

**Adopted Minutes
Spanish Fork City Development Review Committee
March 19, 2008**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Richard Heap.

Staff Members Present: Richard Heap, Public Works Director; David Oyler, City Manager; Junior Baker, City Attorney; Marvin Banks, Public Utilities Director; Joe Jarvis, Fire Marshall; Ryan Bagley, Designer; Dave Anderson, Planning Director; Shawn Jorgenson, Inspector; Chris Swenson, Inspector; Shelley Hendrickson, Planning Secretary; Dave Munson, Planning Intern.

Citizens Present: Lynn Leifson

MINUTES

January 9, 2008, January 16, 2008, and March 5, 2008

Mr. Baker **moved** to **approve** the minutes of January 9, 2008; with the noted corrections. Mr. Anderson seconded and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Mr. Baker **moved** to **approve** the minutes of January 16, 2008; with the noted corrections. Mr. Anderson seconded and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Mr. Baker **moved** to **approve** the minutes of March 5, 2008; with the noted corrections. Mr. Anderson seconded and the motion **passed** all in favor.

ANNEXATIONS

Huntington Leifson

Applicant: Ted Huntington and Lynn Leifson

General Plan: Residential 1.5 to 2.5 Units Per Acre

Zoning: R-1-12 Requested

Location: 7825 South River Bottoms Road

Mr. Anderson gave background on the existing City boundary and the property proposed to be annexed. The property will be R-1-15 not R-1-12 to be current with the General Plan. He explained the annexation petition process and that Richard Nielson had prepared a report regarding the utilities that would need to be addressed.

Mr. Heap explained Mr. Nielson's report. The report indicated that master plans for water, sewer and transportation for the entire river bottoms area would need to be looked at, River Bottoms

Road would need to be relocated and would be a major collector road, water lines/pressurized irrigation (due to the low pressure zone) would need to be looped, there is not a storm drain master plan in the area and one is needed. Mr. Heap explained the City Council would be meeting in the next few months to talk about these issues but feels all the zoning in the river bottoms needs to be addressed along with this proposal and this annexation petition is premature.

Discussion was held regarding the need to widen or relocate River Bottoms Road to accommodate a major collector road.

Mr. Anderson explained that the subject property is within the current City annexation declaration boundary. He feels timing is a factor and the application is premature but that the City is not far off from answering the questions, within a year or two, in this area. He explained what he foresees the density will be and where in the river bottoms it would be located but that the growth boundary would need to be amended before growth would be allowed in the area.

Discussion was held regarding the Growth Boundary and the process to have it amended and the annexation proposal being premature.

Lynn Leifson

Mr. Leifson explained that the City approached him a few years back to annex his property but that he wouldn't. He explained what property he owned versus Ted Huntington. He and Mr. Huntington are looking at what they can do along River Bottoms Road and explained where an easement was for a high pressure gas line. He feels they are only looking at six homes and feels that everything can be done within reason. He feels that all of the utilities are already available. They would like to be looked at separate from the River Bottoms Annexation.

Discussion was held regarding utilities and the City's utility plans, where the water would need to loop, flood plain study, electric master study, traffic study, and River Bottoms Road not being a City street.

Mr. Anderson **moved** to recommend the City Council **deny** the Huntington Leifson Annexation petition based on the following findings:

Findings

1. That the City's General Plan Elements for transportation, power and storm drain are not complete; therefore, the annexation is premature.
2. That the City's review of the land-use plan for adjacent properties is not complete.
3. That the subject properties are not within the growth boundary.

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

Discussion was held regarding the process of taking the proposal to the Planning Commission, City Council and the costs that would be incurred.

Mr. Leifson

Feels they are being held hostage by the larger annexation and would like to be considered separately.

MINING OVERLAY

Van Rok

Applicant: Van Rok

General Plan: Heavy Industrial

Zoning: Industrial 1

Location: 3000 East Highway 6

Mr. Anderson **moved** to **table** the proposal due to the applicant not being present. Mr. Baker **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

STREET VACATIONS

450 West

Applicant: Preston Naylor

General Plan: Light Industrial

Zoning: Industrial 1

Location: 450 West between 1000 North and Depot Road

Discussion was held regarding a ditch adjacent to the street and whether or not the railroad could access their property if the street is vacated.

Mr. Olyer **moved** to recommend **vacating** 450 West between 1000 North and Depot Road subject to notifying adjacent property owners including the railroad. Mr. Baker **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Northeast Bench General Plan Amendment

Applicant: City

General Plan: Residential 1.5 to 2.5 Units Per Acre to General

Commercial and Residential 5.5 to 8 Units Per Acre

Zoning: Industrial 1

Location: 2550 East and 400 North

Mr. Anderson explained that the Planning Commission and LEI have discussed the possibility of setting aside some property for commercial development. They feel that of the four corners surrounding the intersection the northeast corner is the most likely to support commercial development. It is owned by the Miner family.

Mr. Baker asked why not zone all four corners with the commercial development for a total of 20 acres.

Mr. Anderson explained why he felt it would not work.

Discussion was held regarding what kind of commercial uses (retail, office etc), would be allowed and moving higher density to the remainder of the parcel.

Mr. Anderson **moved** to recommend to the Planning Commission to include the General Plan for the Miner property changing the lower 12½ acres from residential 1.5 to 2.5 units per acre to general commercial and the remaining property changed from residential 1.5 to 2.5 units per acre to residential 5.5 to 8 units per acre. Mr. Baker **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

DRC BUSINESS

Review of New Submittals

No Discussion.

Mr. Banks **moved to adjourn**. Mr. Baker **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor at 11:15 a.m.

Adopted: March 25, 2008

Shelley Hendrickson, Planning Secretary