



## Planning Commission Agenda April 4, 2012

- Planning Commissioners**                      6:30 P.M.
1. Preliminary Activities
    - a. Pledge of Allegiance
    - b. Approval of Minutes: March 7, 2012.
  2. Downtown Inventory Presentation
  3. Text Amendments
    - a. **Haven Home for Girls**  
Applicant: Myrna Dalton  
General Plan: City-wide  
Zoning: City-wide  
Location: City-wide
    - b. **Animal Rights**  
Applicant: Spanish Fork City  
General Plan: City-wide  
Zoning: City-wide  
Location: City-wide
  4. Preliminary Plats
    - a. **Stone Subdivision**  
Applicant: Spanish Fork City  
General Plan: City-wide  
Zoning: City-wide  
Location: City-wide
  5. Other Business
    - a. Discussion on multi-family projects.
- Michael Christianson  
Chairman
- David Stroud
- Rick Evans
- George Gull
- Brad Gonzales
- Seth Sorenson

**Planning Commissioners, if you are unable to attend a meeting please let us know ASAP. Thanks.**

The public is invited to participate in all Planning Commission Meetings at 40 South Main Street, Room 140, Spanish Fork. If you need special accommodations to participate in the meeting, please contact the City Manager's Office at (801) 804-4530.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**Draft Minutes**  
**Spanish Fork City Planning Commission Meeting**  
**March 7, 2012**

**Commission Members Present:** Chairman Michael Christianson, Rick Evans, George Gull, Dave Stroud.

**Staff Present:** Dave Anderson, Community and Economic Development Director; Shelley Hendrickson, Planning Secretary; Trapper Burdick, Assistant City Engineer; Jason Sant, Assistant City Attorney.

**Citizens Present:**

Chairman Christianson welcomed everyone to the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

**PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES**

**Pledge**

Scout Bryson Lunceford led in the pledge of allegiance.

**MINUTES**

**January 4, 2012**

Commissioner Evans **moved** to **approve** the minutes of January 4, 2012, with the noted correction. Commissioner Stroud **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

**PRELIMINARY PLATS**

**White Rail**

Applicant: Lewis Bankhead  
General Plan: High Density Residential  
Zoning: R-1-6  
Location: State Road 51 and 800 North

Mr. Anderson handed the Commissioners copies of the proposed plat and the notes from the neighborhood meeting that the applicant had held.

Mr. Anderson explained that there had been several different submissions for development on this property. The proposal before the Commission tonight is consistent with the General Plan and zoning. A Master Planned Development was previously approved for this property and is still valid. Staff recommends that the proposal be approved subject to a few conditions. Mr. Anderson went over the conditions.

49 Chairman Christianson asked Mr. Anderson to refresh his memory regarding the original  
50 approval and Zone Change of the proposal as his recollection was that the Zone Change  
51 was approved contingent with the Master Planned Development. He expressed his  
52 frustration with the City not getting concessions when it comes to development.  
53  
54 Commissioner Evans expressed that it was unfortunate that concessions would not be met  
55 from a previous approval but that it is what it is and the Master Planned Development is  
56 irrelevant.  
57  
58 Commissioner Stroud asked if there was a development agreement when the property  
59 was re-zoned. Mr. Anderson said no. Commissioner Stroud said if there was not a  
60 development agreement and the R-1-6 zone is there than there is not anything binding  
61 with regard to concessions for this parcel.  
62  
63 Chairman Christianson asked if conditions of approval carry any legal weight.  
64  
65 Mr. Sant said yes.  
66  
67 Mr. Anderson said that by right today the applicant can request development approvals in  
68 accordance with the zoning that is in place. He further explained that he had heard more  
69 than one opinion with regard to whether or not cities could impose conditions with a Zone  
70 Change. Because a Zone Change is a legislative action and that we do not attach  
71 conditions to their approval. That is why Zone Changes are a big deal. Once the rights  
72 are assigned to a specific property, property owners are allowed to exercise those rights.  
73  
74 Commissioner Evans asked Mr. Sant if a Zone Change could be granted conditionally.  
75 Mr. Sant said no.  
76  
77 Chairman Christianson asked if there was a way for the City to learn from this situation so  
78 that the City would stop getting duped. He said he had been on the Commission for six  
79 years and had heard continual promises for concessions and then they don't get built or  
80 the developer changes their mind and change the plats. He said that he felt commitments  
81 were two sided and that it keeps coming back that the City doesn't get any of the  
82 promised amenities.  
83  
84 Mr. Anderson said that he shared the same concern. His recollection was that typically it  
85 was with Master Planned Developments.  
86  
87 Chairman Christianson asked if the City needed to approve a Master Planned  
88 Development with every approval then.  
89  
90 Mr. Anderson said that the City had not had a situation where an applicant was going from  
91 a Master Planned Development to a standard subdivision. This is a case where the  
92 applicant is foregoing whatever consideration, whatever bonus they were awarded by the  
93 City.  
94  
95 Chairman Christianson said that they had lower density to start with when the project was  
96 originally approved. The Commission approved it with the idea that the commitments  
97 would be met.

