

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

**Adopted Minutes**  
**Spanish Fork City Planning Commission Meeting**  
**April 30, 2014**

**Commission Members Present:** Chairman Brad Gonzales, Bruce Fallon, George Gull, Treaci Tagg, Reed Swenson. Absent: Richard Heap.

**Staff Present:** Dave Anderson, Community Development Director; Kimberly Brenneman; Community Development Division Secretary; Jered Johnson, Engineering Division Manager; Jason Sant, Assistant City Attorney.

**Citizens Present:** Nefi Gareia (VZW), Marvene Zohner, Jesse Brimhall, Joe Rich, Cody Brazell, Richard Mendenhall, Keith Warner, Lori Warner, Gaylon Steiner, Linda Terry, Tim Terry, Faye W. Hall, Bill Bushman.

**PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Gonzales led in the pledge.

**Approval of Minutes: April 2, 2014**

Chairman Gonzales proposed a change to the minutes of April 2, 2014

Commissioner Fallon **moved** to **approve** the April 2, 2014 minutes with the proposed change. Commissioner Swenson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

**GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONE CHANGE**

**The Ridge**

**Applicant:** Dos Amigos

**General Plan:** Medium and Low Density Residential existing; High Density Residential proposed

**Zoning:** R-1-6 existing; R-3 proposed

**Location:** 2700 East Canyon Road

Several items from the last meeting on April 2, 2014 needed to be addressed. Dave Anderson presented a staff update for The Ridge.

The City Council would need to approve a Zone Change and a General Plan Amendment. An email from Chairman Gonzales was sent earlier this week to the Commission; it will be attached to the minutes for today's meeting. The City has applied for and has been awarded money to realign 2550 East. Construction for the realignment of the road will be completed in 2016. This intersection has been a problem. The applicant hired a consultant to perform a traffic study that was completed and sent to City staff on April 29, 2014. The study presented that traffic will be going from a delay at peak hour of 55 seconds to a delay of 58 seconds,

48 assuming the development is built out prior to the intersection realignment. The delay is  
49 significantly decreased once the intersection is aligned. There were some reservations  
50 concerning the height of the buildings close to Canyon Road. The biggest step the applicant  
51 has taken was to present a different building type. There will be 2-story units constructed from  
52 the clubhouse south.

53

54 A public hearing was held on April 2, 2014, and Chairman Gonzales thanked the public for the  
55 input from that meeting. There was a letter received by Mechelle Cebrowski with her  
56 concerns. The letter will be attached to today's meeting minutes.

57

58 Chairman Gonzales outlined 4 issues with the development that he feels have been addressed:

59

- 60 1. The applicant has agreed to have a proper fence installed to protect children from  
61 accessing the neighboring properties and agricultural area.
- 62 2. The applicant will work with the Water Master to make sure that the water will be  
63 accessible for watering.
- 64 3. The applicant has addressed the height concern by modifying the buildings from the club  
65 house south to Canyon Road as 2-story units, as well as decreasing the volume of units  
66 along that stretch.
- 67 4. Most of the road concerns will probably be addressed prior to the development being  
68 built out. The proposed housing project will not magnify the traffic issue. The traffic  
69 issue is due to the number of homes in the surrounding area. There are some additional  
70 steps being done by the City that will eventually relieve the congestion.

71

72 Jesse Brimhall presented to the Commission that the square footage will range from 1700-  
73 2800. The average price will be a little higher than anticipated with the larger floor plans.  
74 Jesse Brimhall presented an elevation of the difference from the 2-story to the 3-story units.  
75 The 2-story units will range from 30'-34' in height. Jesse Brimhall is agreeing to have the fence  
76 jog around the water access point.

77

78 Commissioner Fallon stated the main focus of the traffic report was the 2550 East intersection  
79 and did not address the northern access point. He is concerned with visibility on the northern  
80 access point of the development. Dave Anderson addressed that visibility is not an issue and,  
81 functionally speaking, there should not be any issues of having the intersection on the north  
82 end of the development where it currently is proposed. The City hired their own consultants  
83 and it was determined that where the intersection is proposed is the best location.

84

85 Chairman Gonzales asked about the demographics of those who would be living in the  
86 development. Jesse Brimhall stated that it is targeted toward young families but that they  
87 expect of mix of resident types.

