-1-8 Single Family Residential matching the adjoining Mountain View Estates Subdivision zoning. He noted city property adjacent and east of the subject property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial/Business Park. He said that presently the former public works shops property has been leased to a business that performs RV trailer repairs and services. He noted the city has chosen to retain this property for possible future city use. He said the Planning Commission has proposed a new zoning map for the City Council's consideration that would rezone the city property to the Commercial Residential Transition (CRT) Zone. He also said the city's present general plan identifies Mr. Glines' property as being utilized as multifamily residential to match the adjacent townhome development within the Mountain View Subdivision and the existing townhome development is stubbed to the Glines property.

Mr. Stephens noted that Mr. Glines had attached a written statement to the application saying he is requesting the property be rezoned to I-1 Light Industrial/Business Park. Mr. Stephens also noted Mr. Glines has pointed out there is a natural gas pipeline that runs diagonally through the property in addition to his desire to place a use on the property that would be similar to the trailer repair business on the city's adjacent property.

Mr. Stephens also reviewed the general plan for this area stating the general plan designates the subject property for future multifamily residential zoning and development. He also noted the city's property and other properties to the east lying along Redwood Road are designated in the general plan and will be rezoned to Commercial/Residential Transition or CRT Zone. He said that

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 10**

preserving a small patch of industrial zoning for a use that is dissimilar to the existing residential area and dissimilar to the future zoning of the adjoining properties to the west may not make the most sense.

Following the review by Mr. Stephens, Commissioner Sharp asked if this property was zoned as R-1-8 residential. Mr. Stephens said that yes it was zoned for single family residential, and the applicant wants to rezone the property to be I-1 Light Industrial. He also said there had been a development agreement for a portion of the property with Ivory to put in townhomes when they had planned their development in the adjacent neighborhood. Mr. Stephens then went through the different zoning in the area in question as well as the surrounding properties with the Commission.

Following the information given by Mr. Stephens, Mr. John Glines joined the discussion. He said his family had owned this property since 1978. He said the city did not want to purchase the property because of the gas line that is located on the property. He said in 2008 he had the property appraised but because of the gas line located on the property it is a problem. He said he did not see any way to use this property with the gas line located on it except for light industrial or with an above ground storage area. He said he would like to see it used instead of letting it sit vacant and letting weeds grow on it. He also said that at one time Ivory Homes was going to buy the property, but they offered such a low price he did not want to sell it.

Following the comments by Mr. Glines, Chairman Poole then opened the public hearing.

Mr. LeGrande Blackley asked if this was considered spot zoning. Mr. Stephens said if you are trying to rezone something that is dissimilar it could be but the proposed or current zones do not conform to the general plan so he said it would depend on how someone would look at the issue. Mr. Stephens said the use would be compatible for a short time but with zoning changes that are presently being considered in that area, it could be changed to a CRT Zone. He said the general plan has this city property that is located adjacent to this proposed property in the I-1 Light Industrial Zone at the present time.

Ms. Cynthia Sahm said she lives on 1500 South west of the roundabout. She said she felt like it made the most sense to have this zoned as residential when it would be surrounded by other homes. She said she realizes the gas line problem is annoying as well. She said she realizes the access is coming from Redwood Road right not but is concerned about an access coming from 1500 South. She said she would like assurances that there would be no access allowed from 1500 South.

Mr. Stephens noted that Redwood Road is a state owned road and that UDOT may choose to close the access at some point that is located on Redwood Road into this property. He said the city would have no control over what happens on Redwood Road with it being state owned.

Ms. Aleaha Delaney then addressed the Commission. She said she is hoping the Planning Commission and the City Council would appreciate the aesthetics they are trying to keep in the

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 11**

neighborhood. She said they have an excellent standard for their neighborhood, and she felt it would be a distraction to have above ground storage in this area. She said she appreciates Mr. Glines position, but she hoped the city would try to find developers who can work out building homes in this area. She asked the Planning Commission to please consider what they are trying to maintain in their neighborhood.

There were no further comments and Chairman Poole closed the public hearing.

Chairman Poole invited Mr. Glines to add any other comments he would like to add following the above comments. Mr. Glines said he did not see how there could be any kind of structures put onto this property over the gas lines without permission which he said would be very, very difficult as the gas company did not want to work on solving the gas line issue. He said he had parked a vehicle in the area over the gas line at one point and they contacted him right away to remove it. He said as far as aesthetics go, he felt that a small warehouse would be appropriate for the area. He also said he has cleaned up his property on many occasions from garbage and debris that has been thrown over the fence from the townhomes and the problem seems to be getting worse. He said if the property was utilized better that would not happen. He also said originally the property was not zoned residential but when the Ivory subdivision went in things changed. He also said he felt like this property could be used to generate tax revenue for the city if it was used better instead of leaving it as empty ground.

Chairman Poole reminded the public there would be another public hearing held by the City Council on April 6<sup>th</sup> so the public could also make comments at that meeting.

Commissioner Sharp said he sympathized with Mr. Glines predicament. He also said there had been a lot of hard work put into the General Plan and the zoning in this area. He said he did not want to see an island in this area and if the zoning is changed it would not fit into what is there. He said he would like to see this property be zoned the same as the old city shops property in the future, but he is opposed to changing it the I-1 Zone.

Commissioner Larsen and Commissioner Jones said they agreed with Commissioner Sharp.

