

Approved Minutes
Spanish Fork Planning Commission Meeting
October 3, 2001

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

Commission Members Present: Chair Kevin Baadsgaard, and Commissioners David E. Lewis, Roy L. Johns, Thad S. Jensen, and Thora L. Shaw. Commissioner Paul Healey was absent.

Staff Members Present: Emil Pierson, City Planner; Richard J. Heap, City Engineer/Public Works Director; Nate Crow, GIS Specialist and Marlo Smith, Engineering Secretary

Citizens Present: Les Allen, *Dos Amigos*; Karen Payne; Pat Mitchell; David K. Davis; Chris Thompson; Angela Silva; Tim Ingn; Courtney Elliott; Lisa Elliott; Deloy Atwood; Michele Atwood; Lynn G. Kenley; Lori McClellan; Kathy Palica; Paul Eriksson; Jay Cordon; Wendy Cordon and Dennis Fay.

Agenda Review

City Planner Emil Pierson reviewed with the Commission each item on the agenda. No general discussion took place.

Commissioner Jensen made a **motion** to open the public hearing at 7:06 p.m. Commissioner Shaw **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Public Hearing - Urban Village Zone

Mr. Pierson explained that On April 3, 2001, the City Council tabled the 2000 East zone change and requested that a committee be formed with members of the Planning Commission and residents of Spanish Fork. The committee was formed and met a number of times discussing transportation issues, design elements, possible layouts and drafting a new commercial zone.

Discussion about the transportation elements included the alignment of 2000 East and its connection to 2300 East, the islands in the middle of 2000 East and a traffic circle and the 2550 East connection to Highway 6. Pedestrians and their access were a major element as well as keeping the traffic slow but following for the adjacent neighbors.

The last meeting was held on September 12, 2001. At that meeting the committee wrote the following draft for the Urban Village zoning ordinance:

This district is intended to provide controlled and compatible settings for a wide range of commercial and residential uses in the same area, uses designed to serve neighborhood, community, and regional needs. Uses may be freestanding or integrated in a center. Developments in this district will be designed towards pedestrians in mind; designs will have the character of an urban village; with high quality materials being used. All site plans and subdivisions will be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

A. Permitted Uses:

1. Multi-family residential
2. Retail Uses
3. Offices
4. Restaurants
5. Financial institutions, without drive through facilities
6. Department stores
7. Gas station/convenience stores
8. Health and fitness facilities, recreation facilities
9. Schools, professional and vocational
10. Personal service businesses
11. Government facilities
12. Museums, art galleries, dance studios, live performance theaters
13. Movie theaters
13. Dental/medical offices
14. Farmer's markets
15. Plant and garden shops with outdoor sales
16. Hotels
17. Laundry and dry cleaning

B. Uses Subject to Conditions (as described in Chapter 17.28.050):

1. Seasonal sales and special events

C. Uses Subject to Conditional Use Permit (see Chapter 17.12.080):

1. Financial institutions, with drive through facilities
2. Veterinary offices (small animals)
3. Restaurants with drive through facilities
4. Day care facilities
5. Auction sales (indoor only)
6. Brew pubs (indoor only)

D. Accessory Buildings and Uses (See Chapter 17.28.040):

E. Design Review/ Performance Standards (see Chapter 17.12.050) These standards are intended to foster the creation of a urban environment that accommodates growth and is compatible with the existing homes and uses in the area:

1. Outdoor Sales, Display and Storage.
 - a) The outdoor permanent sales or display of merchandise shall not encroach into areas of required parking, sidewalks, or landscaping.
2. Lighting. On-site lighting, including parking lot lighting and illuminated signs, shall be located, directed or designed in a manner to prevent glare on adjacent properties and be designed for pedestrians. All lighting should have the same design elements throughout the development.
3. Location of Service Areas. All loading docks and other service activities shall be located away from view of any public street. Exceptions to this requirement may be approved through the site plan process. If such activities are permitted adjacent to a public street, a visual screening design approved by the city planner shall be required.
4. Urban Design. Designs for this area should envision a "village character" relating to the

heritage of the early residents of the community. Safe and efficient pedestrian circulation is a priority.

