

Tentative Minutes
Spanish Fork Planning Commission Meeting
May 3, 2000

1 The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by Chair Kevin Baadsgaard for a preliminary review of the
2 agenda. At 7:00 pm regular business commenced.

3 Commissioners Present: Chair Kevin Baadsgaard, Thad Jensen, Roy L. Johns, David E. Lewis, and
4 Thora L. Shaw. Commissioner Paul Healey was excused.

5 Staff Members Present: David A. Oyler, City Manager; Emil Pierson, City Planner; Richard J. Heap,
6 Engineer/Public Works Director; Nate Crow, GIS Specialist; and Gina Peterson, Deputy Recorder.

7 Citizens Present: McKay Winkel.

8 **James Purnell Zone Change (R-R to R-1-9) and Purnell Estates Preliminary Plat**

9 Mr. Johns made a **motion** to open the public hearing at 7:03 pm. Mr. Lewis **seconded**, and the
10 motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

11 Mr. James Purnell is requesting a zone change from R-R to R-1-9 on 6.09 acres located at 1400 South
12 1700 East. Preliminary Plat approval will create 13 single family lots for a density of 2.13 units per
13 acre. The general plan designates the area for residential use at 2.5 to 3.5 units per acre. Lot sizes in
14 the development will range from 14,646 to 15,912 square feet. The Development Review Committee
15 reviewed the request and recommended approval.

16 Chair Baadsgaard opened the meeting for public input. None was received.

17 Ms. Shaw made a **motion** to recommend approval of the James Purnell zone change from R-R to R-1-
18 9 as the amendment is consistent with policies of the General Plan, and conditions will be placed on
19 preliminary plat approval which will mitigate adverse affects to adjacent properties. Mr. Johns
20 **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

21 Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to recommend approval of the Purnell Estates Preliminary Plat subject to the
22 following conditions:

- 23 1. All plans and profiles be stamped and approved by the City Engineering Department;
- 24 2. Preliminary Title Report must be submitted prior to final Development Review Committee
25 approval;
- 26 3. Access to Lot 1 may not come from 1700 East, and a 3-rail white vinyl fence installed along
27 1700 East which matches the fence to the north;
- 28 4. Setbacks will be as follows: Front - 20 feet to living area, 25 feet to garage; Rear - 25 feet; and
29 Side - 10 feet. Corner lots - 15 feet to living area, and 25 feet to garage;

30 5. CC&R's be submitted, which include the use of the "point system" similar to Aspen Meadows
31 subdivision, prior to the preliminary plat being submitted to the City Council.
32 Mr. Jensen **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

33 Ms. Shaw made a **motion** to exit the public hearing at 7:12 pm. Mr. Johns **seconded**, and the motion
34 **passed** with a unanimous vote.

35 **Preliminary Plat - Gateway Commerce Park**

36 Boulder Ranch, L.C. is requesting preliminary plat approval to create 26 commercial and industrial
37 building lots on 52.79 acres at 3450 North Main Street. This property was annexed into the City on
38 September 24, 1999, and is zoned both I-1 and C-2. Construction is underway on one lot for a new
39 building for LEI Consulting Engineers.

40 The developers will install a temporary lift station, and eventually participate in the costs of a regional lift
41 station which will be installed to the northwest of the development.

42 It was indicated a user has signed a letter of intent to occupy the northerly 20 acres with a 400,000
43 square foot building and approximately 350 employees. The representative stated not much more
44 information is available at this point.

45 Mr. McKay Winkel, representing Boulder Ranch, stated the company feels good with the proposed
46 occupants. He indicated they are not comfortable with staff requiring them to install and pay for the
47 City welcome signs as part of the approval. Mr. Winkel stated the requirement is nebulous, and if
48 required they will need guidelines, including proposed costs. Mr. Pierson feels the signs would be a
49 good amenity for the City. Much discussion took place regarding the proposed entrance signs. Mr.
50 Winkel indicated they are willing to install the sign, although they would like to maintain reasonable
51 costs.

