MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE HYRUM CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD MARCH 27, 2025 AT THE HYRUM CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 60 WEST MAIN, HYRUM, UTAH.

CONVENED: 6:30 P.M.

CONDUCTING: Stephen Nelson

PRESENT: Chairman Stephen Nelson, Commissioners Averie Wheeler, Paul Willardson and Alternate Member Scott Casas.

EXCUSED: Vice Chair Angi Bair, Commissioner Brian Carver

CALL TO ORDER: There being four present and four representing a quorum, Chairman Stephen Nelson called the meeting to order.

OTHERS PRESENT: City Planner Tony Ekins, City Engineer Matt Holmes and 26 citizens. Secretary Shara Toone recorded the minutes.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Commissioner Casas led the governing body and the citizens in the Pledge of Allegiance.

INVOCATION: Commissioner Willardson

AGENDA APPROVAL:

A copy of the notice and agenda for this meeting was posted on the Utah Public Notice Website and Hyrum City's website, distributed to each member of the Planning Commission, and posted at the City Offices more than forty-eight hours before meeting time.

ACTION

Commissioner Willardson made a motion to approve the agenda for March 27, 2025, as written. Commissioner Casas seconded the motion and Commissioners Casas, Nelson, Wheeler, and Willardson voted aye.

5. SCHEDULED DELEGATIONS

A. <u>Jesse Elsmore</u>, <u>Jardine Builders</u>, <u>LLC</u> - To request site plan approval for two (2) two-story mixed-use buildings located at 139 West Main Street & 127 West Main Street, consisting of 0.96 acres.

6. ADJOURNMENT

SCHEDULED DELEGATIONS:

JESSE ELSMORE, JARDINE BUILDERS, LLC - TO REQUEST SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR TWO (2) TWO-STORY MIXED-USE BUILDINGS LOCATED AT 139 WEST MAIN STREET & 127 WEST MAIN STREET, CONSISTING OF 0.96 ACRES.

City Planner Ekins said that the meeting is a continuation of one held on February 13, 2025. The applicant, Jardine Builders, has submitted a petition to the city for a permitted mixed-use commercial project within the (C-2) commercial zone. The (C-2)downtown mixed-use zone is designated to preserve the mixed-use nature and feel of downtown Hyrum providing for office, commercial, and residential uses, with a mixed-use setting. A primary goal of the (C-2) downtown mixed-use zone is to establish visually appealing streetscapes that include landscaping to buffer sidewalks from major roadways, as well as features such as recreational amenities and social gathering spaces to support a walkable community. This comes from the adopted code that guides the vision for development within the (C-2) district. The applicant would like to develop the 0.96 acres with two, two story, mixeduse buildings facing the streetscape on Main Street. The main floor level of each building will be divided into two north and south commercial units for a combined of four ground level commercialuse units. The applicant shared a list of possible uses, which is included in a public packet, with their project details. These uses include things like open market and conference space, a community kitchen, classrooms for homeschool and training, farmers or craft markets, and space for non-profit groups. Each building will also have six short-term hotel-style units on the upper floor, with single or double beds. The units will be reached by stairs inside the buildings and will have secure entry doors at the main level. The February 13, 2025 meeting was a planning commission meeting where the applicant discussed the staff's first review comments. The commission recommended that the applicant make updates and come back, and they agreed to hold a special meeting for that purpose-which is why this meeting is being held now. Staff received updated documents from the applicant, which are included in the packet shown on screen. Compared to the first review, the new staff comments were minimal and all were addressed. One main issue was about sewer lines: city code requires a separate sewer line for each building with residential units. This wasn't clearly shown at first, and there was some confusion about the definitions of "dwelling" and "dwelling unit." The sewer department clarified the requirement during the second review, and planning staff agreed with that correction based on the code.

Chairman Nelson asked if the requirement means that each building needs its own sewer line, or if each individual room needs one.

City Planner Ekins said each building needs its own lateral line and then it can break out and service each building.

Chairman Nelson clarified that only one sewer line is needed for each building.

City Planner Ekins confirmed that each building needs its own sewer line, so instead of the one shown on the plans, the code requires two. He noted because the applicant made the requested updates, staff recommended the planning commission forward the project to the city council for further discussion. He pointed out that there were people in the audience and the commission could open the meeting for public comment if they wanted. He also notified them that a phone call opposing the project was received by the mayor from a citizen named Terry Johnson. He explained that the original planning commission meeting took place on February 13, 2025, and tonight's meeting on March 27, 2025, is a continuation of that discussion. The next city council meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2025, after two cancellations—one for spring break and another for a conference. If the planning commission recommends moving the project forward, it will be added to the May 1, 2025 city council agenda. The applicant can respond to any remaining staff comments by April 17, 2025 and staff will complete a third review before the city council meeting. The final decision will be made by the city council.

Chairman Nelson asked for confirmation that this is an administrative decision and that the development is allowed by right.

