



AGENDA

November 10, 2015

6:00 p.m.

The Roy City Planning Commission regular meeting will be held in the City Council Chamber / Court Room in the Roy City Municipal Building located at 5051 South 1900 West. The meeting will commence with the Pledge of Allegiance, which will be appointed by the Chair.

Agenda Items

1. Declaration of Conflicts
2. Approval of October 27, 2015 regular meeting minutes
3. Continued – Request for Preliminary Subdivision approval for Spencer subdivision, a three (3) lot residential subdivision located at 2343 W. 5200 S.
4. Commissioners Comments
5. Staff Update
6. Adjourn

In Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary communicative aids and services for these meetings should contact the Administration Department at (801) 774-1040 or by email: ced@royutah.org at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Certificate of Posting

The undersigned, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted in a public place within the Roy City limits on this 6th day of November, 2015. A copy was also provided to the Standard Examiner and posted on the Roy City Website on the 6th day of November, 2015.

STEVE PARKINSON;
PLANNING & ZONING ADMINISTRATOR



1 ROY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

2
3 October 27, 2015

4
5 Minutes of the Roy City Planning Commission Meeting held in the Administrative Conference
6 Room of the Roy City Municipal Building on October 27, 2015, at 6:00 p.m.

7
8 The meeting was a regularly scheduled meeting designated by resolution. Notice of the meeting
9 was provided to the *Standard Examiner* at least 24 hours in advance. A copy of the agenda was
10 posted.

11
12 The following members were in attendance:

13
14 Gennie Kirch, Chairman Steve Parkinson, Planner
15 Bob Dandoy Michelle Drago, Secretary
16 Leland Karras
17 Doug Nandell
18 Lindsey Ohlin
19 Joe Paul
20 Claude Payne

21
22 Others present were: Greg Sagen.

23
24 Pledge of Allegiance: Gennie Kirch

25
26 There were no declarations of conflict.

27
28 1. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 13, 2015, MINUTES

29
30 **Commissioner Paul moved to approve the October 13, 2015, minutes as corrected.**
31 **Commissioner Stonehocker seconded the motion. Commission members Dandoy, Karras,**
32 **Kirch, Nandell, Ohlin, Paul, and Payne voted “aye.” The motion carried.**

33
34 2. DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED TITLE 13 – SIGN ORDINANCE

35
36 Steve Parkinson stated that the meat of the new title was contained in Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 7.
37 The rest of the title came from the City’s current sign regulations and had not changed much.

38
39 The Planning Commission decided to review the title page by page. There weren’t any comments
40 about Chapter 1.

41
42 Steve Parkinson stated that more definitions might be added to Chapter 2.

43
44 Commissioner Dandoy stated there some misspelled words in the definitions contained in Chapter
45 2 – Sign, Floodlight and Sign, Off-Premise.

46
47 The Planning Commission had questions about several signs prohibited by 13-3-2. Chairman
48 Kirch said there was a conflict regarding roof signs. They were prohibited in 13-3-2, but were
49 allowed further in the title.
50

51 Commissioner Dandoy what a flood zone sign was. Steve Parkinson stated that FEMA had
52 designated some areas in Roy as flood plains. The Sign Ordinance prohibited any signs in those
53 areas. Commissioner Dandoy asked why. Mr. Parkinson explained that to make any changes to
54 the topography required approval from FEMA. Therefore, a sign would have to receive approval
55 from FEMA. Commissioner Dandoy felt prohibiting signs in flood zones was more of a federal
56 regulation than the City's.

57
58 Commissioner Nandell asked what a snipe sign was. Commissioner Dandoy said it was
59 prohibited. He also wanted to know what it was. Mr. Parkinson was not sure. A definition would
60 have to be added in Chapter 2. Subsequent to the meeting, Commissioner Dandoy found a
61 possible definition for a snipe sign: A sign which is tacked, nailed, posted, pasted, glued, or
62 otherwise attached to trees, poles, wire or wood stakes, or fences, or to other objects with a
63 message appearing thereon.

64
65 The Planning Commission asked why A-frame signs were prohibited. Most of the businesses in
66 Roy used them. Steve Parkinson reminded the Planning Commission that all signs in Roy were
67 currently illegal.

68
69 Chairman Kirch asked if prohibiting animated signs meant EMC signs were prohibited. Mr.
70 Parkinson referred to the definition of an animated sign which said that electronic message signs
71 or time, temperature or public service message signs were not animated signs.