98  
99 Mr. Anderson said that he understood what Chairman Christianson was saying but that he  
100 felt this property should be zoned R-1-6 and that the City should be comfortable with a  
101 development that conforms to the standards of the R-1-6 zone.  
102  
103 Commissioner Evans expressed that, regardless of the history, if someone came to the  
104 City requesting that this property be zoned R-1-6 that the City would change it. Mr.  
105 Anderson agreed.  
106  
107 Mr. Anderson said that concessions in his mind were a function of Master Planned  
108 Developments. He said that if the Commission was comfortable approving a Master  
109 Planned Development for this property, then in his opinion, we should be very comfortable  
110 approving this proposal.  
111  
112 Commissioner Stroud asked what the previous number of units was (over 100).  
113  
114 Lewis Bankhead  
115 Mr. Bankhead expressed that one thing they were very careful to do was to renew the  
116 current entitlement that exists with 100 lots. They feel this new proposal is an  
117 enhancement from the current approval of 100 lots with 40-foot frontages and five-foot  
118 setbacks and as they have worked through the economic challenges of this property and  
119 have driven around asking what will this really look like they felt like it wouldn't be an  
120 enhancement to the neighborhood to proceed with the Master Planned Development.  
121  
122 Commissioner Evans expressed that he felt the proposal was quite appropriate.  
123  
124 Chairman Christianson asked Mr. Burdick how many lots they could construct before a  
125 second access would need to be constructed. Mr. Burdick said it was 50 homes.  
126  
127 Commissioner Evans asked if the extension of Expressway Lane was indeed going to be a  
128 dead end.  
129  
130 Mr. Burdick said that the master Transportation Element shows the road north of the  
131 project.  
132  
133 Mr. Anderson said it was a crossing that the City would like to have relocated.  
134  
135 Mr. Bankhead said his basic feeling was that to go from 40-foot wide lots up to 50, five-  
136 foot side yard setbacks to ten and 100 lots to 87 is an enhancement.  
137  
138 Discussion was held regarding the removal of the extension of Expressway Lane through  
139 this project.  
140  
141 Chairman Christianson invited public comment.  
142  
143 Stuart Tanner  
144 Mr. Tanner said that the Commission was talking about allowing 50 lots subject to  
145 conditions. He asked who would be enforcing them because no one enforced the

146 conditions on the first approval. He said that the City was not enforcing it and that  
147 planning and zoning was a joke.  
148  
149 Mr. Anderson told Mr. Tanner that he was welcome to come in and talk to him anytime.  
150 He then explained that should this proposal get approved tonight, per the proposed  
151 design, that at any point of the life of the project, unless the City Council changes their  
152 approval of the project, you can look at any of the plats and they will match the approved  
153 design perfectly; however, if the City Council decides to change any part of how the  
154 project has been approved then staff will check to make sure that things will be  
155 constructed according to the changed plan.

156  
157 Mr. Tanner expressed that he felt the Commission should not be approving a Master  
158 Planned Development because they could not enforce any of the stipulations.

159  
160 Mr. Tanner asked how the Commission was going to enforce things in the future because  
161 people could let there time burn out and then come back to the City for another approval.

162  
163 Commissioner Evans said, in terms of a Zone Change, that Mr. Tanner was correct, but  
164 not in terms of a Master Planned Development.

