

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

**Adopted Minutes**  
**Spanish Fork City Planning Commission**  
**March 2, 2016**

**Commission Members Present:** Chairman Brad Gonzales, Bruce Fallon, Treaci Tagg, Jens Nielson. **Absent:** Brad Tanner, Brad Wilkinson.

**Staff Members Present:** Dave Anderson, Community Development Director; Jason Sant, Assistant City Attorney; Cory Pierce, Staff Engineering; Andrea Allred, Management Intern.

**Citizens Present:** Sharla Thomas, Jay Thomas, Bryon Prince, Aaron Ostler, Roy Hatfield, Tate Colton, Fred Clark, David Olsen, Rob McNeed.

Chairman Gonzales called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

**PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Tagg led the pledge.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**October 7, 2015, October 13, 2015, November 4, 2015, January 6, 2016, January 13, 2015, February 3, 2016 and February 23, 2016.**

Commissioner Tagg **moved** to **approve** the minutes of **October 7, 2015, October 13, 2015, November 4, 2015, January 6, 2016, January 13, 2015, February 3, 2016 and February 23, 2016.**

Commissioner Nielson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

**ZONE CHANGE**

**Newport Village**

Applicant: LEI

General Plan: Mixed Use

Zoning: R-R current; R-1-9 proposed

Location: 100 South 920 West

Dave Anderson displayed the Newport Village plat that was proposed as a Master Planned Development and would conform to R-1-9 standards, should it be approved. Last time the Commission raised the issue of future land use and whether it made sense to allow, through changing the zoning, the property to develop residentially at this time. Plans are in the works for a potential interchange near this property with I-15 not far to the west. Staff took direction from the Commission and Dave Anderson is reporting back on the direction given relative to

47 the proposed zoning since this is a zoning issue. If changed to R-1-9 the owner is entitled to  
48 have a residential project approved.

49  
50 Dave Anderson showed the schematic view of what is currently planned in the vicinity of the  
51 subject property. In 2012 MAG, UDOT and UTA did an interchange study to see what was  
52 feasible and what was needed for interchanges and looked at future needs. An interchange  
53 would involve a traffic signal toward the western edge of this property's frontage and the north  
54 east corner of the development. Last night the City Council approved a contract with CBC  
55 Advisors (Coldwell Bankers Commercial Advisors) to provide consulting services in the City.  
56 They would help the City identify sites good for retail usage. It is the largest commercial real  
57 estate brokerage in Utah. The brokers working on projects are top notch and have worked with  
58 retailers and restaurants you would recognize. Dave Anderson has corresponded with Steve  
59 Bowler over the past few weeks, their point person for Spanish Fork, and spoke to them about  
60 this site.

61  
62 Dave Anderson said that CBC said, should the planned interchange happen, a property about  
63 850 feet by 650 feet would be excellent for commercial development, likely a grocery anchored  
64 development. So it could be used by a retail user approaching a big box size. Many grocery  
65 stores these days are larger than 100,000 square feet, but maybe something between 50 and  
66 100 thousand square feet, with the idea that the entire acreage would be utilized. Steve  
67 Bowler also asked about the area to the west of this site where a church is being developed  
68 now. Steve Bowler was upfront about giving the advice the City is paying him to give. They  
69 also discussed setting part of the development aside for commercial, but CBC said that that  
70 wouldn't be good enough. If the City is trying to reserve sites for retail development, the entire  
71 site should be reserved.

72  
73 Dave Anderson said that the advice from CBC is only true if there is an interchange. An  
74 interchange at Center Street is planned by MAG in Phase 2. Phase 1 goes from today to  
75 2025. Phase 2 goes from 2026 to 2035. Phase 3 is the following 10 years and anything farther  
76 out they do not even guess how far out it will be. Therefore, no funding would be available until  
77 at least 2025 for any meaningful work on an interchange in this location including design or  
78 environmental work. The other Spanish Fork Phase 2 project is the 2700 North interchange  
79 and is a higher priority for Spanish Fork City. The City meets with state legislators about this  
80 interchange and they feel it will be needed soonest to alleviate traffic issues on the north side  
81 of the City. Dave Anderson also said that both of these projects would be really high dollar.  
82 The Center Street interchange was estimated to be a \$55 million interchange. 2700 North was  
83 just shy of that. The City generally doesn't see a City get two of these projects done in a 10  
84 year time period, it could happen. It is possible that the Center Street interchange could  
85 become the priority. The best case scenario, if the environmental work were to begin in 2026,  
86 the process would take 2-3 years. It would take a year to get funding for design work, a year  
87 to get a design together, go out to bid. We are looking closer to 2035 than 2025, and it is best  
88 case scenario to get an interchange at this site.

89  
90 Chairman Gonzales said he discussed with a citizen about the hospital on Arrowhead Trail that  
91 is now in construction, the interchange by that facility is a higher priority for UDOT than

92 originally thought. Since that site in Salem is only about a mile or two away from this site, has  
93 Dave Anderson heard of any changes of emphasis because of that.  
94  
95 Dave Anderson had not heard that and would be surprised if that were the case.  
96  
97 Cory Pierce hadn't heard anything about that, but the County is working to build another road  
98 from Elk Ridge and Salem, down through that area to get traffic to the interchange. So it is a  
99 priority for MAG and the County.  
100  
101 Chairman Gonzales said that the Commission should consider the priorities of bordering areas.  
102  
103 Dave Anderson said that his curiosity is piqued as to how things might stack up. The City  
104 knows that environmental work is happening for a new interchange in Payson. They have a leg  
105 up on us compared to what we would like to see happen at 2700 North. The City is generally  
106 aware of what is going on in their vicinity because if a project gets built in Payson that is  
107 consuming the funding that otherwise would be available for projects in our community.  
108  
109 Dave Anderson asked if the road in Salem and Elk Ridge area has always been in the thought  
110 process but is being pushed more now because of the hospital.  
111  
112 Dave Anderson asked Cory Pierce if that road is under construction now.  
113  
114 Cory Pierce said no but they are clearing environmental issues and design. But they have  
115 received some funding.  
116  
117 Chairman Gonzales pointed out that on a previous slide, it showed that one driving mechanism  
118 of the Center Street interchange was UTA's desire to continue the rail down this far. The  
119 Chairman wondered if they were going to move the rail stop to the Benjamin exit rather than to  
120 the Center Street stop.  
121  
122 Dave Anderson said when they did a study in 2012, it showed that if they had a stop at this  
123 location, the next stop would be in Payson because of minimum spacing requirements. But  
124 they didn't identify a specific location in Payson. Springville has actually owned land for what  
125 would be their stop for a number of years and this location would work well with their stop.  
126 Dave Anderson speculated that the construction of an interchange would go hand in hand with  
127 the development of commuter rail south of Provo and a stop at that spot, which just makes the  
128 project more expensive. The study also clearly illustrated that unless we lead some of the  
129 regional traffic off our Main Street, and this interchange would be the best way to do that, our  
130 Main Street would be failing by 2030 or 2040. So this interchange will happen sometime  
131 before that. Often times, that is what drives things like the legislature approving large sums of  
132 money for an interchange like this.  
133  
134 Dave Anderson said that the study MAG did in 2012 on this interchange and the alignment  
135 they drew is a conceptual plan and is not etched in stone. While we hope that the alignment  
136 we were given ultimately resembles what gets built, our experience is that that doesn't always

