

Adopted Minutes
Spanish Fork City Development Review Committee
February 13, 2008

Staff: Richard Nielson, Richard Heap, Shawn Beecher, Dave Munson, Joe Jarvis, Marvin Banks, Carl Johnston, Junior Baker, Dave Anderson, Kelly Peterson, Dave Oyler, Shawn Jorgensen, Doug Shorts, Ryan Baum

Citizens: Kelvin Bird, Glen Cook

Called to order at 10:05 AM.

Mr. Heap asked questions about minutes from January 30th.

Mr. Anderson proposed getting everyone the newest copy.

Mr. Baker suggested changes.

Mr. Baker made a **motion** to **approve** the January 23, 2008 minutes. Richard Nielson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor. Mr. Baker made a **motion** to **continue** the minutes of January 30, 2008. Mr. Anderson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

River Bottoms Annexation

Mr. Anderson suggested that the most appropriate course of action was to first work on reviewing the General Plan and then entertain an annexation proposal.

Mr. Cook mentioned extending 30 days.

Mr. Baker asked if they had contacted Lynn Leifson.

Mr. Cook said they have someone working on it. He also mentioned that density and General Plan amendments will be based on sewer capacity and the flood plain study. They expect to be turning in a General Plan amendment application next week based on the results of the studies.

Mr. Anderson feels without an amendment development the River Bottoms doesn't seem practical. He pointed out that not accepting their petition doesn't bar them from re-petitioning. Mr. Cook asked how long the process would take. Mr. Anderson said we need to know where we're at with FEMA and the flood plain study, which he expects to know in a couple of weeks; then, talk about land use, including density, which could take six months and a transportation plan which could be finished by this time next year if not earlier.

Mr. Baker mentioned that the last General Plan review and revision took a year and a half to do and said that things could be done in a year but may take longer.

Mr. Cook mentioned discussion among the property owners about a trail system. He is worried about the annexation being dropped slowing down other developments in the area. He says that the City and the landowners may be using different words to describe the same issues, which is leading to confusion. He asked about leaving the annexation behind while working on the General Plan amendment.

Mr. Baker mentioned how the land owners are cooperating and asked how many of the landowners are participating. Mr. Cook mentioned there being about 150 parcels and says 25 owners have ten acres or more, 8 with fifty or more. He said they have reached the requirements for land value and area.

Mr. Baker said he would like to see a lot more than 50%. He says he wants to make sure the smaller landowners are also buying into the idea.

Mr. Cook said all he can do is follow the rules, which say 50%.

Mr. Baker said they don't have to accept the application despite keeping the rules.

Mr. Shorts mentioned sending out public notices so everyone would know the situation.

Mr. Anderson mentioned that a formal review of the General Plan could be considered a good faith step that the City is taking to prepare for the eventual annexation of the River Bottoms.

Mr. Heap asked about the timeline for starting work on a General Plan amendment.

Mr. Baker and Mr. Oyler mentioned the density discussion.

Mr. Oyler asked where the "magic number" is for density which will keep them from annexing. He asked what this facility can carry and mentioned that density is a political issue.

Mr. Cook said they sewer capacity could probably handle ten thousand units. At 2.5 units per acre you would have forty two hundred units. He asked for 2.5 units per acre with options for clustering, trails, etc. He mentioned some people that may want 1-acre lots. Mr. Anderson said this reinforces his position about the General Plan amendment.

Mr. Baker said Mr. Anderson's position makes more sense.

Mr. Cook asked if he should let the landowners know that the annexation should take 90 days, once the General Plan is amended.

Mr. Baker said, legally, it would take four to five months.

Mr. Cook asked about trails being built before the annexation.

Mr. Baker and Mr. Heap explained that that wasn't the current plan.

Mr. Peterson mentioned the need for a substation.

Mr. Oyler said this would be a part of the General Plan amendment. He asked Mr. Anderson to review the study process.

Mr. Anderson first mentioned flood plain, then transportation studies.

Mr. Oyler pointed out the difference in the current density from the future.

Mr. Anderson said that the General Plan amendment should come before the other studies. Mr. Anderson suggested finding a consultant for land use questions and asked Mr. Cook if he would help financially.

The importance of the density issue being addressed first was discussed.

Mr. Oyler asked if water and sewer will be done in-house, Mr. Nielson answering in the affirmative.