72
73 Chairman Kirch asked for a clarification about the prohibition of parking advertising vehicles.
74 Steve Parkinson said it referred to vehicles used to advertise businesses that were parking in a
75 way to gain attention. Chairman Kirch felt that section needed to be reworded.

76
77 Chairman Kirch asked if 13-3-2-A(12) would prohibit candidates from using a vehicle for campaign
78 advertising. Commissioner Dandoy felt the way the section was worded would prevent a vehicle
79 with advertising from even driving home. Mr. Parkinson said he would look at the wording.

80
81 Commissioner Paul asked about temporary political signs in park strips. Steve Parkinson said
82 political signs were a different animal. They were addressed later in the Sign Ordinance in 13-4-
83 3(O).

84
85 Commissioner Dandoy felt No. 12 needed to be clarified for the reader. Steve Parkinson said he
86 could add the words 'if not in this title' or include the reference to direct the reader elsewhere.

87
88 Commissioner Paul asked about non-conforming signs. Steve Parkinson stated that a sign was
89 only non-conforming if it was legal at the time the City's sign regulations were adopted. As every
90 sign in the City right now was illegal, there would be very few non-conforming signs.

91
92 Chairman Kirch asked if No. 13 – Public Areas referred to yard sale signs. If people couldn't put
93 up yard sale signs how did they advertise them? Commissioner Karras said an ad on KSL would
94 bring more people than you want.

95
96 Steve Parkinson said yard sale signs were difficult because they were usually put up on the
97 weekend when City employees were not working. Mr. Parkinson said it was public property versus
98 private rights. The City had to either allow all signs in public areas or none.

99 Councilman Dandoy asked what was executable. Should the City adopt a statute that was
100 functionally unenforceable? Mr. Parkinson said enforcement of signs on public areas would be
101 difficult, but he didn't want to open the door to all signs. He felt the public would catch on.
102 Commissioner Dandoy did not feel Item No. 13 was attainable.

103
104 Commissioner Paul asked if house numbers could be painted on curbs if signs were prohibited in
105 public areas. Chairman Kirch 13-3-2(B4) allowed numbers to be painted on curbs.

106
107 Chairman Kirch felt No. 13 should include the exceptions listed in 13-3-2(B).

108
109 Commissioner Dandoy questioned the words 'all signs shall require permits' in 13-3-3(A) was too
110 broad. Mr. Parkinson felt the wording was sufficient. There were exceptions to permit fees, but he
111 wanted to require sign permits to set parameters for signs.

112
113 Chairman Kirch stated that 13-3-4(A) repeated itself. The second sentence should be deleted.

114
115 Chairman Kirch asked about if the reference to 'the Director' in 13-3-5 was correct. In other parts
116 of the Sign Ordinance there was reference to 'the Community Development Director.' She felt the
117 terminology should be consistent throughout the ordinance.

118
119 Chairman Kirch felt if 13-3-6 needed to include the candle measurement for electronic message
120 centers.

121
122 Chairman Kirch stated that the 13-4-3 headers needed to match, and 13-4-3(J) needed a
123 description.

124
125 Commissioner Dandoy stated that 13-4-1(O4) limited the number of campaign signs to one per
126 parcel. He felt that corner lots with should be allowed to have two signs; one per frontage to catch
127 the different traffic patterns. Mr. Parkinson said he would look at language to allow one sign per
128 frontage.

129
130 There was a discussion about the maximum size of a campaign sign. Commissioner Dandoy
131 stated that 13-4-1(O5) limited campaign signs to six square feet. Commissioner Paul said the
132 current regulations allowed different sizes in the residential and commercial zones. The signs in
133 commercial zones were larger. The Planning Commission felt campaign signs in commercial
134 zones should be a maximum of 32 square feet, the same size as a 4'x8' sheet of plywood, and a
135 maximum six feet from the ground.

136
137 Commissioner Dandoy stated 13-4-1(O6 and 7) referred to the Code Enforcement Officer. Was
138 the Code Enforcement Officer the employee authorized to enforce the Sign Ordinance? Mr.
139 Parkinson said it was the Code Enforcement Officer, or its authorized agent. If there were issues
140 with the location of a campaign sign, the Code Enforcement employee usually contacted the
141 candidate and asked that the sign be moved. Commissioner Dandoy asked if a City employee
142 would feel comfortable removing a campaign sign. Commissioner Dandoy asked how long the
143 Code Enforcement Officer would wait to remove a campaign sign if it was causing a public safety
144 issue. What would the trigger be? Mr. Parkinson felt that would be up to the City Attorney. If a
145 public safety issue was involved, he felt the Code Enforcement Officer would give it a day.