165  
166 Mr. Anderson explained that zoning is zoning. It is the law and people are expected to  
167 follow it. There is not a mechanism whereby something can automatically revert without  
168 another legislative action being taken.

169  
170 Discussion was held regarding access and the railroad crossing.

171  
172 Commissioner Evans asked Mr. Sant if he could help the Commission understand, in the  
173 future, if they could set conditions on Zone Changes. Mr. Sant said that he could look into  
174 it.

175  
176 Commissioner Evans **moved** to recommend **approval** of the White Rail Preliminary Plat  
177 subject to the following conditions:

178  
179 **Conditions**

- 180  
181 1. That the design for State Road 51 cross-section be changed to include a 10-foot  
182 park strip, 5-foot walk, and a 5-foot planter.  
183 2. That UDOT's approval for accesses onto State Road 51 be obtained before any  
184 Final Plats are approved.  
185 3. That the applicant meet the Power Department's requirements including any  
186 requirements related to the phasing of the development.  
187 4. That the applicant meet all City development standards.

188  
189 Commissioner Stroud **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor by a roll call vote.

190  
191 **Hawk Landing**

192 Applicant: Gordon Dawe

193 General Plan: Medium Density Residential

194 Zoning: R-1-8

195 Location: 2292 East Canyon Road

196

197 Mr. Anderson explained that this proposal had been approved in the past but had lost its  
198 vesting. This proposal is very similar to what was proposed in the past with lots that  
199 conform to the City's standards in the R-1-8 zone. The proposed lots meet the zoning  
200 requirements. There are two issues that do warrant some additional discussion. The first  
201 is access onto 2300 East. The City adopted a Transportation Element, which is an  
202 advisory document that does not recommend driveways be permitted onto collector roads.  
203 In order to mitigate the driveway concern, staff recommends two things be required of the  
204 developer. Require the developer to limit the accesses to 2300 East. Six lots should  
205 share driveways and be designed so that the vehicle can conceptually turn around on the  
206 lot. The applicant is willing to meet the conditions.

207

208 Commissioner Stroud said as an advisory document he does not see a problem with the  
209 conditions.

210

211 Commissioner Evans explained that he lives on the next collector street which is 1700  
212 East and that there are several driveways on it and as undesirable as this situation is you  
213 cannot take the development rights away from the landowners.

214

215 Chairman Christianson asked that if the lots are sold off individually then something needs  
216 to be recorded on the plat, that driveways are shared.

217

218 Discussion was held regarding the need to address documents being filed with the plat  
219 and reasonable solutions for the land to be developed.

220

221 Mr. Anderson said that there is a difference in accidents between 1700 East and 2300  
222 East. It is an issue. Animal rights are another concern. The larger lots are adjacent lots  
223 that will have homes that are closer than 100 feet to the rear lot line. The concern is that  
224 we require a certain buffer from where the animals are kept to neighboring dwellings.

225

226 Commissioner Evans explained that as long as you exercise your animal rights you get to  
227 keep them but if you do not, for the period of one year, than you lose your rights.

228

229 Mr. Anderson explained that the City's vesting of animal rights in this situation would be  
230 different. The City's code currently allows animals on any lot in Spanish Fork that is ½ an  
231 acre or greater and that you do not lose those rights because of non use; however, you do  
232 have to meet the buffer requirement. Where the animals on the parcel are housed must  
233 be a certain distance from neighboring dwellings. The City is suggesting we recognize  
234 that the lots to the west will maintain their right to put animals any place on there lot  
235 where today it is legal to keep that animal. That will remain perpetual until something  
236 happens to the lot such as a subdivision.

237

238 Commissioner Evans asked what is different with these seven lots from any other lot in  
239 town. How is it appropriate considering the precedence it is setting?

240

241 Mr. Anderson said that he did not feel this was the best approach that it would be better  
242 to change our Zoning Ordinance. He explained that there was concern relative to drainage

243 and how it would impact the homes to the west. The City will be requiring the developer  
244 to provide a detailed grading plan.