- a) Architectural Character and Materials.
 1. A differentiated base will provide human scale through change, contrast, and intricacy in facade form. Scaling elements such as insets and projects serve to break up flat or monotonous facades along with color and a change in materials.
 2. The climate in Spanish Fork City is such that in the summer months shade is preferred, and in the winter months protection from the snow and wind is necessary. By providing the pedestrian with a sidewalk that is enjoyable to use year round, a pedestrian oriented development is encouraged. Therefore, the following will be encouraged:
 - a) Arcades
 - b) Awnings and/or marquees
 3. Entrance and Visual Access
 - a) The intent in this district is to encourage pedestrian activity between the public street/sidewalk and buildings. Sidewalks shall provide continuous, uninterrupted interest to the pedestrian by providing visual interest and/or amenities. The environment will benefit with increased pedestrian activity, this activity will only occur if opportunities are provided that make walking to a destination a preferred and an enjoyable pursuit. The use of blank building facade walls is discouraged. Therefore, all buildings in this district are subject to the following standards:
 1. Minimum First Floor Glass. The first floor elevation of a building facing a street shall not have less than forty (40%) percent glass surfaces. All first floor glass shall be a non-reflective. Display windows that are three dimensional and are at least two feet deep are permitted and may be counted toward the 40% glass requirement.
 2. Provide at least one (1) operable building entrance per elevation that faces a public street. Buildings that face multiple streets are only required to have one door on either street, if the facades for both streets meet the forty (40%) percent glass requirement.
 3. The maximum length of any blank wall uninterrupted by windows, doors, art or architectural detailing at the first floor level shall be forty (40) feet.
 4. All building equipment and service areas, including on-grade and roof mechanical equipment and transformers that are readily visible from the public right-of-way, shall be screened from public view.
 4. Roof pitch and materials
 - a) All roofs will be required to have at least a 7/12 pitch and will be standing seamed metal.
 5. Public Amenities and Public Art.
 - a) Amenities and works of art enhance quality of life as well as visual interest. Public amenities and art encourage pedestrian activity and contribute to the “village” experience. A cohesive, unified lighting and amenity policy will help give the district its own distinctive identity. Therefore, all projects will

be required to have public amenities and art that are subject to the following standards:

- 1) Sidewalks and street lamps installed in the public right of way shall be of the type specified in the city's construction and development standards. All parking lot lights will be required to match the city's standards.
 - 2) Park benches will be required within the development.
 - 3) Public art (which may include artists' work integrated into the design of the building, and landscaping, sculpture, painting, murals, glass, mixed media or work by artisans), that is accessible or directly viewable to the general public shall be included in all projects. The plan to incorporate public art shall be reviewed and approved by the Spanish Fork Arts Council.
 - 4) All projects will be required to have a minimum of 20% open space and developments with residential units will be required to have 35% open space.
6. Conditional Use Approval. A modification to the urban design/performance provisions of this section may be granted as a conditional use, subject to conformance with the standards and procedures.
- F. Definitions. For the purpose of this section, the following terms shall have the following meanings.
"Facade" means the front of a building, or any other "face" of a building on a street or courtyard given special architectural treatment.
- G. Landscaping, Buffering, Walls (see Chapter 17.28.030): Use the S-C zone requirements.
- H. Signs (see Chapter 17.28.010): All individual developments (not a planned center) will be required to follow the requirements of the C-O zone.
- I. Parking Standards (see Chapter 17.28.020):
1. Restrictions on Parking Lots. The following regulations shall apply to parking facilities.
 - a) All parking lots adjacent to a public street will be required to have twenty-five (25) foot landscape setback and a minimum three (3) foot berm with trees every thirty (30) feet apart.
- J. Solid Waste Receptacle Areas. (see Chapter 17.28.030 G)
- K. Building Height. Use the S-C zones requirements.
1. Height Exceptions: Spires, towers, or decorative non-inhabitable elements shall have a maximum height of sixty (60) feet measured from the street grade.
- L. Development Standards. Use the S-C zone requirements.
- M. Master Planned Developments (MPD). (as described in Chapter 17.28.050 G)
1. Allowed a density of 5 to 12 residential units per acre.
 2. MPD will be required to have public art integrated and 35% open space area.
 3. Projects with a residential component will be required to have at least a 1 to 1 square footage of commercial to residential square footage and phasing of the project must have commercial square footage.
 4. Residential units will required to meet the High Density Residential (R-3) setbacks.
 5. Residential units must be designed in a manner to blend with the urban village and not be a separate element of the area.