137 happen. We know there will be an interchange in that vicinity and the layout we looked at  
138 would work, but things change from time to time.

139  
140 Dave Anderson also brought up the Mixed Use general plan designation. Looking at it from the  
141 perspective of what properties in the City are general plan Mixed Use; we have a smorgasbord  
142 of land used in that designation. From a general plan perspective, the Planning Commission  
143 could assign Commercial 2 zoning to the property and lots of other land uses as well including  
144 R-1-9. We could make a strong case that it is consistent with the plan with the Mixed Use  
145 designation.

146  
147 Dave Anderson discussed the concept of cities planning for the future and reserving sites for  
148 commercial uses. Dave Anderson said that retail uses often are among the last to become  
149 economically viable to put into play. Usually you need a certain amount of traffic, a certain  
150 number of people driving by, a certain number of rooftops within a certain vicinity of the site,  
151 and things of that nature before the property becomes viable for commercial uses.

152  
153 Dave Anderson discusses a variety are locations in the City that the City zoned as commercial  
154 that would have developed as residential if the zoning weren't commercial. For example, he  
155 discussed a location at 400 North and 2550 East near Maple Mountain High School. When this  
156 property was annexed, the City required the applicant to set aside 15 acres zoned Commercial  
157 2 with the understanding that 400 North and 2550 East do from a traffic perspective and  
158 growth in that area that we believe that a property there at some point in the future would  
159 support retail uses, and we felt like without zoning it for that, we would perhaps miss an  
160 opportunity to keep that property reserved for retail development.

161  
162 Dave Anderson next talked about the property zoned Urban Village on 2550 East but down by  
163 US 6. Twelve years ago, the City zoned this for basically commercial uses. If the City hadn't  
164 zoned if for commercial uses, Dave Anderson believes it would have developed residentially,  
165 given what has happened in the surrounding areas.

166  
167 Dave Anderson next brought up the Gardner Property owned by the Gardner family. Dave  
168 Gardner, one of the sons of the family members has spoken with Dave Anderson about the  
169 property at the intersection of Volunteer Drive and Main Street many times. At least for the  
170 last 15 years for commercial; it is a big vacant field. The Gardners would have loved to have  
171 the zoning change to residential over the years. They really had their eye on high density  
172 residential zoning, and with some of the buyers they spoke to. From the same perspective as  
173 with the other sites, the City believing that at some point in the future there would be a need  
174 for commercial development on that end of the City, therefore, commercial zoning was used as  
175 the tool to reserve the property for that in the future.

176  
177 Dave Anderson stated that the City needs to acknowledge neighborhood push back. When the  
178 City has a public hearing for commercial or high density residential zoning, the City went  
179 through it last year with the property down by Volunteer Drive; the City generally gets push  
180 back unless the City is talking about land uses that are similar to surrounding land uses. The  
181 Planning Commission is the group that gets to deal with the real heat. Neighbors tend to like  
182 similar land uses next to theirs.

183 Dave Anderson also stated that the anticipated lifespan of a single-family dwelling is well over  
184 100 years, on the order of 130 years or something like that. It is a function of 30 year  
185 mortgages that get replaced one after another over time. Once a residential neighborhood is  
186 approved, they generally stay residential neighborhoods for a long time. This is not always the  
187 case as we saw in Spanish Fork with the Canyon Creek project. A number of dwellings were  
188 moved to make way for that. However, it is not very common.  
189

190 Dave Anderson stated that the staff has provided this information as food for thought for the  
191 Commission as they deliberate on the proposed Zone Change. Right now the property is  
192 zoned as agricultural. The proposal is to change the zoning to R-1-9. Dave Anderson said that  
193 this Zone Change is tricky. There is not a clear black and white, right or wrong decision. If the  
194 Commission feels like the land should be set aside for commercial uses, they should probably  
195 talk about setting it all aside for commercial uses based on what Mr. Bowler told the City.  
196

197 Dave Anderson feels an obligation to make a recommendation to the Commission relative to  
198 the Zone Change, which the staff has already done once. The staff has talked about this again.  
199 The initial recommendation was to approve the Zone Change to R-1-9. That hasn't changed.  
200 The reasoning for that is two or three fold. If the interchange was in phase 1 and there was  
201 some kind of funding already identified even for environmental work, something tangible that  
202 was out there the City could look to as some type of certainty that the interchange would be  
203 built, the recommendation would be different. The staff would recommend commercial zoning.  
204 If the City knew with a certainty that the interchange would eventually be built according to the  
205 alignment the City is looking at now, that would cause the staff to do another double take on  
206 their recommendation. However, the uncertainties involved from both timing and design  
207 perspective, coupled with what is currently the property owner's and a builder's desire  
208 influences where we are coming from.  
209