Commissioner Kelemen said she did not want to encourage any more non-conforming uses in the city, and the uses should conform with the General Plan.

Chairman Poole said he felt like a zone change for this property would be a step backward after all of the rezoning work that had been done over the last few months.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 12**

**CONSIDERATION TO MAKE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL  
REGARDING REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1486 SOUTH  
REDWOOD ROAD FROM R-1-8 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO I-1 LIGHT  
INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK—CURTIS POOLE**

Following the above discussion, Commissioner Sharp made a motion to forward to the City Council the Planning Commission's recommendation of denial of the rezone for Mr. Glines property located at 1486 South Redwood Road. Commissioner Kelemen seconded the motion and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**BRYSON SALES AND SERVICE CONDITIONAL USE—PROPOSED BUS SALES AND  
SERVICE BUSINESS LOCATED ON A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY NORTH OF  
1500 SOUTH AND EAST OF REDWOOD ROAD (PARCEL #06-076-0059)—LOLO  
TENIFA**

Mr. Stephens reviewed this agenda item with the Commission. He noted that presently there is a block of property between Argyle Acres and the storage units on Redwood Road. He said the property owner and Tom Stuart Construction have made application for a two-lot industrial park subdivision. He went on to note that Bryson sales is proposing to occupy one of the lots in the proposed subdivision that would be adjacent to the Argyle Acres Subdivision. Mr. Stephens said that Bryson Sales is presently located in Centerville, but they are proposing to build a new facility at the location as noted above in Woods Cross City. He went on to note that Bryson Sales is a Blue Bird school bus dealer that provides sales and service. They would like to construct a building to house their offices and service center. He noted they are also proposing a large parking area for new bus sales and parking for service and repair. Mr. Stephens said this proposed use would be adjacent to a residential neighborhood and consideration would need to be taken to minimize visual impacts as well as noise, odors, light, vibration and so on, that might impact that neighborhood.

Following the review by Mr. Stephens, Commissioner Sharp asked if the city had allowed for vehicles that had been wrecked or disassembled to be stored outside for a short period of time. Mr. Stephens said that yes, auto body shops in the C-2 Zone had been given that allowance if they are waiting for parts to come in or waiting for an insurance claim to be settled, but they cannot store them on the site.

Commissioner Sharp also asked if a sight obscuring fence was required, and Mr. Stephens said a sight obscuring fence was required along with a landscape tree buffer to supply additional sight filtering to keep them separated from the adjacent neighborhood.

Mr. Lolo Tenifa joined the discussion. He said Mr. Stephens had done a good job explaining what is being planned for this area. He said as they move forward, they plan to continue the vinyl fence that is already partially on the property. Mr. Tenifa also noted that Mr. Mark Turner who is the general manager and Mr. Nick Brady who is the architect, were also present to answer any questions for the Commission.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 13**

Commissioner Sharp asked if there would be any wrecked vehicles on the property. Mr. Turner said they do not fix major damage at that location and that any minor damage would be fixed inside the building. He said they want to get the buses back to the customers as soon as possible. Mr. Turner said they work mostly with new buses and there is minimal auto body maintenance that will be done.

Chairman Poole asked what the hours of operation would be. Mr. Turner said the hours would be from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday- Friday. He said they plan to work regular business hours. Chairman Poole asked if there would be any noise associated with the business activities. Mr. Turner said they only use air compressors inside of their building on a limited basis so there is usually very little noise associated with the business. Mr. Stephens also reminded the everyone that the doors of the business are required to be closed when machinery is being operated.

Chairman Poole said he wanted to remind the applicant's to be aware of the adjacent neighbors, especially when it comes to the beeping that comes from the buses as they are being backed up. He said to make sure they stick to the business hours as they are stated.

Commissioner Kelemen said she noticed at their current location in Centerville there are pallets stored outside and she wanted to know if that would be an issue at the new location. Mr. Turner said they will not be a problem and that the pallets are taken away often. He also said they would have a dumpster located on the property.

Mr. Stephens noted there is no outside storage allowed, even if it is temporary and that would include the pallets that had been mentioned.

There were no further comments and Commissioner Jones made a motion to approve the conditional use for Bryson sales with the following conditions:

1. At no time may the business operation negatively impact the adjacent properties particularly the residential neighborhood to the east.
2. The applicant's business operation shall be in conformance at all times with any government agency having jurisdiction over the business or subject property.
3. At no time may any wrecked or disassembled vehicles be stored on the site. In addition, no materials or parts may be stored outside the enclosed building.
4. The applicant is required to submit a site plan application and associated drawings that comply with the zoning and development standards of the city for the Commission's consideration and approval.
5. The business operation shall be in compliance at all times with the city's noise regulation.

Commissioner Doxey seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES  
WOODS CROSS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2021  
PAGE 14**

**CITY COUNCIL REPORT**

Council Member Terry reported on the City Council meeting held March 2, 2021. Please see the minutes of that meeting for the details of his report.

Council Member Terry again thanked the Commission for all of their service and hard work on the zoning rewrite.

**GENERAL AND PENDING**

Mr. Stephens noted the City Council will be considering the adoption of the Northwest Quadrant and zoning map at their next meeting. He said staff is moving forward with the other zoning rewrites and they will be taking place in the next few months.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, Commissioner Doxey made a motion to adjourn the meeting 8:41 P.M.

---

Curtis Poole, Chairman

Bonnie Craig, Secretary