88

89 Commissioner Tagg asked about phasing and the volume. Jesse Brimhall stated that phase 1  
90 will be about 30 units. As far as the timing of phase 2, that will depend on when there is water  
91 in the canal so it can be piped.

92

93 Commissioner Fallon is concerned about the density. He posed the question, as a Commission,  
94 what is the vision of this property? Does this development seem like it is in the right place?

95  
96 Commissioner Swenson said he thinks that is a good point. The main concerns that were  
97 brought up in the review meeting were traffic and height and there was very little concern  
98 addressed about the density.  
99  
100 Chairman Gonzales said there is a need for high density in the City but it is needed in certain  
101 areas. The Commission does look at the zoning in the area surrounding. There is not another  
102 spot in Spanish Fork that is available for this architectural look. This would be a great addition  
103 to the City. High density is best suited for the area in which it is going, especially along US 6.  
104 There is a shortage of nice looking multi-family units in the City.  
105  
106 Commissioner Swenson agreed with Chairman Gonzales.  
107  
108 Commissioner Fallon said we need to be considerate of the adjacent zoning in the area.  
109  
110 Dave Anderson addressed the Commission with the General Plan proposal. It was last  
111 updated in 2010 and there was not much thought given to the specific area that is being  
112 evaluated for this development.  
113  
114 Commissioner Fallon asked if the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan as  
115 currently set out. Dave Anderson said that it does not. To accommodate The Ridge, the  
116 General Plan would have to be amended to High Density.  
117  
118 Chairman Gonzales asked Dave Anderson if the project could be zoned High Density and the  
119 area around it be zoned Medium Density. The reason for the proposed General Plan change is  
120 if a land owner down the road would like to pursue development that is similar to The Ridge,  
121 the process would be easier for the applicant if they do not have to do both a General Plan and  
122 Zone Change. The proposed Zone Change change will only impact the property included in  
123 The Ridge at this time.  
124  
125 The City Council has great discretion when reviewing a Master Planned Development. The  
126 applicant cannot come in and make any changes to the development without the approval of  
127 the City once it has been approved. Master Planned Developments are vested when the  
128 Preliminary Plat is approved.  
129  
130 Chairman Gonzales opened the meeting up for public comment.  
131  
132 Keith Warner  
133 When he and his wife built their home they were part of the County. His property was annexed  
134 with the cherry-stem annexation. Since the annexation he, feels no one takes care of the road.  
135 All along the road there are these subdivisions and there is no turn lane and you cannot go  
136 around a vehicle that is trying to turn due to all the pot holes in the road. He built in the  
137 County to be away from the City and be close to the town as well. He would like to know why  
138 someone can say what he wants done with his property by changing the zoning. He would  
139 prefer to stay zoned R-R because there are things that he enjoys, like animals and chickens,  
140 and who is to say that his new neighbors will not like what he likes.  
141

142 Dave Anderson stepped up to the podium and stated that no Zone Change is proposed for any  
143 property other than the property in the proposed development.

144

145 Tim Terry

146 He lives in the Somerset development. He is concerned that there are issues that need to be  
147 addressed in Somerset prior to the applicant moving on to a new development. It has been 8  
148 years since a fence and gate was supposed to have been completed.

149

150 Chairman Gonzales thanked the community for their input and the Commission for their input  
151 and research to address the concerns.

152

153 Commissioner Fallon asked about turn lanes coming down Canyon Road into the development.  
154 Jered Johnson addressed the Commission that Canyon Road is a UDOT road and that they are  
155 addressing the issue and the new design will allow for a left turn lane for the northern entrance  
156 to the proposed development.

157

158 Chairman Fallon **moved** to recommend **approval** of The Ridge General Plan Amendment.

159 Commissioner Swenson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

160

161 Chairman Fallon **moved** to recommend **approval** of The Ridge Zone Amendment subject to  
162 changing the zoning just for the property outlined to the R-3 zone.