245

246 Gordon Dawe

247 Mr. Dawe addressed the Commission. He said that he agreed to limit the access. He  
248 said that he would be building all of the homes in succession and that he would be  
249 responsible for the shared driveways in the project. He said that in the previous  
250 applications of this plat the lots had direct access onto 2300 East. He said that he was  
251 designing side entry garages with t-shaped driveways.

252

253 Gerald Seely

254 Mr. Seely asked, in relation to the animal rights, that he did not currently have animals but  
255 when he purchased the lot that the price of the lot included animals.

256

257 Mr. Evans recommended that Mr. Seely get the provision in writing.

258

259 Mr. Seely asked if the double driveways go in who would be paying for the driveway.

260

261 Chairman Christianson said that the developer was proposing to build the driveways  
262 concurrently with the structures.

263

264 Kevin Butler

265 Mr. Butler asked, regarding the animal rights, that it was the recommendation from the  
266 City staff to request recording a note on the plat. Is that the appropriate location or was  
267 there another place? If a note is recorded will the note record that the animal rights will  
268 be to the property line?

269

270 Mr. Anderson said it was common practice to use the plat as a medium to advise people of  
271 specific circumstances. He said the note on the plat would only put lot owners on notice  
272 that adjacent animals and the right to keep animals next door existed prior to the  
273 construction of their homes. He said that the City could record some other type of notice  
274 with the properties themselves but the most visible way to get it there is with a note on  
275 the plat.

276

277 Chairman Christianson explained that a notice of interest can be recorded.

278

279 Mr. Butler asked about the shared driveways being recorded as a recommendation or an  
280 advisement.

281

282 Stuart Tanner

283 Mr. Tanner asked about animal rights. He said in his deed it says that he has animal rights  
284 even though he does not have animals on his property right now.

285

286 Mr. Anderson explained that it was perpetual provided that the property owner doesn't do  
287 something to change the property and lose the animal rights.

288

289 Diana Butler

290 Ms. Butler asked if the proposal gets approval but then expires again if the surrounding  
291 property owners could request a Zone Change for the proposed property.

292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340

Mr. Anderson explained that the developer would be vested and that only a property owner can submit for a Zone Change on their parcel.

John Olsen

Mr. Olsen asked when the zoning that exists on the proposed property was changed to R-1-8. Mr. Anderson said that the first time the subdivision was approved was back in 2002.

Discussion was held regarding parcels of land across Canyon Road and its zoning and when it would change.

Mr. Anderson expressed that the likelihood that the City would initiate a Zone Change was small.

Commissioner Evans asked why the animal rights were being discussed with the proposal and not as a separate issue from the plat approval.

Mr. Anderson said that this was a convenient, public forum to discuss it in.

Commissioner Evans **moved** to recommend that the City Council **approve** the Hawk Landing Preliminary Plat subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions**

1. That the subdivision will be accessed via 3 shared driveways on 2300 East and one access onto 1200 South.
2. That driveway's accessing 2300 East will be constructed with the homes such that vehicles do not have to back onto 2300 East.
3. That the Canyon Road driveway access be removed
4. That a mass grading plan be submitted with the Final Plat.
5. That a note be included on the recorded plat that states that the adjacent lots have animal rights.

Commissioner Gull George **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor by a roll call vote.

Commissioner Evans **moved** to recommend that the adjacent properties be given a variance in perpetuity of the buffer. Commissioner Stroud **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor by a roll call vote.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Discussion on Planning Commission Work Program**

Mr. Anderson gave the Commission a handout on the City's growth. Discussion was held regarding the handout.

**ADJOURNMENT**

341 The meeting **adjourned** at 8:47 p.m.

342

343 **Adopted:**

344

345

346

---

Shelley Hendrickson, Planning Secretary

ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_

**ROLL CALL**

<b>VOTING</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>G. WAYNE ANDERSEN</b> Mayor ( <i>votes only in case of tie</i> )		
<b>ROD DART</b> Council member		
<b>RICHARD M. DAVIS</b> Council member		
<b>BRANDON B. GORDAN</b> Council member		
<b>STEVE LEIFSON</b> Council member		
<b>KEIR A. SCUBES</b> Council member		