City Planner Ekins said this is a permitted use and the decision is administrative.

Commissioner Casas asked about the retention area on the east side of the parking lot, specifically what the surface is made ofwhether it's turf or gravel.

City Engineer Holmes mentioned that he didn't see details about the surface of the retention area, and there were also no calculations provided on how the volume was determined. He noted that these are things the engineering team is still waiting on.

City Planner Ekins added that the applicant did submit the stormwater calculations and drainage report, but they were

received too late to be included in the packet for this meeting. However, staff does have them on file.

Commissioner Casas asked how the retention pond is coded, specifically what kind of surface it has—whether it's grass, gravel, or something else.

City Planner Ekins said the applicant can answer that question. He noted that the city engineer, Matt, reviewed the engineering details and shared his findings.

Jesse Elsmore from Jardine Builders thanked the commission for holding the special meeting. He explained that due to the narrow and long shape of the stormwater detention area within the 15-foot green space easement, they plan to line it with a rock or gravel surface. He also mentioned that they will add protection between the pond and the parking area—ideally using decorative boulders if space allows, or another type of barrier if needed. He also gave an update on changes made since the last meeting. One major concern was parking, so he removed the previously shown future use area at the back (south end) of the lot and replaced it with additional parking. The project now includes 54 parking stalls, including ADA stalls, one of which will be van accessible. A breakdown of square footage and expected use was included in their updated response to help show how they meet the parking requirements.

Chairman Nelson mentioned that once there are more than 50 parking spaces, three ADA stalls are required, so the applicant may need to add one more.

City Engineer Holmes said he believed that one ADA stall is required up to 50 spaces, and two are required up to 100 spaces, but he said he would double-check to be sure.

Chairman Nelson said he thought that once there are more than 50 parking spaces, three ADA stalls are required. He added that it shouldn't be a major change but is something that should be confirmed.

Jesse Jardine said it would be easy to add a third ADA stall if needed. He said a lot of time has been spent on designing the stormwater retention ponds, which included a full geotechnical study and PERC tests. In addition, the utility designs have been worked on, and they have no problem adding two separate sewer laterals as required. It was explained that there was a mistake in the water line drawing—it showed a two-inch line going to a four-inch line and then to the hydrant, but that was just an error. The

correct plan is for an eight-inch line from the main connection to the hydrant, with a lateral coming off of it. Also, the building footprint has been increased slightly. The original size was 40×60 feet, but it's now 40×70 feet. This change was made to fit two separate stairway exits inside the building instead of on the outside.

Annette Francis said that she originally bought the land with the intention of building senior housing, but the zoning didn't allow it in the way she had planned. So, the current project is the best option they could develop while following Hyrum City's rules and zoning for that area. She also shared a positive conversation with a long-time Hyrum resident, whose family helped settle the town. He was excited about the project and even offered to donate an elevator to one of the buildings. As someone who uses a wheelchair, he supported the idea because it's hard to find short-term, ADA-accessible housing. Annette said she's excited that the elevator would make it possible for seniors to access the upper floor.

Jesse Elsmore shared a few project updates. One of the buildings will include an elevator. He also discussed the location of the dumpster enclosure, which had been debated in a previous meeting. They decided to place it at the back of the property, near the west edge. It won't be visible from the street because it will be behind the west building. This location works well for garbage truck access and is convenient for tenants. Fencing was another topic. They extended a six-foot-tall cedar fence around the entire property. In the southeast corner, where a neighbor's existing fence line crosses onto the property, they plan to jog around it for now and make adjustments if needed. He also mentioned that more detail was added to the street area in response to comments. This includes existing trees, signage, a sidewalk, and crosswalk signs. They are also considering ideas for a project sign at the street and are open to showing those concepts if requested.

Commissioner Willardson asked what type of material would be between the two buildings.

Jesse Elsmore said the area between the two buildings will have a hard surface, either pavement or concrete.

Commissioner Willardson asked for clarification about the shared access off of Main Street between the two properties. He wanted to know how it will work and what has been done about it since it was last discussed.

Jesse Elsmore explained that, following UDOT's requirement, they

created a 50-foot continuous shared access approach with the neighboring property. A fence will wrap around the 15-foot green space to help separate the two driveways. He mentioned they could also add signage to clearly mark that 1860 is to the left and the private drive is to the right to avoid confusion.

Chairman Nelson asked if there are any problems with site triangles with the fence being there.

City Engineer Holmes said it'll have to be below a certain height so that people can see down the sidewalk and out in the road.

Jesse Elsmore said they could slope the fence down to four feet or whatever height is needed.

There was back and forth dialogue between Annette Francis and a citizen in the audience regarding property lines.

City Planner Ekins asked that the applicants finish presenting and not let the discussion turn into back-and-forth dialogue between the audience and the podium.

Commissioner Willardson clarified that the plan includes a 50-foot approach because that's what was required by UDOT. Part of that 50-foot approach would be a sloped down fence that someone could potentially drive into.