163 Commissioner Swenson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

164

165

## 166 PRELIMINARY PLAT

167

### 168 **The Ridge**

169 **Applicant:** Dos Amigos

170 **General Plan:** Medium and Low Density Residential existing; High Density Residential  
171 proposed

172 **Zoning:** R-1-6 existing; R-3 proposed

173 **Location:** 2700 East Canyon Road

174

175 Chairman Gonzales **moved** to recommend **approval** of The Ridge Preliminary Plat, subject to it  
176 being the plat submitted on 4/30/2014 that outlines the property south of the canal as 2-story  
177 units, that the fence is adequate with the concerns the citizens had with the livestock, and that  
178 there is an access point for the water and the water irrigation is worked out with the Water  
179 Master and irrigation company.

180

181 Commissioner Gull **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

182

183

## 184 ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT (public hearing)

185

### 186 **Title 15**

187 **Applicant:** Woodbury Corporation

188 **General Plan:** City Wide

189 **Zoning:** City Wide  
190 **Location:** City Wide

191

192 The proposal is rather straight forward per Dave Anderson. The applicant proposes that the  
193 requirement for the trees that line the street be changed. Dave Anderson has had a chance to  
194 sit down and speak about the language of the City's requirements for landscaping with Cody  
195 Brazell and the language could be clarified.

196

197 Richard Mendenhall spoke to the Commission. There are architectural requirements for  
198 building commercial developments and the landscaping is to compliment the buildings. They  
199 respect what the City has done with North Park and they would like to tie into what has already  
200 been done. Trees naturally occur in clusters and not in straight lines and evenly spaced. The  
201 proposed development will be a new development for Utah County. The applicant is trying to  
202 replicate a natural setting. The applicant showed a general layout of the proposed Canyon  
203 Creek development with the proposed landscaping and the phases of development in 6 months  
204 cycles with a completion in about 3-4 years. The applicant asked the Commission if, from a  
205 design standpoint, the landscape corridors should be restricted. The applicant showed  
206 different developments that have been done in American Fork, Murray, and the Salt Lake area.  
207 The landscaping is done to give the tenants their exposure but still have the greenery and  
208 landscaping. The landscaping should be worked around the buildings to provide the best  
209 possible visibility. The applicant does not want to diminish the amount of trees; they are  
210 proposing more trees in a different layout. There will be a lot of xeriscaping in the area as well.

211

212 Chairman Gonzales sees the vision of the development but does not understand how you can  
213 not have trees spaced the way they are. The City is full of trees and he does not understand  
214 why changing the requirement to the landscaping the architecture of the landscaping will be  
215 better looking.

216

217 Richard Mendenhall said they would like to move the trees to provide better visibility for the  
218 businesses by adopting new landscape standards. There is a greater variety of tree species  
219 than what would be done by following what the ordinance currently allows. The buildings look  
220 attractive without landscaping, but will look more attractive with the landscaping. With a  
221 uniform structure of landscaping, there is no tapestry of color and size that the applicant feels  
222 appropriate for the theme.

223

224 Chairman Gonzales brought up the new development that Ogden City did. Their streets were  
225 lined with trees. He does not know if they are moving their trees around in Ogden to make  
226 buildings more visible.

227

228 Richard Mendenhall said that the difference is the Ogden project is not a Master Planned  
229 Development and the reason for having the uniformity is to make the various buildings feel  
230 similar, whereas Canyon Creek is a very large Master Planned Development and the  
231 architecture is uniform and the landscaping highlights the architecture.

232

233 Cody Brazell stated that the proposed Text Amendment will only address the trees.

234

235 Commissioner Fallon asked what the definition of Street Frontage Trees is? Dave Anderson  
236 said it is not currently defined but could be with this Text Amendment.  
237

238 Richard Mendenhall said he is not sure what the maximum amount of trees for the area should  
239 be.  
240

241 Chairman Gonzales is concerned that they do not want the developer to clump all the trees in  
242 one spot.  
243

244 Commissioner Fallon asked about the distance from one group of trees to the next group of  
245 trees for the property that borders US 6.  
246