210 Dave Anderson stated why this situation is different than the Gardner property down on South  
211 Main and the properties out on 2550 East, is it has to do with the interchange. In those cases,  
212 the bones of the transportation system are there. Main Street is not going to move. Volunteer  
213 Drive is not going anywhere. It is only going to become a 4-way intersection rather than the 3-  
214 way intersection it is now. Same with U.S. 6 and 2550 East and different things like that. In  
215 those cases, Dave Anderson would argue that they should continue to be reserved for  
216 commercial development because we know what's there and what's going to be there in the  
217 future.  
218

219 Dave Anderson stated that he appreciates the care the Commission has taken, having the staff  
220 look at this and having the staff do the research they have done. Dave Anderson also  
221 appreciates the deliberate nature. The issues raised are valid.  
222

223 Chairman Gonzales stated that this was an issue that was addressed in February's  
224 Commission meeting. The Commission has some questions and concerns about future  
225 development in relation to the proposed traffic plans and sites that Dave Anderson referred to.  
226 This was a public hearing last time and there were a few people to discuss the item. Chairman  
227 Gonzales asked that the record show that this is open to the public but the Commission has

228 already had the public hearing in regards to the Newport Village Zone Change. Chairman  
229 Gonzales asked if the Commission would like to have more discussion.

230  
231 Commissioner Nielson stated that he missed the last meeting when this was first brought up.  
232 He asked if the fact that there is a church being put in next door would affect what businesses  
233 would come in.

234  
235 Chairman Gonzales said he didn't know why. Chairman Gonzales pointed out that the City  
236 has gas stations next to churches, and a grocery store.

237  
238 Dave Anderson said that there is a gas station next to another church at 10<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. The City  
239 has talked about this because there are rules that impact what you can do from a retail  
240 perspective in close proximity to a church. However, we can see that it doesn't take much  
241 distance to be able to operate commercial uses pretty robustly.

242  
243 Commissioner Nielson asked if that wasn't a factor to the people looking at it.

244  
245 Dave Anderson stated that the guys at Caldwell resented the fact that there was potentially  
246 another five acres that could be commercial.

247  
248 Commissioner Nielson asked about the area on the other side of the freeway that is still so  
249 open.

250  
251 Dave Anderson stated that the staff had talked about it. When Dave Anderson was trying to  
252 push Steve Bowler to make sure he is thinking everything through completely and he  
253 acknowledged that there are great opportunities out there for commercial development when  
254 there are thousands of homes on the west side of the freeway and people are traveling by  
255 those commercial sites daily. This is what retailers look for from a traffic perspective. They  
256 don't want destination traffic; they want traffic that is created as people are forced to drive by  
257 their sites daily. That will be the case on the east side of the freeway. It would be the case  
258 today if an interchange were there. It will be the case on the west side but not for a really long  
259 time.

260  
261 Chairman Gonzales stated that his feelings are similar to what Dave Anderson expressed, if it  
262 was more concrete. Chairman Gonzales is the one who raised the issue of reserving the area  
263 for commercial use and he appreciates the staff reevaluating the situation. 2035 potentially 20  
264 years down the road, still with potentially a thought or a wish to eliminate the stress of Main  
265 Street. But 2700 North will reduce some stress. If Benjamin is developed, that will reduce  
266 stress. Who knows, the proposed stresses of today may still be the stresses of 2035. He does  
267 think the Commission has a responsibility as planners to forecast down the road. The  
268 Commission has a responsibility to preserve, if need be. But maybe the Commission shouldn't  
269 preserve based on a 20 year projection that might or might not happen. Chairman Gonzales  
270 stated that he probably, more than his teammates, sits up there and thinks "why do we have to  
271 build on every corner of the City". He has been the one that has been more of a preserver.  
272 But he doesn't know that we should hold back potential on something based on something that  
273 might or might not happen. Chairman Gonzales asked what Commissioner Tagg thought.

274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
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

Commissioner Tagg stated that she doesn't have a problem with the housing development going in that location, as far as it is a good fit with all the other homes in that area. Her only concern is because of the potential that the off-ramp would be there, and that seems many years down the road. There is no commercial value to it at the moment so the land would just sit in hopes that commercial development would happen. That doesn't seem like a good gamble moving in that direction. Once the development goes in, it's all preliminary planning so it's not like UDOT can't make a different plan and work around what changes. Commissioner Tagg did go driving up and down the freeway looking for similar situations where there were houses right off an off-ramp and she couldn't find one. Commissioner Tagg does not think it is the best place for houses to be right next to the off-ramp, but UDOT can figure that out. If the City put houses in there, they're not going to do anything for 30 years then UCOT will figure it out when they get to that point.

Commissioner Nielson wouldn't set it aside for commercial based on what they know now.

Commissioner Fallon stated that he is on the same page. He did have one question is about the density. Should it be denser, but again, it is the same coin.

Chairman Gonzales stated that the suggested zoning is similar to the zoning on the south side, but different to the density on the north side.

Dave Anderson stated that it is pretty similar to both.

Commissioner Tagg asked to look at the zoning map.

Commissioner Nielson clarified that the plat had not been submitted with a portion cut out for commercial stuff and had only houses.

Dave stated that was correct.

Commissioner Nielson asked how many houses were proposed in the preliminary plat.

Dave Anderson stated he believed it was 41.

Commissioner Nielson clarified that the Thompson house would be absorbed in the subdivision, or moved.

Commissioner Tagg asked about other residential developments along Center Street. She asked if there were more housing developments along Center Street before Main Street.

Dave Anderson stated that there are a few. Some are contemporary that have been built in the last 10 years or so. Dave Anderson pointed out a few of these areas on a map. There is not much land that's been vacant.

Commissioner Nielson pointed out that we have three churches really close there.