146

147 Commissioner Dandoy asked how the visual maintenance mentioned in 13-4-1(O9) would affect
148 campaign signs. Steve Parkinson stated that a visual site triangle had to be maintained on all
149 corners. A sign in the site triangle could not be higher than three feet. Commissioner Dandoy
150 suggested that the maximum sign height of three feet be included in 13-4-1(O9).

151
152 Commissioner Dandoy asked about 13-4-1(O10). He felt public property needed to be clarified,
153 i.e., park strips, municipal building, etc.

154
155 Commissioner Dandoy stated that temporary real estate signs referred to 13-4-1(R3) were all
156 over the City. They weren't supposed to be located in park strips, but they were. He was
157 concerned about enforcement. If the Sign Ordinance was adopted, the regulations needed to be
158 enforceable. Steve Parkinson felt there would be an enforcement bubble. Chairman Kirch asked
159 if temporary real estate signs needed a sign permit. Mr. Parkinson said they did not.

160
161 Commissioner Paul asked if police officers could enforce the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Parkinson said
162 they could.

163
164 Chairman Kirch asked about 13-4-1(U). What was the definition of a window covering? Mr.
165 Parkinson said the Sign Ordinance needed to define it. The reason for the regulation was public
166 safety. Police needed to be able to see into a building. Chairman Kirch felt the amount of window
167 coverage should be increased from 25% to 35%. Thirty-five percent was closer to half; 25% was
168 too prohibitive.

169
170 There was discussion about window coverage and what percentage should be allowed.
171 Commissioner Nandell felt business owners would have a problem with a restriction on window
172 covering. Chairman Kirch felt businesses needed some way to draw people in. Commissioner
173 Karras said he didn't look at a window sign until he pulled into a parking lot. Chairman Kirch
174 suggested that Mr. Parkinson look at Clinton, Clearfield, Riverdale, and Ogden City and average
175 the window covering percentage.

176
177 Chairman Kirch suggested wording changes in 13-4-2. 'Dominant' should be 'dominate.' 'Tells'
178 should be 'represents.' 'Feels' should be 'values.' In 13-4-2(A1a) the words 'permitted not more
179 than' should be replaced with 'limited to.'

180
181 Commissioner Dandoy questioned the size of monument sign the Planning Commission could
182 approve for a subdivision in 13-4-2(B2d). Steve Parkinson said that none of the language for
183 monument signs was new. They were existing regulations. Commissioner Dandoy asked if the
184 decision would be made by the developer or the Planning Commission. Mr. Parkinson said the
185 developer would submit a request. Commissioner Dandoy said the Planning Commission could
186 approve the request, recommend a different size, or deny it. Mr. Parkinson said that was correct.
187 The Planning Commission discussed removing this paragraph. Mr. Parkinson pointed that the
188 monument sign was for subdivisions and quasi-public uses.

189
190 Chairman Kirch stated that multiple cabinets were mentioned in 13-4-2(C2d). She asked what
191 multiple cabinets were. Mr. Parkinson explained that a cabinet was the frame for a sign, or group
192 of signs.

193

194 Commissioner Nandell said that electronic message center signs were not allowed in residential
195 zones. What about schools? Steve Parkinson said schools were a quasi-public use and were
196 allowed to seek a conditional use for an electronic message center sign in 13-4-2(D1c).
197

198 Commissioner Dandoy was concerned about regulations for temporary signs in 13-4-2(G). It did
199 not include human signs (person standing on street advertising a business). Steve Parkinson said
200 human signs were protected under free speech. As long as they moved for pedestrian traffic,
201 there wasn't much the City could do about them.
202

203 Commissioner Dandoy stated that the proposed regulations for temporary signs in 13-4-2(G1b
204 and d) allowed businesses to use temporary signs for three special promotions and eight other
205 holidays throughout the year. Why did the City care how many promotions a business had during
206 the year? Why was the City putting restrictions on promotions?
207