247 The applicant is trying to create view pockets for their tenants in an architecturally appealing  
248 way.  
249

250 Chairman Gonzales opened the meeting for public comment.  
251

252 Marvene Zohner handed out a paper to the Commission, which will be attached to today's  
253 meeting minutes. She is part of the Shade Tree Commission. Marvene Zohner stated changes  
254 set precedents and expressed fear that developers will use the smaller oriental trees rather  
255 than the historic larger trees. The smaller oriental trees are not able to be properly pruned to  
256 have proper visibility for traffic. She spoke about the trees in her subdivision and where trees  
257 could have been placed and what was part of the CC&R's. The concern is that when strong  
258 codes are not written, it is easier for items not to be met. She does not feel the landscaping  
259 requirements should be stronger. The main reason for her and her husband to move here was  
260 for the tree lined streets, and she would hate to see that change. The cluster trees do not  
261 provide the same cooling effects or the same aesthetics.  
262

263 Bill Bushman is the Parks and Recreation Building and Ground Manager and is on the Shade  
264 Tree Commission and acting City Forester. For the last 15 years, the City has consistently  
265 been a Tree City USA. The main goal of the City is to have a large canopy. In the last few  
266 years there have been 2,500 trees planted. There should be a happy medium reached between  
267 both parties. There should be trees planted along the roads, especially along US 6. The fear is  
268 that the wording of the text will change and small trees will be planted in the area because you  
269 are not able to cluster large trees together. There are large trees that are a signature of the  
270 City that have been here for 100+ years and he feels that there should be an agreement  
271 reached by both parties. He is asking the Commission that they do not recommend the  
272 proposed Zone Text Amendment to go to the City Council.  
273

274 Chairman Gonzales asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners.  
275

276 Chairman Gonzales would like to recommend a work meeting be held regarding this Text  
277 Amendment as the public comment was very valuable. He would like the applicant to come and  
278 address the type of trees that are proposed.  
279

280 Cody Brazell stated the trees that were chosen will be over 25'. The overall determination of  
281 the maturity is reached by height. That can vary from 5 years to 60 years depending on the  
282 trees planted.

283  
284 Richard Mendenhall appreciated the Shade Trees Commission's comments. There are legal  
285 obligations that they have that discourage anything but just oriental trees on portions of the  
286 site. They are asking that there not be a uniform distribution of the trees. Richard Mendenhall  
287 asked if tree lined streets are what the City is after or if it is uniformity of the development.  
288 The applicant's intent is to move forward with their development, not to prohibit the planting of  
289 trees or to disadvantage the community.

290  
291 Chairman Gonzales closed the public hearing and asked if there was any comment from the  
292 Commission.

293  
294 Commissioner Fallon would like to recommend that the applicant work with the City Forester to  
295 address four items:

- 296  
297 1. What is the street frontage, what does that area pertain to, and how should it be  
298 defined?  
299 2. It concerns him there are several spots where there are no trees in the park strip, from  
300 the curb to the sidewalk. This helps to define the street room; it also helps to protect  
301 the pedestrians.  
302 3. Discuss the mixture of species of trees to address the size for maturity, to evaluate any  
303 sparseness.  
304 4. Look at creating a maximum spacing. There is an appropriate scale that should be  
305 addressed from tree to tree.  
306

307 Commissioner Tagg asked the applicant why they are not able to move forward without the  
308 approval of the Text Amendment.

309  
310 Richard Mendenhall addressed the Commission that they have agreements with the tenants  
311 that are not compliant with the current City code. If the ordinance is not changed, the  
312 applicant must go back to their tenants to propose a new plan for landscaping that fits within the  
313 code and meets the tenant's needs.

314  
315 Commissioner Fallon asked Bill Bushman about the size of the trees proposed and what his  
316 initial thoughts were. Bill Bushman responded that there were some trees that were proposed  
317 that he liked but some do not meet the canopy that he would like to see. He feels trees have a  
318 higher priority and need to be addressed.

319  
320 Bill Bushman liked the modern look. He would like to make sure that all the other frontages  
321 support the longevity of the trees.

322  
323 Richard Mendenhall proposed that the text amendment apply to C-2 or Commercial  
324 Developments where the architecture can be controlled. He believes that there can be a  
325 compromise accomplished with the way the proposal is structured.  
326

327 Chairman Gonzales said that there is a point when the City needs to decide that it is their City  
328 and what they would like their City to look like. These businesses can conform to the  
329 ordinances as they currently are or they can go to another city to build.