320  
321 Commissioner Fallon welcomed everyone to Utah.  
322  
323 Dave Anderson stated that from his perspective relative to Mixed Use, the area along Center  
324 Street is all designated Mixed Use. The area is really diverse.  
325  
326 Commissioner Tagg clarified that in this area it is a block of this and a block of that.  
327  
328 Dave Anderson said that we do not have a single real Mixed Use project in that area.  
329  
330 Commissioner Nielson asked if the City owned property is a potential commercial use property.  
331  
332 Dave Anderson said that was music to his ears, as the economic development guy. He asked  
333 Commissioner Nielson if he knew somebody that might be interested because we can always  
334 talk.  
335  
336 Commissioner Nielson stated that 7-eleven might want to go there with all the high school kids.  
337  
338 Dave Anderson said that they don't know the plan for the City owned property in that area. He  
339 pointed out the SFCN building and the area that is City owned. There is room to expand the  
340 court building and the police department.  
341  
342 Chairman Gonzales stated that they could take the RC car track and make it a full NASCAR  
343 track.  
344  
345 Commissioner Nielson pointed out that if everything fills in, the City will own the only vacant  
346 spot and the best commercial real estate in the City. It would solve all the financial problems  
347 of the City.  
348  
349 Commissioner Fallon asked again if this is the right zoning. Is it dense enough for what the  
350 future is? He asked for Dave Anderson's recommendations and thoughts.  
351  
352 Dave Anderson state that he is still smarting from the last time he stood before them and  
353 recommended that they zone a property in this general vicinity for something a bit more dense.  
354 Dave Anderson stated that he is a fan of the R-1-9 zoning.  
355  
356 Commissioner Neilson asked if the developers were happy with the plan presented.  
357  
358 Chairman Gonzales stated that they should discuss the zone before they discuss the plat  
359 because if they don't pass the zone then the plat is not relevant.  
360  
361 Commissioner Fallon **moved** to recommend approval to City Council of the Newport Village  
362 Zone Change.  
363  
364 Commissioner Nielson **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.  
365

366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
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

PRELIMINARY PLAT

**Newport Village**

Applicant: LEI  
General Plan: Mixed Use  
Zoning: R-1-6  
Location: 100 South 920 West

Dave Anderson wanted to point out a few things they have already talked a little bit about. Looking at the potential interchange, and even if the interchange is not put in, Center Street is a big road. The City has made sure that the width of Center Street will stay consistent through this property. That is why you see the gap between the rear lot lines and where the current property line is. This land would be set aside so that, regardless of what happens along Center Street from a transportation perspective, we would never expect that any of these properties would be impacted by that. Dave Anderson also pointed out an active railroad track adjacent to the property; a spur that gets used once or twice a week. It's the pallet factory that takes deliveries via that line.

Commissioner Fallon stated that he assumed it was at low speeds.

Chairman Gonzales pointed out that it dead ends right there.

Dave Anderson stated that he wasn't sure if they use this specific part that often.

Cory Pierce stated that they come into it to switch cars.

Chairman Gonzales asked Dave Anderson what his thoughts were about a connection to potential expansion to the west of the plat.

Dave Anderson stated that prior to the church building there, he would have said yes, they needed to do that.

Chairman Gonzales said he had thought the church was farther west. Chairman Gonzales said that it wouldn't be the only spot in the City that would exit right into the church parking lot.

Commissioner Fallon asked if the land to the north would be deeded to the City, would it sit weed infested for 30 years.

Dave Anderson stated that the church dedicated land over to the City for a trail and there is a trail on the north east side of the property. With this development, that only leaves a property that is owned by the Nebo School District over on the south side of 100 South to get us to where we can tie into the trail that goes through the Spanish Fields Development before it ties into the River Trail. So we are close to having a loop from the River Trail all the way back around Center Street here. That is one plus of this development.

412 Cory Pierce said that this development would build the masonry wall there as well as the trail  
413 for that section. Then you are really up against that railroad. So it is a little bit of improvement  
414 from the weeds being there.

415  
416 Chairman Gonzales said that often developments come in phases. He asked if this is all one  
417 phase.

418  
419 Dave Anderson stated that he would let the applicant talk about that.

420  
421 Bryon Prince from Ivory Development stated that this would be a two-phase project. If you cut  
422 the project in half, south and north, they would start with the south and move north for phase  
423 2.

424  
425 Chairman Gonzales asked when the entrance would be done in relation to the phases.

426  
427 Bryon Prince said that the roads on the south and east corners will be completed in phase 1  
428 along with the road on the east side. The remainder roads inside the property would be in  
429 phase 2. Bryon Prince stated that Dave Anderson was right when he said that they do plan to  
430 put a masonry wall around the subdivision. They made that decision well in advance of knowing  
431 that UDOT may make a decision 20 years from now and residents are smart enough to look  
432 into that and be concerned about potential traffic years down the road. Ivory Development will  
433 deed the big section on the north end to the City, put a wall up and the development will be  
434 pretty enclosed.

435  
436 Bryon Prince said this design mirrors an active adult project they did in Orem City several  
437 years ago called De Vinci Place. It was a very successful project. This won't in any way be a  
438 deed restricted community but they do think of it as age targeted, active adult location because  
439 of its location and the design in providing some privacy.

440  
441 Chairman Gonzales asked Cory Pierce if he was okay with the road design in relation to the  
442 phases.

443  
444 Cory Pierce said yes. He stated that from the standpoint of street alignments, a larger facility  
445 and UDOT road on the south, the same on 920 West as well as a more major facility to connect  
446 those two roads. Splitting that with access in the middle is ideal from an access spacing  
447 standpoint as well as aligning up across the street. So from an access and road standpoint it is  
448 as good as we can get.

449  
450 Commissioner Fallon stated that there were four conditions outlined in the recommendations  
451 from staff and asked if any of those had changed since the report was written.

452  
453 Dave Anderson stated that they have not changed.

454  
455 Commissioner Fallon stated that staff recommended that the proposed Zone Change and plat  
456 be approved subject to the following conditions. The Commission didn't put any conditions on

457 the Zone Change and it is probably fine that they didn't because they will put them on here and  
458 he wanted to make sure.

459  
460 Dave Anderson said that was right.

461  
462 Commissioner Fallon **moved** to recommend approval to City Council of Newport Village  
463 Preliminary Plat based on the following conditions:

464  
465 Conditions

- 466
- 467 1. That the applicant meet the City's current development standards;
  - 468 2. That the applicant pay any connectors agreements;
  - 469 3. That the applicant provide a UDOT permit for access onto 100 south;
  - 470 4. That the applicant coordinate with the canal company to pipe or abandon the existing  
471 ditch along 100 South.