208 Steve Parkinson said it was an effort to cut back on the sign clutter. The proposed regulations
209 allowed businesses to advertise a promotion almost every month of the year.
210

211 Commissioner Karras said the dates only pertained to temporary signs.
212

213 Commissioner Ohlin asked about the holidays listed in the regulations. Mr. Parkinson said he had
214 checked sign ordinances for seven other cities. Those were the holidays they listed. Chairman
215 Kirch said they were standard advertising holidays in the business world.
216

217 Commissioner Dandoy stated that if a business was limited to one temporary sign, did the City
218 care when it held a promotion? He felt the City should stick with limiting the number of temporary
219 signs and not worry about how often a business put up a temporary sign.
220

221 Commissioner Paul said if a business had a temporary sign in the same place all the time, it was
222 no longer a temporary sign.
223

224 Commissioner Dandoy felt the City was trying to put all businesses in the same box. It needed to
225 have a broader perspective.
226

227 Steve Parkinson stated that signs for service and retail businesses were treated the same.
228

229 Commissioner Dandoy stated that not all businesses had retail sales. How did the City make the
230 Sign Ordinance flexible enough to address all needs?
231

232 Chairman Kirch stated that businesses could also use other advertising methods, such as window
233 signs or EMC's.
234

235 Chairman Kirch felt the note about banner signs included at the bottom of the holiday periods in
236 13-4-2(G1d) needed to be included in 13-4-2(G1b).
237

238 Chairman Kirch stated that 7-Eleven stores had a board on the front on their stores used for
239 advertising. They changed the copy periodically. Was that considered a temporary sign? Mr.
240 Parkinson said it was a permanent sign and was probably never approved.
241

242 Commissioner Nandell was concerned that if the City overburdened businesses they would leave.

243

244 After further discussion, the Planning Commission agreed to allow four promotion periods during
245 the year of ten days each and leave the holiday periods as listed.

246

247 Chairman Kirch asked if language about permits for temporary signs and stickers needed to be
248 added to 13-4-2(G). Mr. Parkinson said permits were addressed in 13-3-3 and 13-8. He felt
249 stickers on temporary signs should be a policy rather than an ordinance.

250

251 Commissioner Dandoy was still struggling with the City defining promotions. He wasn't willing to
252 let it rest.

253

254 Commissioner Dandoy asked billboards, which were addressed in 13-7. Steve Parkinson said the
255 City currently had five non-conforming billboards. The regulations had been written to encourage
256 billboard owners to relocate them along the I-15 corridor. Chairman Kirch asked if adjoining cities
257 would approach Roy if they considered a billboard near Roy's boundaries. Mr. Parkinson said
258 they would not. If a billboard was located in another jurisdiction, there wasn't much the City could
259 do.

260

261 Commissioner Dandoy asked who regulated fees for sign permits. Steve Parkinson said fees
262 were set by the City Council. The Planning Commission didn't have input about permit fees. The
263 sign permit told the City where a sign would be located, what it would look like, how long it would
264 be there, and when it would come down.

265

266 Chairman Kirch suggested that 13-8-1(A10c) be added indicating that permits for temporary signs
267 would not have a fee.

268

269 Steve Parkinson stated that the City Attorney was still reviewing the Sign Ordinance. There might
270 be other changes.

271

272 Chairman Kirch thanked Mr. Parkinson for his efforts to rewrite the City's Sign Ordinance. He had
273 accomplished what the City had been attempting to do for over six years.

274

275 3. COMMISSIONER'S MINUTES

276

277 Chairman Kirch stated that she had spoken with Lynn Wangsgard, the Weber County Library
278 Director. Ms. Wangsgard was not aware that the library's lights were on at night. The library had
279 had some vandalism. They planned to move into the library in November and be open in February.

280

281 Chairman Kirch was concerned about zoning for North Park. It was currently zoned R-1-8. She
282 asked if it could be changed to a Business Park Zone. Residents were concerned that it could be
283 changed to commercial. Cathy Spencer, Management Services Director, said that the frontage
284 along 1900 West was in a redevelopment area. It did have the potential for a commercial use.
285 She felt the City Council planned to talk to the Planning Commission about the zoning.

286

287 4. STAFF UPDATE

288

289 Steve Parkinson reported that the height of the senior housing had been resolved. The basement
290 was not considered a level because it was underground. Chairman Kirch asked if the size of the
291 property had been resolved. Mr. Parkinson said there was a difference between the size the
292 County had and the survey. He felt the County had included the right-of-way in the property
293 description. He felt the amenities proposed by the developer qualified them for the density bonus,
294 although most of the amenities were not outside.