The Committee is making the following recommendations:

1. That the properties along the 2000 East and south of 750 South be planned as single

family residential. This would include changing the General Plan for this area from High Urban Residential 5-12 u/a to Medium Urban Residential 3.5 to 5 u/a.

2. That the property on the west side of 2000 East be zoned R-1-8 as recommended in the General Plan.

Chair Baadsgaard opened the meeting for brief public comment.

Karen Payne was the Chairman for the committee that was formed for the 2000 East zone change. Ms. Payne spoke on her thoughts about forming the committee and feels that the goal was accomplished.

Chair Baadsgaard asked if Ms. Payne thought that forming the committee was worthwhile. Ms. Payne answered yes for many reasons including: that the committee was able to educate a number of people about the process of zone changes and for the people to understand the work that went into the zone changes; the committee was able to give and receive more community information.

Pat Mitchell was also a part of the committee and discussed her experience as a member of the committee expressing the ability for more public input.

General discussion took place regarding the master plan for transportation.

Mr. Pierson discussed that the Development Review Committee met today and concluded that their recommendation for the Planning Commission is positive and include the two recommendations from the 2000 East Rezone Committee as listed above.

Commissioner Shaw made a **motion** for a positive recommendation to the City Council for approval of the Urban Village Commercial Zone with the following findings:

1. That the properties along the 2000 East and south of 750 South be planned as single family residential. This would include changing the General Plan for this area from High Urban Residential 5-12 u/a to Medium Urban Residential 3.5 to 5 u/a.
2. That the property on the west side of 2000 East be zoned R-1-8 as recommended in the General Plan.
3. That the road alignment follow the current transportation master plan.

Commissioner Johns **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Shaw addressed her thoughts on the 2000 East Rezone Committee and gave a respectable recommendation on this committee and suggested this type of committee be used in the future.

Public Hearing - Dos Amigos/Nielson Rezone

City Planner Emil Pierson reviewed a proposed zone change initiated by Dos Amigos. It is planned to change the zone of 26.2 acres at 2900 East Canyon Road from R-R, Rural Residential, to R-2,

Medium High Residential to construct a subdivision in the future. The General Plan before October 2000, was zoned as Commercial because it didn't seem desirable for residential for the reason being it is bordered by two arterial roads. In October 2000, the area was changed on the General Plan for residential. A subdivision will be brought before the Planning Commission at the next meeting for their review. When a development does come before the Planning Commission a wall will be required along Highway 6. A wall will not be required along Canyon Road because of the canal and proposed open space. The original proposed subdivision showed five 12-plexes that would align Canyon Road. Because of public comment the developer was able to reduce that to four 12-plexes and move them to the North West end of the subdivision, away from the Red Pines Development across Canyon Road. Mr. Pierson and Mr. Allen had previously discussed that this could possibly be a gated community.

Mr. Pierson discussed that only 62 units would be allowed right now because of the utility restriction in place. Mr. Pierson wanted to clarify to the Planning Commission and to the public attending that this was a public hearing for a zone change not for the preliminary plat. The preliminary plat has not been reviewed by the City staff yet.

The Development Review Committee reviewed this zone change and discussed the proposed future construction on September 26, 2001 and recommended approval with the following condition:

1. That the developer understand that there is a utility restriction in place.

Mr. Les Allen, *Dos Amigos* discussed the concept of the development including; the type of homes that will be built, all the open space will be maintained by a homeowners association, because of the costs of piping the irrigation ditch it raises the price of the home \$10,000.00 and curb, gutter and sidewalk will be required on Canyon Road.