472  
473 Commissioner Tagg **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

474  
475  
476 TEXT AMENDMENT

477  
478 **Title 15 – High Density**  
479 Applicant: Spanish Fork City  
480 General Plan: City Wide  
481 Zoning: City Wide  
482 Location: City Wide

483  
484 Dave Anderson appreciated the meeting last week. The direction he received that night was  
485 useful and it was productive time. What he has done this past week was a follow up on that,  
486 really trying to incorporate the direction he got into the draft language they had prepared that  
487 night in hopes of getting things to a point this evening to where you feel comfortable at least  
488 considering action on the idea of creating a new zoning district. That being the case, there are  
489 a couple of things Dave Anderson had been thinking about that he thought would be issues that  
490 would need to be worked through with the option of a new zoning district. As he got into more  
491 of the details this past week, it became more apparent that there are some other things that  
492 need to be considered, so Dave Anderson will take maybe five minutes going over some of  
493 those collateral issues. Then he will go over the specifics of the changes he made since they  
494 last talked.

495  
496 Dave Anderson stated that the reasoning for creating a high density residential zoning district  
497 hasn't changed for months and months. We are still operating with the idea that there is a  
498 need in the community and we would like that need to be met with some type of housing  
499 development that is going to appreciate for the community overtime, it's going to gain value.  
500 It's going to be an asset and not a liability. We are still working with that fundamental premise.  
501

502 Dave Anderson stated that he will discuss some things he has thought about including separate  
503 design standards and how to incorporate the new language into Title 15 with the idea that  
504 there is probably a need to make some adjustments to the R-3 zone and the Infill Overlay zone.  
505

506 Dave Anderson stated that if the R-4 zone were adopted, the City would have 3 mechanisms  
507 by which the City can approve a residential development with something other than single-  
508 family homes in it. Right now, the two mechanisms we have are the Infill Overlay and Master  
509 Planned Developments. For example, Infill Overlay was intended to be used on an isolated  
510 basis for the redevelopment of a property. We have stretched that because our code didn't  
511 have a way to deal with some other projects to include some other uses or implementations as  
512 well. But originally the Infill Overlay was intended, as the name suggests, was used for small  
513 little pieces where there was a gap or something you wanted to see redeveloped. One of the  
514 things Dave Anderson suggests is that with changes we make here soon, we take the Infill  
515 Overlay back to that original intent of serving small projects. For example, right now, we don't  
516 have a maximum size for an Infill Overlay. Without being completely arbitrary, the language we  
517 passed out would change that so we would have a maximum size:  $3 \frac{3}{4}$  of an acre, which is  
518 basically one City block.  
519

520 Chairman Gonzales asked if he meant a typical City block or a Utah City block.  
521

522 Dave Anderson said some of the originally platted City blocks were basically 400 feet by 400  
523 feet, here in Spanish Fork. That's where Dave Anderson got the  $3 \frac{3}{4}$  acres with the idea that  
524 the Infill Overlay tool is meant to be used on a limited scale, on properties of a certain size and  
525 in a certain area of the City. With the idea that there is a place for that; there is a need for  
526 Infill Overlay. It doesn't exist on a whim, it is a useful tool.  
527

528 Master Planned Developments are another mechanism someone can have multi-family units  
529 included in a project. Tonight the Commission drove by the Maple Mountain Development  
530 where there is a mixture of single-family homes north of Sierra Bonita and on the other side  
531 you have town homes. In the past, this has been a way for the City to allow for that distinct  
532 land use on green field development or on land that hasn't previously been developed. With  
533 one catch, right now that tool still works. The limiting factor with Master Planned  
534 Developments today is that the densest project you can do is 5.37 units per acre. Even if a  
535 property is zoned R-3, which is the highest zone Spanish Fork has, the ceiling for density is still  
536 5 units for the acre. Which, frankly, for the projects we oftentimes see, your typical townhome  
537 project is usually in the 8, 9, or 10 unit per acre range. Because Dave Anderson feels like there  
538 should be a mechanism to approve a town home project with 8 units to the acre, there is a need  
539 to adjust the density that is allowed for a Master Planned Development in an R-3 zone, which  
540 right now, it matches what is allowed in the R-1-6 zone. They both top out at 5.37 units per  
541 acre. Dave Anderson suggests the City change that to 8 units per acre.  
542

543 Commissioner Fallon asked if Dave Anderson would disconnect it from zoning.  
544

545 Dave Anderson stated that he wouldn't. Dave Anderson pointed them to the last page of the  
546 memo he passed out, where it shows some changes the staff is suggesting to the zoning chart.  
547 Probably the biggest one is adding the R-4 zone, but another one is that change. Right now it

548 is 5.37 and Dave Anderson is suggesting that be bumped up to R-1-8. Incidentally it is 5.37  
549 because the lot size, 6,000 square feet is the same for the R-3 zone and the R-1-6 zone, 5.37 is  
550 a factor of that. It is if you did a project with 6,000 square foot lots, accounting for roads and  
551 things, you'd likely end up with something in the 5.37 range, so that's the history behind that.  
552 With the idea that there is a need for a zoning tool that allows the City to at least consider a  
553 project with a little bit higher density than 5 units to the acre. This is a change that makes  
554 sense. It helps fill the void we would otherwise have between the Infill Overlay and the R-4  
555 zone. The R-4 zone is intended to serve an entirely different animal from a development  
556 perspective. We are well suited to keep the R-4 zone's expectations very distinct from the  
557 Master Planned Development approach where it is kind of a medium density thing than a high  
558 density thing.

559  
560 The key features of the language for the R-4 zone would be a minimum project size of about 12  
561 acres, maximum density of 18 units per acre, really with the idea that it is promoting a project  
562 that is maybe 200 units in size because we understand that is kind of the industry standard.  
563 From a scale perspective, that is what a development would need to contain the types of  
564 amenities we are expecting.

565  
566 Dave Anderson said so these are three distinct tools all to allow multi-family developments to  
567 be approved.

568  
569 Dave Anderson offered to talk more about what makes those tools distinct.