295

296 5. ADJOURN

297

298 **Commissioner Nandell moved to adjourn at 7:59 p.m. Commissioner Payne seconded the**
299 **motion. Commission members Dandoy, Karras, Kirch, Nandell, Ohlin, Paul, and Payne**
300 **voted "aye." The motion carried.**

301

302

303

304

305 Attest:

306

307

308

309 _____
Michelle Drago

310 Secretary

311

312 dc:poct2715

Gennie Kirch
Chairman

SYNOPSIS

Application Information

Applicant: Sharon Spencer
Loren Kay

Request: Request for Preliminary Subdivision approval for Spencer Subdivision, a three (3) lot single-family residential subdivision.

Address: Approximately 2243 West 5200 South

Land Use Information

Current Zoning: R-1-8; Single-Family Residential

Adjacent Land Use: North: R-1-8; Single-Family Residential South: R-1-8; Single-Family Residential
East: R-1-8; Single-Family Residential West: R-1-8; Single-Family Residential

Staff

Report By: Steve Parkinson

Recommendation: Recommends denial

APPLICABLE ORDINANCES

- Roy City Zoning Ordinance Title 10, Chapter 10 (General Property Development Standards)
- Roy City Subdivision Ordinance Title 11, Chapter 3 (Preliminary Subdivision Application)
- Roy City Subdivision Ordinance Title 11, Chapter 9 (Subdivision Development Standards)

BACKGROUND

The property is located just west of the Roy City cemetery, on the south side of 5200 South. Lots 1 & 3 already exist. 5200 South has a wider R.O.W. than most streets. Typically there is normally 66 feet from property line to property line (sidewalks are usually found within the R.O.W. 5200 South has an 82.5 foot R.O.W. because in 1984 on the south side of 5200 South a drought relief line was installed. The council adopted resolution 198 (exhibit "?"), which states that "residence with property adjoining the drought line ... shall be allowed to use the area occupied by the drought line as "yard" area required by setback requirements".

On September 8, 2015 the Planning Commission heard and voted to deny the applicants' original request. On October 6 and Council also heard the request, but prior to the Council making a vote the spokesman for the applicants withdrew the request. Since that Council meeting the applicant has submitted new plans showing a different configuration to divide the area into three (3) parcels.

The new subdivision configuration has Lot 2 with an odd tail like portion that is fifteen (15) feet wide and runs ninety-six (96) feet. There is also an easement on 90% of this tail portion to allow Lot 3 to have access to the rear portion of his property. Thus making the tail portion of Lot 2 un-useable for anyone other than the owner of Lot 3.

Subdivision: The proposed subdivision is to subdivide two (2) existing parcels into three (3) separate parcels. In total there is .72 acres (31,273 square feet) of property to be split into three (3) individual parcels.

According to the Roy City Subdivision Code, Section 903 which states:

- I. Arrangement and Design: The lot arrangement and design shall be such that lots will provide satisfactory and desirable sites for buildings, and be properly related to topography and to existing and future

requirements.

Staff is unsure how the configuration of Lot 2 with the tail end (provided only to get the required lot area, but has an easement across 90% of it) would provide satisfaction to a home owner or be desirable to build an accessory building.

Zoning: The property is currently zoned R-1-8 and according to table 10-1 of the zoning ordinance the R-1-8 zone requires that each single-family lots to be a minimum of 8,000 sq.-ft.

Access: Lot 1 has access onto 2300 South with lots 2 & 3 having direct access to 5200 South.

Improvements / Utilities: Lot 2 is the only parcel that does not already have utilities, because lots 1 & 3 already exist and already have all utilities.

DRC Review: The DRC has reviewed the proposed subdivision, see attached memo, with the exception of comments from the Engineer, which are still forthcoming. Lot 2 does not comply with the lot area requirements without the tail and the tail does not comply with the Subdivision Ordinance.

CONFORMANCE TO THE GENERAL PLAN

The future land use map shows and supports this area to be developed as R-1-8; Single-Family Density Residential.

CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

- I. Compliance to the requirements and recommendations as outline in this report and the DRC memo dated 5 November 2015.