Jesse Elsmore said adding striping could help make things clearer, though it might be affected by winter weather. He also said that striping and signage on the fence would help guide drivers.

Commissioner Willardson asked if they left it there because they were required to.

Jesse Elsmore said that was correct.

Chairman Nelson asked if the access to the property meets our standards, as presented.

City Engineer Holmes said the situation isn't fully resolved. The city has requirements for distance from the property line, but the UDOT section, especially where it crosses the gutter, doesn't meet those standards. He added that it's difficult for the city to make UDOT follow city requirements.

Commissioner Willardson clarified that UDOT governs on their right of way.

Chairman Nelson asked if UDOT is open to another access point along the property front.

City Engineer Holmes said that if someone wants a different access point, they would need to apply for a variance with UDOT and get it approved.

Annette Francis said they tried to get approval for access in the middle of the property, but UDOT did not allow it.

She explained that Hyrum City's 50-year plan shows the entire block as commercial, and UDOT used that plan to make its decision. UDOT wouldn't allow the access to be placed within a certain distance of other streets. She also mentioned hiring a consultant and paying \$2,000 to avoid putting the access where it is now, but it couldn't be changed.

Commissioner Wheeler said that there is a note about the HVAC system for the west building.

Jesse Elsmore said that was a drafting error. The HVAC system will be in an enclosure with full screening and some sound barriers, and it will be placed on the east side of the building, similar to the one that's shown on the backside of the west building.

Commissioner Willardson suggested discussing the streetscape features while the applicant was still present.

Annette Francis said they will follow the code.

Jesse Elsmore said there was a comment about a tree that may need to be checked for health and possibly replaced. He said they've noted that on the plans and can add any other needed features as well.

Commissioner Willardson asked if they have a particular choice.

City Engineer Holmes said there is an existing list of approved medium and large trees that's been in place for a long time. They've been waiting for the tree board to update the list, but that hasn't happened yet. The current list can be provided if needed.

Jesse Elsmore said one challenge they need to watch for is the crosswalk sign, specifically the flashing school zone sign that's already there.

City Engineer Holmes said UDOT will be replacing the current signs with full cross arms that hang over the street.

City Planner Ekins said that before the project is recommended to the City Council, the streetscape detail should be included. Since it's a required part of the code and is currently missing, he recommended that the motion include a request for the applicant to have that detail ready for the City Council presentation.

Chairman Nelson said that while there may be a dispute between neighboring property owners, it's not the Planning Commission's role to get involved in those issues. If there are any facts or concerns related to the proposal violating an agreement, neighbors should bring that to city staff and provide a record for the City Council. He said the commission's focus is on reviewing details related to code and ordinance, and any public comments should be submitted to staff. The Planning Commission is only a recommending body, and the City Council will make the final decision.

Commissioner Willardson said he was still unsure about the access width. He asked if 25 feet is wide enough for two cars to pass one another and whether that's acceptable for a development like this.

Commissioner Casas said he felt okay with the 25-foot width. He mentioned that many places are narrower and still work fine. He recently measured a public area for another project and saw that two cars or even small trucks could go in and out comfortably with 25 feet of space.

Chairman Nelson said that fire code requires a minimum of 20 feet for access, but if the width is only 20 feet, no parking or loading is allowed along the sides. Parking is only allowed when the access is at least 26 feet wide. Since the current plan is under 26 feet, he suggested adding a recommendation to post "No Parking" signs along the access ways.

Commissioner Willardson agreed and said it would be a good idea to not allow parking along the interior corridor.

City Engineer Holmes explained that 26 feet is the minimum required for aerial fire truck access. Normally, 20 feet is enough for a fire access road, unless it's next to a hydrant—then it must also be 26 feet. He said fire code requires 26 feet if an aerial truck is involved. Two 12-foot lanes are usually enough for vehicles to pass each other. Since it will be a fire lane, there should be no parking at any time. If needed, signs can be added. He said the

plan meets the minimum requirements of the fire code.

Commissioner Willardson said it's important to remember that their role is to review whether the project meets code requirements, and he felt that this one does.

Commissioner Wheeler said she agrees with the suggested changes and emphasized the importance of including the streetscape. She said that if those things are followed, there's no reason to deny the plan.

ACTION

Commissioner Casas made a motion to recommend site plan approval for two (2) two-story mixed-use buildings located at 139 West Main Street & 127 West Main Street, consisting of 0.96 acres, with these conditions: 1.Two sewer laterals 2.City Council get details of streetscape 3. Address all of staff comments that the City Council get. Commissioner Wheeler seconded the motion and Commissioners Bair, Carver, Nelson, Wheeler, and Willardson voted aye.

ADJOURNMENT:

ACTION

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

| Stephen | Nelson | | |
|----------|--------|--|--|
| Chairman | | | |

ATTEST:

Shara Toone Secretary

Approved: May 8, 2025
As Written