Chair Baadsgaard opened the meeting for brief public comment.

Ms. Kathy Palicka, 1346 S 2990 E, discussed that she approved of the concept plan. But, questioned if the plan would change if the zone was changed to R-1-8 instead.

Mr. Allen answered Ms. Palicka that the plan would not change.

Chair Baadsgaard clarified that is was a zone change only not a hearing on the preliminary plat. The subdivision hearing would be at a later time and this was premature discussion.

Mr. Lynn Kenley, 3124 E 1480 S, discussed concern on the type of living and maintenance fo the grounds that would consume the 12-plexes.

Mr. Pierson stated that the maintenance of the grounds would be maintained by the homeowner association.

Mr. David Davis, 3057 E 1300 S, discussed that when he researched the area where he built his home

it was zoned that apartments would not be allowed next to the residential homes and that this zone change was going against what he researched.

Mr. Dennis Fay, 3143 E 1480 S, discussed that he would like to keep Spanish Fork as rural as possible. Mr. Fay was also concerned about the safety if allowing the 12-plexes.

Ms. Lori McClellan, 3039 E 1300 S, spoke about the concern of over crowding of new schools.

Commissioner Johns made comments on the populations in the schools and that the City has no control over the School District.

Ms. Chris Thompson, 1284 S 2900 E, discussed that she was pleased with the developer and has heard very commendable things. Ms. Thompson would like to see the zone changed to R-1-8 instead of R-2.

Ms. Lisa Elliott, 2984 E 1300 S, questioned if her property zone would change as a result of this zone change. Ms. Elliott would like to see the developer stay, but doesn't like the high density zone.

Mr. Courtney Elliott, 2984 E 1300 S, was concerned about the concept plan being a rental area only and the up keep of the homes.

Ms. Angela Silva, 1437 S 2900 E, was concerned about the added traffic on Canyon Road and Highway 6.

City Engineer Richard Heap discussed the transportation plan of Canyon Road and Highway 6. Canyon Road will become a minor arterial road and Highway 6 will become a major arterial road. Stop lights are planned for the road at a later time. Additional stop lights down Canyon Road are proposed. Mr. Heap commented on the upgrade of Canyon Road that will have five lanes instead of the current two. Mr. Heap made a point of no new driveways allowed on Canyon Road because of this upgrade.

Commissioner Jensen commented on the active utility restriction and that the Planning Commission is able to manage the growth.

Commissioner Lewis commented that he would like the motion be null the zone change if the plat doesn't go through.

Commissioner Shaw stated that she did not think this area would become a rental community.

Discussion took place on whether the developer would sell the lots to another builder or if the developer would build on the lots. Mr. Allen said his company would not sell the lots to another builder, that they would be building all the homes.

Commissioner Lewis expressed his personal feelings on living in a new area when he was younger and the problems with the over crowding and moving between schools. Commissioner Lewis discussed that this community when approved would not become a rental area that they will be very impressive family homes. The cost of developing and building were discussed and how it is worthwhile for the builder to continue. Commissioner Lewis recommended that the rezone be tied to the acceptance of the preliminary plat.

Commissioner Lewis made a **motion** to recommend the City Council's approval of the Dos Amigos/Nielson Rezone from R-R, Rural Residential to R-2, Medium High Residential with the following conditions:

1. The developer is only allowed to build the 62 units that have been transferred.
2. The preliminary plat must be approved by Development Review Committee and Planning Commission before the zone change and preliminary plat go concurrently to the City Council.

Commissioner Johns **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Commissioner Shaw made a **motion** to exit the public hearings at 8:40 p.m.. Commissioner Lewis **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.

Adjournment

Commissioner Lewis made a **motion** to adjourn the meeting of the Spanish Fork Planning Commission at 8:40 p.m.. Commissioner Shaw **seconded**, and the motion **passed** with a unanimous vote.