I MOVE this ordinance be adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

I SECOND the foregoing motion \_\_\_\_\_

**ORDINANCE No.** \_\_\_\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CONDITIONS FOR  
TREATMENT CENTERS IN EXISTING VACANT BUILDINGS**

WHEREAS, Spanish Fork City allows treatment centers in residential zones upon meeting certain conditions to maintain the residential nature of the neighborhood; and

WHEREAS, one of the conditions is that building sizes cannot exceed the size of the largest home in the neighborhood by more than twenty percent (20%); and

WHEREAS, there are just a few old schools and similar large buildings which are no longer used for the purpose they were built for and which are vacant buildings in residential zones; and

WHEREAS, putting those large buildings to a good use enhances the property values throughout the neighborhood, as old, dilapidated buildings are refurbished rather than left in a run down state; and

WHEREAS, allowing existing buildings which are in residential zones and which are vacant to be used for residential treatment facilities provides a benefit to the neighborhood if appropriate conditions can be imposed to mitigate any adverse circumstances, and provided the building can be made safe; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held before the Spanish Fork Planning Commission on Wednesday, the 4th day of April, 2012 where public comment was received; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held before the Spanish Fork City Council on Tuesday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012, where additional public comment was received; and

WHEREAS, putting old, vacant buildings to a beneficial use is in the best interests of the City in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the City and its residents;

NOW THEREFORE, be it enacted and ordained as follows:

## I.

Spanish Fork Municipal Code §15.3.24.010(E)(4) is hereby created as follows:

### **15.3.24.010. Treatment Facilities.**

#### **E. Design and Separation.**

4. An existing building which has been vacant for over one year may be converted to a residential treatment facility, if it meets all other criteria of §15.3.24.010(D) and (E), but shall be exempt from the criteria found in subsection (E)(2) and shall, in lieu thereof, meet the following criteria:
  - a. provide a report from a licensed structural engineer indicating the building is safe, or can be made safe, for its intended use. The City building official and fire inspector will have the final say on what must be done to

- meet current codes;
- b. veneer finishes to the exterior of the building may be required, depending on the exterior material of the building and the other buildings in the neighborhood, to match the type and color of existing materials on other residences within the neighborhood;
  - c. bring the building up to current standards on all codes (building, fire, safety, energy, etc).
  - d. provide a landscaping plan prepared by a landscape architect which provides for 50% of the entire site to be green landscaped;
  - e. provide off-street parking for all staff members on duty at the highest shift, plus one additional stall for each three residents;
  - f. at the discretion of the electric division, remove any overhead electric lines and place them underground;
  - g. the facility shall have a fully fenced rear yard of either masonry or solid vinyl materials six (6) feet in height;
  - h. the only signage shall conform to that permitted for a home occupation;
  - i. security lighting shall be adjusted such that no overflow light falls onto adjoining properties;
  - j. windows shall be a minimum of double pane insulated glass and shall be non-reflective;

## **II.**

This ordinance shall be effective twenty days after passage and publication.

PASSED AND ORDERED PUBLISHED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SPANISH  
FORK, UTAH, this 17th day of April, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_

G. WAYNE ANDERSEN, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_

Kent R. Clark, City Recorder



# TEXT AMENDMENT

## REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION ANIMAL BUFFER REQUIREMENT TEXT AMENDMENT

**Agenda Date:** April 4, 2012.

**Staff Contacts:** Dave Anderson, Community Development Director.

**Reviewed By:** Development Review Committee.

**Request:** The attached language would remove a requirement that non-domestic animals be kept a certain distance from dwellings on neighboring properties.

**Zoning:** City-wide.

**General Plan:** City-wide.

**Project Size:** City-wide.

**Number of lots:** Not applicable.

**Location:** Not applicable.

### Background Discussion

The proposed amendment would remove a requirement that non-domestic animals be kept a certain distance from dwellings on neighboring lots.

As proposed, the buffer requirement would be eliminated and language could be added (see point 4) if there are concerns about having pens, corrals, stable or the like located too close to a neighborhood dwelling. The Development Review Committee recommended that the proposed language be approved with or without point 4.