570  
571 Dave Anderson brought up a specific example east of Summerset Village. Dave Anderson  
572 stated that he is not really here to advocate for or against the concept he will talk about but he  
573 would like to get the Commissioners' thoughts, and if this is something they would like to  
574 pursue then they should place that change to the Master Planned Development. Density does  
575 become pretty important. The property is now R-1-6, and with that, the City could approve a  
576 Master Planned Development but the ceiling on the density would be just over 5 units per acre.  
577 That might be a good thing, and that is something we would like to get your thoughts on  
578 tonight. Incidentally, Summerset Village all together is in that 5 ½ or so unit per acre range.  
579 Although, if you look at different parts of the project, for example what they have done on the  
580 west end, clearly in certain areas, they are closer to 10 units per acre than they are 5. The  
581 applicants here have proposed this townhome project at 8 units per acre. Dave understands  
582 that the idea, from a design perspective, would be similar to Summerset Village between  
583 Canyon Road and U.S. 6. Dave Anderson's opinion, for those reasons and given what is next  
584 door in Summerset Village which is a bit higher density residential development; this is not a  
585 far-fetched idea. The idea that you would put a bit higher density residential use there is pretty  
586 easy for Dave Anderson to get his head around. However, this is good to illustrate, both so the  
587 applicant can get some feedback and as well as to talk about the Master Planned Development  
588 program and the idea of bumping up the density. Without changing the density in the R-3 zone,  
589 we would not have a mechanism to consider this at the proposed density for approval. The  
590 ceiling would be 5.5 units per acre because the property is not big enough to qualify for R-4  
591 zoning. There is a void unless we make an adjustment to that zoning standard. This is what  
592 Dave Anderson had to mention regarding integrating the R-4 language into the code to draw  
593 the lines a little more distinctly between Infill Overlay, Master Planned Development and R-4.

594 Dave Anderson thinks the language in the memorandum does that. Dave Anderson stated that  
595 the Commissioners can tell him if they think it is a good idea or not.

596  
597 Commissioner Nielson asked how many acres this development would leave in in the vacant  
598 piece on the end.

599  
600 Dave Anderson stated that UDOT owns that piece.

601  
602 Cory Pierce state that UDOT has already realigned the road and has purchased property and  
603 will line the road up with the road to the south like they changed the signal and the access  
604 south east of the development.

605  
606 Commissioner Nielson clarified that this piece represents what is left in this project.

607  
608 Cory Pierce pointed out UDOT's plan.

609  
610 Chairman Gonzales clarified that without an amendment of the R-3 zone to Title 15, this  
611 particular project would have to use the overlay process.

612  
613 Dave Anderson said yes they would have to use the Infill Overlay, which the City could do,  
614 unless the Commission sets a size limitation, as Dave Anderson has suggested is a good idea.  
615 So if the Commission doesn't change the maximum size to 4 acres or similar for Infill Overlay,  
616 then the City could use Infill Overlay as a tool for this project, and because this is designated  
617 as medium density on the general plan, then they could zone it to 8 units per acre using Infill  
618 Overlay as a tool.

619  
620 Chairman Gonzales stated that the proposal Dave Anderson handed out did not include the  
621 Infill Overlay change he had in the power point.

622  
623 Dave Anderson said that it did.

624  
625 Commissioner Tagg said that it does have the maximum project size is 3.75 acres.

626  
627 Dave Anderson said that was the only change.

628  
629 Commissioner Tagg clarified that the change was just making it a certain size of land, but then  
630 to counter that we would change the R-3 for a smaller piece of land to have more.

631  
632 Commissioner Nielson said it preserves the integrity of Infill Overlay.

633  
634 Dave Anderson agreed with Commissioner Nielson. He stated that it was bringing it back to  
635 the original intent. The City has stretched it; Dave Anderson doesn't think it has been a  
636 terrible thing, but it hasn't been consistent.

637  
638 Commissioner Tagg asked what other places in the City are designated R-3.

639

640 Dave Anderson stated that the City doesn't have a lot. In fact, there is not any developable  
641 land that is zoned R-3. For example, for this project they are looking at, the applicants would  
642 have to apply for a Zone Change to R-3, and that would be part of the process.

643  
644 Commissioner Tagg stated that they would still have the ability to manage that in our City, as  
645 far as where that kind of density would be put.

646  
647 Dave Anderson stated yes, and that is a great thing to talk about with the Infill Overlay  
648 because that is a zoning mechanism that the City Council has all the discretion in the world as  
649 to whether to approve something or not or to suggest or require changes. It is much like that  
650 with a Master Planned Development as well.

651  
652 Chairman Gonzales asked about how the motion would be stated. Typically when the  
653 Commission makes changes it will say "we approve the changes outlines 1-10" where this is  
654 not really 1-10, it is in its proper format. Do we make a motion "as written per March 2,  
655 2016?"

656  
657 Dave Anderson stated that he guessed they would say "with the following changes".

658  
659 Commissioner Tagg clarified that they were making this recommendation to the City Council to  
660 approve the changes.

661  
662 Dave Anderson stated that if they wanted to go that route tonight, that is how the verbiage of  
663 a recommendation likely would be. "As written on the memorandum dated March 2" maybe  
664 "with the following changes".

665  
666 Chairman Gonzales stated that he has seen where the changes are summarized as the  
667 "following changes" and he just wanted to make sure that they were presenting it properly, or  
668 "as indicated in red."

669  
670 Dave Anderson stated that he wanted to work through the document with them quickly and  
671 talk through the specific changes. He asked if they had any thoughts about this project they  
672 wanted to talk about now. Dave Anderson stated that if they thought this conceptually was a  
673 bad idea, the applicants would like to hear that. If the Commission thinks it is worth pursuing,  
674 the applicants would like to hear that as well. From Dave Anderson's perspective, it is fairly  
675 easy to support the idea that you would do a bit higher density there.

676  
677 Commissioner Nielson asked what else you could put there.

678  
679 Commissioner Fallon asked if Dave Anderson had reviewed the townhome definition with John  
680 Little from a building code perspective. There are specific nuances in the residential code  
681 regarding townhomes and it has been a long time since Commissioner Fallon has dealt with it,  
682 he doesn't remember what they are. Commissioner Fallon also mentioned that there is some  
683 legislation that has been proposed this year to deal with that as well.