330  
331 Commissioner Swenson agreed that the applicant should work with Bill Bushman.

332  
333 Chairman Gonzales said that there needs to be some evaluation of the size of property and the  
334 development.

335  
336 Chairman Fallon **moved** to recommend **tabling** this discussion until the next Planning  
337 Commission meeting.

338 Commissioner Swenson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

339

340

341 **Conditional Use Permit (public hearing)**

342

343 **Verizon Wireless 110' Monopole**

344 **Applicant:** Technology Associates

345 **General Plan:** Commercial

346 **Zoning:** I-1

347 **Location:** 1345 North 200 East

348

349 **Verizon Wireless 65' Monopole**

350 **Applicant:** Technology Associates

351 **General Plan:** Commercial

352 **Zoning:** Public Facility

353 **Location:** 3815 East US 6

354

355 One of the proposed towers is located just south of Mountain Country Foods. There are some  
356 concerns that have been raised with the height of the tower and the relation to the runway.

357 The City employs a consultant for matters like this and the consultant recommends that the  
358 height be reduced to 78' and that will not affect the runway now or down the road. It is located  
359 in a heavy industrial area and there are a lot of power poles in the area and staff feels it is very  
360 appropriate for the area. Staff recommends the pole be approved at 78' with no conditions.

361

362 The second proposed tower is on City property and the staff is not opposed to the proposal.

363

364 Chairman Gonzales opened the meeting for public discussion.

365

366 Nefi Garcia addressed the Commission and thanked the Commission for their time.

367

368 The public discussion was closed.

369

370 Chairman Swenson **moved** to **approve** the Verizon Wireless 78' Monopole Conditional Use  
371 Permit at 1345 North 200 East as well as the Verizon Wireless 65' Monopole Conditional Use  
372 Permit 3815 East US 6.

373 Commissioner Gull **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419

**AT&T three new antennas**

**Applicant:** Justin Hadley  
**General Plan:** Mixed Use  
**Zoning:** C-2  
**Location:** 1312 East Center Street

There is an existing tower on the site. The existing antenna they are proposing is about 3' higher than what is currently on the tower. The staff recommends the Conditional Use be approved.

Chairman Tagg **moved** to **approve** the AT&T Conditional Use Permit.  
Commissioner Fallon **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

On the Woodbury Title 15 proposed Zone Text Amendment, the concerns need to be addressed and narrowed to move the discussion along. The concerns Chairman Gonzales would like addressed are:

1. Design.
2. Distance between trees.
3. The species of the trees.

Commissioner Fallon said he thinks spacing is important. Once spacing is determined, the applicant can select a tree that fit accordingly.

Commissioner Tagg stated that all the time that has gone into North Park, and she thinks that the corridor down Main Street is a different situation than what is proposed for the North Park area.

Chairman Gonzales said that staff should really be involved in making the decision. He also said that having some flexibility to having up to 60' between trees may be appropriate.

Commissioner Tagg addressed the trees in the Main Street 4 block area, blocks the view of the stores and that there needs to be some visibility of the stores.

Dave Anderson pointed out that the visibility of businesses was stressed on the proposed Text Amendment. Having trees on the street is what makes the street inviting and attractive for patrons.

Chairman Gonzales was wondering if they change the wording to projects over 200 acres with a clause of up to so many feet between trees.

420 Dave Anderson is inclined to make the Text Amendment applicable to all commercial  
421 developments.  
422  
423 Commissioner Fallon stated that a 40' sign does not provide the same amount of shade as a  
424 40' tree.  
425  
426 The Commission agrees that there can be some changes made to the Title 15 Text Amendment  
427 but they would like some wording from the staff to make sure the City's goals are achieved.  
428  
429 Dave Anderson proposed having a work session to have this issue resolved prior to the next  
430 scheduled June 4<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting so that it can make it to an earlier City  
431 Council meeting.  
432  
433 Commissioner Tagg suggested the Commission revisit The Ridge General Zone Change at that  
434 time as well.  
435  
436 Chairman Gonzales **moved to adjourn**.  
437 Commissioner Fallon **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor at 8:45 pm.

438  
439  
440 **Adopted:** May 14, 2014

---

Kimberly Brenneman  
Community Development Division Secretary