Mr. Bird said the key to financial help is to make sure everyone knows what is going on.

Mr. Oyler said the critical issue is the land-use planning and finding the appropriate density.

Mr. Cook mentioned that he'd like to temporarily shelve the annexation and apply for the General Plan amendment and as studies for their area come up, he wants to know if the City expects them to help with the costs.

Mr. Baker said that if they are working on the General Plan then they will be working on the annexation.

Mr. Anderson made a **motion** to recommend to the City council to **deny** the annexation so they can tell them what they believe does need to happen, based on the following findings:

1. The City should review the General Plan for the River Bottoms prior to entertaining annexation proposals.
2. That it may be most appropriate for the landholders petitioning for annexation to initiate a General Plan amendment.
3. That as part of that General Plan amendment, the City would take into account the pending flood plain letter of map revision study, the transportation element of the General Plan, power and other utility studies.

Mr. Oyler said we should be specific about density and Mr. Anderson added the following findings:

4. That most of the necessary studies can't be completed until land-use questions (density) have been answered.
5. That some of the necessary studies will be funded by the City but that the City may look to a group of applicants to help fund some of the necessary studies.

Mr. Oyler said finding 4 is closely related to the floodplain study and it should be completed before.

Mr. Bird asked about the trail issues and if the landowners will be contacted.

Mr. Nielson said they would meet individually with the landowners to discuss trail issues.

Mr. Cook asked for another copy of the trail the landowners had laid out.

Mr. Heap said that Mr. Thompson has it, who would speak to the landowners.

Mr. Cook said the majority of the trail would be on the land of people who are currently involved in the discussion.

Mr. Baker **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Maple Mountain

Mr. Anderson asked to go out of order and look at the proposed phasing plan. He explained the background of the situation. He mentioned installing public improvements along main roads. He mentioned adding the four requirements from his Feb. 8th memorandum. He made a motion to approve the phasing plan.

Mr. Baker asked when improvements would be made for existing homes.

Mr. Anderson answered that they would be put in for that home when they were put in for the rest of the phase the home would be a part of. He explained that they do improvements as they do the phase, not as they do the plat. The committee added to the fourth requirement to make it easier to understand.

Mr. Baker asked if the notes from the phasing plan are accurate and Mr. Anderson suggested how it should be clarified. He added a fifth note to the requirements.

Mr. Baker suggested they continue to work on the language of the requirements.

Mr. Jorgensen mentioned that a definition of a phase and a plat should be included with the requirements.

Mr. Anderson made a **motion to approve** the phasing plan for Maple Mountain as displayed on exhibit A and explained in the memorandum. Mr. Baker **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Mr. Oyler had a question on the motion and asked if requirement five would be applied to the phasing plan.

Mr. Anderson said they would work on making it more clear.

Maple Mountain Townhomes Plat A

Mr. Salisbury has a new design for a townhome unit and is planning to amend the plat.

Mr. Baum mentioned discussions with Mr. Salisbury about making driveways deep enough for people to park on the driveway.

Mr. Oyler made a **motion to approve** the amended plat. Mr. Nielson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

New Submittals

Mr. Anderson mentioned the EBCo submission and asked people to make long lists of all the issues they could think of with the property. He said he had talked to Jack Evans and said they would meet later in the month to discuss the issues with the property.

Mr. Oyler asked if they have adequate sewer capacity as part of their plan, Mr. Nielson answered in the negative. Mr. Oyler asked if they should meet with Mr. Nielson first to discuss sewer issues.

Mr. Anderson said yes and also mentioned power and other issues.

Christensen

Mr. Anderson explained the situation with the Christensen property. He asks again for a list of issues to discuss with the developers.

Mr. Oyler asked about Rocky Mountain Power right-of-way, whether or not it will be used for back yards, etc.

Mr. Anderson and Mr. Neilson answered in the negative.

Mr. Oyler again mentioned the importance of the density factor.

Mr. Nielson asked Mr. Baker about the legal implications suggested. He answered that since they own the property they can use the right-of-way in determining density whether Rocky Mountain Power wants them to or not.

Mr. Oyler said no Rocky Mountain Power area can be used in their lots.

Mr. Anderson said the land has already been deeded to the City.

Mr. Baker made a **motion to adjourn**. Mr. Banks **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Adopted: February 27, 2008

Dave Munson, Planning Intern