

**Adopted Minutes  
Development Review Committee  
Wednesday, February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

**Staff present:** Shawn Jorgensen, Shawn Beecher, Dave Anderson, Dave Munson, Joe Jarvis, Chris Thompson, Ryan Baum, Ryan Bagley, Seth Perrins, John Little, Junior Baker, Marvin Banks, Doug Shorts, Chris Swenson

**Citizens present:** Mark Dallin.

This meeting was called to order at 10:01 by Mr. Anderson.

**Minutes: January 30, 2008 and February 13, 2008**

On the January 30<sup>th</sup> minutes, Mr. Baker made corrections. Mr. Baker made a **motion to approve** the minutes of January 30, 2008; with the corrections. Mr. Thompson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Mr. Anderson made a **motion to continue** the February 13, 2008 minute. Mr. Thompson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

**Mark Dallin Zoning Text Amendment**

Applicant: Mark Dallin

General Plan: N/A

Zoning: N/A

Location: City Wide

Mr. Anderson explained the situation with Mr. Dallin. He referred to the handouts. He said that we need to take some of the information out of the footnotes in the zoning ordinance and put them in the main text. He mentioned that some renumbering of the footnotes would be necessary.

Mr. Baker pointed out some areas that need to be more specifically defined.

In an example, Mr. Anderson moved the footnote information on townhomes and duplexes into the main text of the ordinance. He proposed changing the minimum lot width for a duplex from a minimum of 80 feet to 60 feet.

Mr. Thompson mentioned a concern of having two garages and narrow doors in a close proximity and how that layout is less attractive.

Mr. Jorgensen suggested different building layouts that might be more attractive.

Mr. Thompson says the important thing to ask is what you want to encourage the builders to build as far as frontage. He said that narrow frontage would encourage builders to build the whole house behind the garage.

Mr. Anderson suggested reducing the minimum lot width to 60 feet. He also proposed changing the minimum lot sizes, which currently have two minimums depending on zone. He proposed 9,700 square feet for all zones.

Mr. Thompson proposed changing the title of the table to Single Family Residential Development Standards, because the proposed changes would leave it mostly as information for single family homes.

Mr. Anderson said that he would like to leave it the same because much of it would still apply to multi-family projects and the exception information would be in the text. It was proposed that a footnote about multi-family exceptions be added to the table. The user-friendliness of the table was discussed. Mr. Anderson made the point that these width changes would only be for duplexes and not townhomes.

Mr. Banks asked if we're not going to have private streets then who will maintain this space.

Mr. Anderson mentioned that Mr. Dallin's plan was to have the access be a driveway and not a street.

Mr. Banks expressed concerns about the depth of the driveway and the ability of a fire truck to get back there. Mr. Banks asked whether the depth requirement was being changed along with the width, Mr. Anderson replied in the negative. The requirements for garages were discussed, as well as the differences under the current code for duplexes and townhomes.

Mr. Baum mentioned what could happen in the future if the text amendment was not made regarding infill developments and the possibility of duplexes on every corner.

Mr. Anderson asked if we require people to pay for fire hydrants along with building permits.

Mr. Shorts said that according to the fire code, you need to be within 400 feet of a hydrant. The current one closest to the back building would be roughly 420 feet. The measurements relative to the frontage versus the building itself and the requirements of the municipal code and the fire code were discussed.

Mr. Banks said that in the past they have required people to buy and install hydrants.

Mr. Bagley said that this development would put a strain on the current power grid in that part of town.

Mr. Anderson said this could result in a lot more smaller dwellings and Mr. Dallin mentioned the impact of one large building versus many small buildings.

Mr. Jorgensen said that the City is growing and it is not a question of if this will become an issue but when.

Mr. Baker pointed out the need to renumber the footnotes. He made a **motion** to recommend to the Planning Commission **approve** the text amendment including a footnote 7 with the word “garage” in front of the word “door” and another footnote distinguishing single family and multi-family dwellings. Mr. Thompson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

### **Master Plan Development Text Amendment**

Applicant: Spanish Fork City

General Plan: N/A

Zoning: N/A

Location: City Wide

Mr. Anderson said it should be up to the Planning Commission to decide whether to change the minimum area requirement for master planned developments.

Mr. Thompson asked if Mr. Anderson was saying to send this to the Planning Commission without a recommendation. Mr. Anderson answered that he would not prefer that, but if they couldn't come to a conclusion in this meeting then that is what they should do.

Baker said that 20,000 square feet is too small but would be willing to bring it down to 2 acres from 5. He mentioned how you usually get a higher end product in return for bonus density. Mr. Baker asked how many units you can put on 20,000 square feet. Mr. Anderson answered 5-8 units per acre.

Mr. Anderson mentioned that the biggest advantage of Master Planned Developments, regardless of size, is architecture.

Mr. Baker said the only incentive we offer for Master Planned Developments is density.

Mr. Anderson mentioned that the flexibility offered is also an incentive.

Mr. Swenson said all this would do is allow people to do more with their land.

Mr. Anderson proposed going to the Planning Commission with a two or even one acre minimum and Mr. Thompson agreed.

Mr. Baker made a **motion** to recommend to the Planning Commission to **amend** the ordinance to allow master planned development in the R-1-6 and R-3 zones on a minimum of two acres. Mr. Thompson **seconded** and the motion **passed** by a roll call vote. Mr. Anderson opposed saying that one acre would be more appropriate, with Mr. Baker suggesting to take the 20,000 square feet to the Commission and to see what they say. Mr. Baum, Mr. Short and Mr. Swenson agreed.

### **DRC Business**

Mr. Anderson mentioned the meeting that was planned with the canal company in charge of the part of the City where Jed Morley's project is, to discuss their requirements.

Mr. Baker **moved** to **adjourn**, Mr. Banks **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor at 11:05 a.m.

**Adopted: February 27, 2008**

---

Dave Munson, Planning Intern