684

685 Dave Anderson stated that you can tell in his simplified way what he and the City Attorney  
686 were trying to do that in distinguishing a townhome and a stacked flat. But that is a great  
687 suggestion.

688  
689 Commissioner Fallon's first reaction to Infill Overlay maximum size was that it was still too big  
690 to fit the intent. When you are talking about an entire City block, that is not Infill, in his  
691 opinion. Commissioner Fallon suggested half a block, half that size.

692  
693 Dave Anderson stated that that is not entirely arbitrary; there is some basis for that.

694  
695 Commissioner Fallon stated that would be his suggestion.

696  
697 Chairman Gonzales stated that talking about the 3.75 acres under Infill Overlay based on a  
698 City block, he agreed that it should be more restricted to areas of a block that we feel can be  
699 enhanced or improved without doing the whole block. Talking about recent situations like the  
700 one by the park, where they might not have wanted to change a whole block on the east side of  
701 the block for the business type area, but maybe the one corner of that block made sense. He  
702 would almost dare say that it needs to be smaller.

703  
704 Commissioner Fallon asked if he meant smaller than half-a-block.

705  
706 Chairman Gonzales stated that, no, he was referring to smaller than the designation now of  
707 3.75 acres.

708  
709 Commissioner Nielson asked if theoretically, we had one small portion of the block that wanted  
710 to use the Infill Overlay, if the others come on board, you would have your full acreage and it  
711 works.

712  
713 Commissioner Fallon clarified that they are talking about maximum size. So if they have one  
714 piece of property that is the minimum of 8,000 square feet, they can use the infill overlay up to  
715 the 3.75 or whatever the Commission decides for the maximum size.

716  
717 Commissioner Nielson stated that if he lived on a City block, he would have a little more  
718 control over what is happening in the backyard if the requirement is bigger. He thought that  
719 was the purpose of the larger area.

720  
721 Dave Anderson said that typically they are talking about minimums, not maximums, when they  
722 talk about project size. Dave Anderson supports the smaller minimums to try to encourage  
723 people to do something with property that needs to be redeveloped. Dave Anderson isn't sure  
724 that 8,000 square feet is the magic number, but, for example, in the R-3 zone to do a duplex  
725 today, you have to get the Infill Overlay approved, and Dave Anderson thinks that the Infill  
726 Overlay isn't a big enough lot to build a duplex on. Dave Anderson would look at it more from  
727 the perspective of what reasonably could you do on something that small.

728

729 Commissioner Fallon asked how large the property on the north side of Center Street that was  
730 done by Mark Dallon 4 or 5 years ago. It is a duplex and the Commission can use it as an  
731 example.

732  
733 Dave Anderson stated that it was a little bit bigger when they approved it, but he sold the back  
734 part off. But he checked with us and maintained the minimum when he sold the back.

735  
736 Cory Pierce measured the property.

737  
738 Dave Anderson stated that it was a good example of a 9,000 square foot project.

739  
740 Commissioner Fallon said that 8,000 feet sounds like the right number.

741  
742 Commissioner Tagg asked if 8,000 square feet was a normal plot size for a house.

743  
744 Dave Anderson said yes, it was.

745  
746 Chairman Gonzales asked if Dave Anderson was requesting that the Commission go by  
747 minimums and not by maximums.

748  
749 Dave Anderson said both. Right now there is no maximum, and his only suggestion is that the  
750 City employ a maximum to try to get the Infill Overlay back to the original intent.

751  
752 Dave Anderson stated that since they were on a roll, they could touch on a few more things  
753 and go from there. Dave Anderson stated that they have already talked about the two changes  
754 to definitions.

755  
756 Dave Anderson stated that they have talked about development standards for the R-4 district.  
757 They have talked about density: 18 units per acre. One change Dave Anderson did make was  
758 adding the additional language, which was a copy from elsewhere in the code, to make it clear  
759 that when it comes to calculating what density is allowed, they are talking about buildable land.  
760 So if someone has a 10 acre site and half of it is wetlands he can't build on, he won't get 18  
761 times 10 he will get 18 times 5 to figure out what density is allowed.

762  
763 Commissioner Fallon asked if roads are included in that or not.

764  
765 Dave Anderson stated that if the developers own the road, if it is a road they would build for  
766 the development that is included. So it is gross density from that perspective, or gross area,  
767 not net.

768  
769 Chairman Gonzales asked if it was necessary under lands, churches, schools, etc. to say that it  
770 is an example, so it doesn't come across as limited to those. Because when he reads that, he  
771 is looking at that as if you are using those as examples, but you could probably make an  
772 argument that it is only those versus only an example of those.

773

774 Dave Anderson stated that is how he reads it today, is that it is only those things. Dave  
775 Anderson asked if the Chairman was saying that the City should give itself some kind of caveat  
776 with the language, and say those uses and similar things.

777  
778 Commissioner Tagg stated that it already says sites for other non-residential uses and that  
779 kind of encompasses everything.

780  
781 Chairman Gonzales stated that if they feel that it covers it, and asked if it covered only  
782 buildable areas.

783  
784 Dave Anderson stated that this would address buildable land and land that ends up being used  
785 for something that is not tied to the residential project, which is usually a church or a school.

786  
787 Chairman Gonzales stated that he thought it was okay if you are reading it that way.

788  
789 Dave Anderson stated that the parking was directly from what they talked about last week.  
790 The unit sizes were directly taken from the conversation they had last week with both a  
791 minimum unit size based on number of bedrooms and the average. Heights are the same,  
792 about 45 feet. Dave Anderson stated that the 30% number and how they have spelt that out  
793 with this language, Dave Anderson is not completely comfortable with the language. Dave  
794 Anderson stated that he thinks he understands the concept which is just that a third of the  
795 building's roofline would be a distinct distance above sea level from the remaining part of the  
796 roofline. Dave Anderson asked if that was how the Commission understands what they talked  
797 about.

798  
799 Chairman Gonzales stated that yes it was.

800  
801 Commissioner Fallon asked if 1-foot shift is enough, does the Commission want to have a more  
802 distinct shift in roofline. The way it is written seems as though a 1-foot shift would work, which  
803 is not hard to do.