52 Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to recommend the City Council approve the Gateway Commerce Park
53 Preliminary Plat subject to the following conditions:

- 54 1. The subdivision must abide by all plans and profiles stamped and approved by the City
55 Engineering Department;
- 56 2. The Dry Creek Canal landscaping needs to be approved on the site plans for Lots 21 and 22;
- 57 3. Common features for the subdivision need to be approved by the City Planner prior to being
58 scheduled for City Council;
- 59 4. The sewer lift station will be run by private ownership of the subdivision and must be approved
60 by the City Attorney prior to City Council approval;
- 61 5. The developer will be required to provide a location for City welcome signs, but will not be
62 required to install or pay for the signs;
- 63 6. Improvements on 3450 North must be completed through Lot 9 proceeding west to east.

64 The motion **died** for lack of a second.

65 Ms. Shaw made a **motion** to recommend the City Council approve the Gateway Commerce Park
66 Preliminary Plat subject to following conditions:

- 67 1. The subdivision must abide by all plans and profiles stamped and approved by the City
68 Engineering Department;
- 69 2. The Dry Creek Canal landscaping needs to be approved on the site plans for Lots 21 and 22;
- 70 3. Common features for the subdivision need to be approved by the City Planner prior to being
71 scheduled for City Council;
- 72 4. The sewer lift station will be run by private ownership of the subdivision and must be approved
73 by the City Attorney prior to City Council approval;
- 74 5. Lots 17 and 26 will have greeting signs installed by the developer;
- 75 6. Improvements on 3450 North must be completed through Lot 9 proceeding west to east.

76 Mr. Johns **seconded**, and the motion **carried** with a **majority** vote of 4:1. Commissioners
77 Baadsgaard, Jensen, Johns, and Shaw voted in favor of the motion, and Commissioner Lewis was
78 opposed.

79 **Discussion on Current and Future Utilities**

80 Mr. Heap reviewed with the Planning Commission the utility capacity of water, sewer and electricity. It
81 was indicated that at the present time, the capacity for the culinary water and sewer plant could
82 accommodate approximately 25,000 residents. The electric 138 KV substation is being constructed by
83 SUVPP and should allow for substantial growth for the electric system. Based on these capacities, Mr.
84 Heap recommends the City not accept any more preliminary plats until a study can be completed to
85 determine how to increase culinary water and sewer plant capacities.

86 Mr. Jensen made a **motion** to recommend to the City Council that no new residential preliminary plat
87 applications be accepted until remedies for utility capacity increases are studied and a plan is approved
88 by the City Council. Mr. Johns **seconded** the motion. Mr. Lewis asked for clarification on the issue.
89 Mr. Pierson indicated staff needs to time to address utility needs before approving further development.
90 A general discussion took place. Chair Baadsgaard called for a vote on the motion. The motion
91 **passed** with a **majority** vote of 4:1. Commissioners Baadsgaard, Jensen, Johns, and Shaw voted in
92 favor of the motion, and Commissioner Lewis was opposed.

93 Ms Shaw made a **motion** to issue an effective date of May 3, 2000 for the acceptance of preliminary
94 plat applications on the above motion. Mr. Johns **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a **majority**
95 vote of 4:1. Commissioners Baadsgaard, Jensen, Johns, and Shaw voted in favor of the motion, and
96 Commissioner Lewis was opposed.

97 **Discussion - General Plan Update 2000**

98 The General Plan states that it is important to review and annually update the plan to ensure it keeps up
99 with changing conditions and values in the community. The City Council has asked the Planning
100 Commission to review different aspects of the general plan, including whether the growth boundary
101 should be amended, commercial areas, and a trails plan. Mr. Pierson reviewed future Planning

102 Commission work sessions to review these and other items in the General Plan.

103 **Adjournment**

104 Mr. Johns made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting of the Spanish Fork Planning Commission at 8:48
105 pm. Mr. Lewis **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.