### Development Review Committee

The Development Review Committee reviewed this latest proposal on March 28, 2012 and recommended that the proposal be approved. Draft minutes from that meeting read as follows:

#### Animal Rights

Applicant: Spanish Fork City  
General Plan: City-wide  
Zoning: City-wide  
Location: City-wide

Mr. Anderson explained the existing code as it relates to animal rights and the language that is proposed to be removed. He further explained that the City did not have very many zoning provisions in the City that rely on what one neighbor can do on one side of the property line to define what another neighbor can do on the other side of the property line. With a buffer requirement like we have today, where it says that somebody must keep their horses a certain distance from a neighboring dwelling, where the dwelling is determines where the neighbor can have a horse. The more that staff discussed this they determined that because there are other protections built into the ordinance for people that may live next to a property that is large enough to have animal rights that striking the buffer is, in their opinion, okay.

Mr. Anderson **moved** to recommend that the Planning Commission **adopts** the proposed Text Amendment eliminating the buffer requirement as found under the

animal section 15.3.24.090, G and that the Planning Commission include the language listed as item number 4; if they feel it is necessary. Mr. Anderson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

### **Budgetary Impact**

Staff believes there would be little or no budgetary impact with the proposed Zoning Text Amendment.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the proposed Ordinance Amendment be approved.

### 15.3.24.090 Supplementary Regulations

#### G. Animals

Animals are allowed in the A-E, R-R, I-1, and I-2 zoning districts with no restrictions on the maximum number. Animals are allowed in all other zoning districts subject to the following regulations:

1. The portion of the property on which the animals, except for household pets, are kept must be at least one-half (½) acre. The chart following this section sets forth the maximum number of animals which may be kept per each half acre of property. The numbers are not cumulative. A maximum of one species precludes any other species. For example, on a half-acre parcel, two horses may be kept, or four sheep, or one horse and two sheep, but two horses and four sheep are not allowed.
2. All requirements set forth in Title 6, Animals, must be met.
3. No animal shall be kept in a residential zone for the purpose of commercial production.
4. In the event that animals are occasionally kept on a portion of a parcel that is less than one half (½) acre (corrals, pens, stables, barns and so forth), that portion of the property must be as far from any neighboring dwellings as it is from the dwelling on the subject property.

Hen Chickens	10	100
Rabbits	10	50
Pigeons	12	50
Ducks, Geese	8	50
Game Birds*	8	50
*with appropriate permits		

Animal	Maximum# Per ½ Acre	Min. distance of barns, pens, or corrals to neighboring dwelling (In feet)
Cattle	2	100
Horses	2	100
Sheep, Goats, Llamas, Ostriches	4	100
Poultry, Turkeys or Fowl	10	100



# PRELIMINARY PLAT

## REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION STONE SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAT

**Agenda Date:** April 4, 2012.

**Staff Contacts:** Dave Anderson, Community Development Director.

**Reviewed By:** Development Review Committee.

**Request:** Spanish Fork City is requesting Preliminary Plat approval for a 2-lot subdivision in the R-1-6 Zone.

**Zoning:** R-1-6.

**General Plan:** Medium Density Residential.

**Project Size:** approximately 5 acres.

**Number of lots:** 2.

**Location:** approximately 2600 East Canyon Road.

### Background Discussion

Spanish Fork City proposes that approximately 5-acres be subdivided into two lots with a redesigned alignment for 2550 East.

### Development Review Committee

The Development Review Committee reviewed this request in their March 14, 2012 meeting and recommended that it be approved. Draft minutes from that meeting read as follows:

#### Stone

Applicant: Spanish Fork City

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Zoning: R-1-6

Location: approximately 2700 East Canyon Road

Discussion was held regarding the existing home becoming non-conforming.

Mr. Baker said that the non-conforming use was being forced by the City due to the road.

Mr. Anderson said that if the property becomes non-conforming than we should look into going through a process for a variance.

Mr. Baker **moved** to recommend to the Planning Commission that they **approve** the Stone Preliminary Plat. Mr. Perrins **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Mr. Anderson said that the lots do conform to the R-1-6 zone.

Mr. Peterson said that he had a couple of issues with an existing pole.

### Budgetary Impact

There is no immediate budgetary impact anticipated with the approval of this plat.



**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the proposed Preliminary Plat be approved.