FINDINGS

- I. The proposed subdivision does not meet all of the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

The Planning Commission can recommend Approval, Approval with conditions, or Table.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends denial of the Preliminary Subdivision of Spencer Subdivision located at approximately 2243 West 5050 South.

EXHIBITS

- A. Aerial Map
- B. Preliminary Subdivision plat
- C. DRC Memo dated 5 November 2015

EXHIBIT "A" - AERIAL MAP





DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

REVIEW MEMO

Date: 5 November 2015

To: Loren O. Kay
Sharon P. Spencer
E. Roche – Reeve & Associates

From: Steve Parkinson – Planning & Zoning Administrator 
Mark Miller – City Engineer
Ross Oliver – Public Works Director
Jeff Comeau – Deputy Fire Chief
Ed Pehrson – Building Official
Clint Drake – City Attorney

Subject: Spencer Subdivision [2243 We. 5200 So.] – Preliminary Plat

We have tried to address all items of concern with reference to all applicable City codes or for the general Health, Safety and Welfare of the public, however, this review does not forego any other items of concern that may come to our attention during additional reviews.

Engineering / Fire / Public Works / Legal

1. No comments received as of yet.

Building

1. There shall be a Geotechnical Engineer inspection conducted once the excavation has been completed and prior to any fill or footings being placed. The Geotech Engineer shall provide a report to the contractor, which will then turn it into the City Building Official for review. All conditions present at the time of inspection shall be noted and any recommendations from the Geotechnical Engineer shall be followed. Soil type, ground water, and fill material are a few of the items to be checked for.
2. Section R405.1 Concrete or masonry foundations requires drains to be installed. Drains shall be provided around all concrete or masonry foundations that retain earth and enclose habitable or usable spaces located below *grade*. Drainage tiles, gravel or crushed stone drains, perforated pipe or other *approved* systems or materials shall be installed at or below the area to be protected and shall discharge by gravity or mechanical means into an *approved* drainage system. Gravel or crushed stone drains shall extend at least 1 foot (305 mm) beyond the outside edge of the footing and 6 inches (152 mm) above the top of the footing and be covered with an *approved* filter membrane material. The top of open joints of drain tiles shall be protected with strips of building paper. Perforated drains shall be surrounded with an *approved* filter membrane or the filter membrane shall cover the washed gravel or crushed rock covering the drain. Drainage tiles or perforated pipe shall be placed on a minimum of 2 inches (51 mm) of washed gravel or crushed rock at least one sieve size larger than the tile joint opening or perforation and covered with not less than 6 inches (152 mm) of the same material.
3. Property lines shall be established so as to maintain the minimum fire separation distances of 5' to detached structures on adjoining properties and to maintain the minimum set back requirements for the zone in which it is located for dwelling units.

Planning

1. The canopy on Lot 1 needs to be removed, or property line between Lots 1 & 2 will need to move East so that it is twenty five (25) feet from the canopy.
2. Drive approach to lot 3 is too large and a portion of it will need to be removed and the curb and will need to be replaced.
3. According to Weber County Lot 1 owns to the middle of 2300 West, that portion of the right of way needs to be dedicated to the city.
4. Concrete pad on proposed Lot 2 will need to be removed.
5. Building on Lot 3 has to maintain an eight (8) foot side yard, property line will need to move West so that it is eight (8) feet.
6. All junk and unlicensed/inoperable vehicles will need to be removed or placed on appropriate surfaces.
7. How is the configuration of the proposed Lot 2 going to be used by a potential homeowner? How is it desirable to anyone to have such an area of land? (Title 11 section 903). It is also un-useable due to the imposed easement.
8. Plat shows Lot 2 as having 8,059 sq.-ft, but adding up all of the land that is being proposed for Lot 2, it adds up to something different. Same problem with Lot 3.
9. The signature blocks for Engineer, City Council and Attorney are incorrect, see below for correct language

ROY CITY ATTORNEY

Approved as to form this _____ day of _____, A.D. 20_____.

Roy City Attorney

ROY CITY ENGINEER

I hereby certify that the requirements of all applicable statues and ordinances prerequisite to approval by the Engineer of the foregoing plat and dedications have been complied with. Signed this _____ day of _____, 20 _____.

Roy City Engineer

ROY CITY ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that this subdivision plat was duly accepted by the City Council of Roy City and approved by the Mayor, on the _____ day of _____, 20_____.

Roy City Mayor

Attest