804  
805 Dave Anderson showed some examples of roofs and asked if the Commissioners felt that those  
806 examples should qualify. One had a hip on each end, and an area straight across. Another had  
807 a different kind of variation.

808  
809 Commissioner Fallon stated that Dave Anderson had two different elements he was dealing  
810 with, a ridgeline and an eaveline.

811  
812 Dave Anderson stated that it would be useful to write that distinction in.

813  
814 Commissioner Fallon stated that he thinks so. Commissioner Fallon saw it as the ridgeline  
815 being the delineator, not the eaveline. The eaveline will get that because the Commission has  
816 designated the visual relief, through balconies and all that; that will be taken care of. The  
817 ridgeline is the delineator he is looking for.

818

819 Dave Anderson said that most ridgelines they are looking at are pretty much one line, unless  
820 they are somehow accounting for that gable on the end, which seems to be pretty common, its  
821 one line.  
822  
823 Dave Anderson pointed out another example.  
824  
825 Commissioner Fallon pointed out that it did have a 1-foot break.  
826  
827 Dave Anderson asked if that was good enough for mission accomplished.  
828  
829 Commissioner Tagg stated that the one with the break looked better than the other ones.  
830  
831 Commissioner Neilson stated that it would be difficult to cover all that stuff.  
832  
833 Dave Anderson pulled up another example with one hip on the top.  
834  
835 Commissioner Fallon stated that he goes back to Hillsborough. That is the image he would like  
836 to see.  
837  
838 Dave Anderson asked if they should write in a certain number of feet and use the word  
839 ridgeline.  
840  
841 Commissioner Fallon stated they should say ridgeline, but he is struggling with the number of  
842 feet. He stated they should just call it ridgeline.  
843  
844 Chairman Gonzales asked if he was referring to the offset number of feet, one foot, two feet.  
845  
846 Commissioner Fallon stated that a minimum offset of 2 feet is not out of the ordinary.  
847  
848 Chairman Gonzales asked if he was proposing that the Commission have an offset of two feet.  
849  
850 Commissioner Fallon said no, he doesn't want to control it to that level.  
851  
852 Commissioner Tagg asked if he was just changing roofline to ridgeline.  
853  
854 Commissioner Fallon said yes.  
855  
856 Dave Anderson stated that he wasn't sure exactly how that language would read but that the  
857 City will make sure that the languages says something like the ridgeline of the roof.  
858  
859 Commissioner Nielson asked if minimum of 12 acres, if it is all buildable, can you have 12 acres  
860 with only half of it being used for the buildings and the other half for something else. So if you  
861 do want to have open space, you could.  
862

863 Dave Anderson stated maybe. For example, if you had a 12-acre development, with what they  
864 talked about last time, which is a 30% open space requirement, 30% of 12 is 3.6 acres so you'd  
865 have 3.6 acres that would be open. A lot of times that is integrated.

866  
867 Commissioner Nielson asked if they wanted more they could have more.

868  
869 Dave Anderson stated they could. A lot of planners would suggest consolidating those  
870 buildings into one part to open up another area.

871  
872 Commissioner Nielson asked about wetlands.

873  
874 Dave Anderson stated that wetlands could be part of the project; you just wouldn't get credit  
875 for purposes of density with it.

876  
877 Dave Anderson stated that 30% was the next change. Dave Anderson brought a couple of  
878 standards from the Master Planned Development into the R-4, for example the maximum block  
879 length of 600 feet. Dave Anderson feels pretty strongly about that, so that is where it came  
880 from. Dave Anderson also brought up Development Agreements. Just having that mechanism  
881 in place to make sure that what gets approved gets built, regardless of whether the project  
882 gets sold to another owner, regardless of whether the project would have been zoned to R-4,  
883 we will make people contract to build what they present, and the City attorney feels very  
884 comfortable with that approach.

885  
886 Dave Anderson stated that the only change to Infill Overlay was the maximum project size.  
887 Something like half a block, we could do that mathematically, it would be 1.8 something.

888  
889 Commissioner Fallon stated half a block is 1.875.

890  
891 Dave Anderson stated that he would write that in.

892  
893 Commissioner Nielson asked about City blocks that are out there that are smaller than normal.

894  
895 Dave Anderson said he is talking about old grid blocks.

896  
897 Dave Anderson stated another change was making the landscaping requirement 30% for the  
898 Infill Overlay zone. The chart already talked a bit about, hopefully no surprises there. In a  
899 nutshell, that is what they have.

900  
901 Dave Anderson handed out a document and stated that he would like to have it more polished.  
902 Dave Anderson stated that he is committed to the idea that the City needs this tool for the  
903 high-density zone, and he likes the idea of developing for the Infill Overlay and Master Planned  
904 Development options as well. Dave Anderson is not suggesting this is a finished product. As  
905 the staff put this together, they realized what they lack from an imagery standpoint, so they are  
906 working on getting more photographs and sketches put together that they think more  
907 accurately touch on the points that need to be emphasized. This is the type of document that

908 they would expect to have somehow recognized by the City as the advice that people get in  
909 terms of what would and would not be approved in terms of an apartment development.  
910  
911 Chairman Gonzales asked Dave Anderson to remind him about the discussion they had about  
912 reducing the landscaping from 35% to 30%.  
913  
914 Dave Anderson stated that they have some numbers they have collected from other cities  
915 relative to higher density. You could make a case that it should be 35%; you could make a case  
916 that it should be 20% as well. So going with 30% seemed like a reasonable standard.  
917  
918 Chairman Gonzales stated that he remembered that discussion now.  
919  
920 Commissioner Fallon asked if the design standards addressed flat roofs.  
921  
922 Dave Anderson stated the document tries to say not flat roofs. The verbage here is taken  
923 directly from what they just talked about.  
924  
925 Chairman Gonzales asked if they should refer to it as a pitch.  
926  
927 Commissioner Fallon stated that he could see nothing in the design guidelines that says that  
928 we don't want flat roofs.  
929  
930 Dave Anderson stated that was a great catch.  
931  
932 Commissioner Fallon asked if we don't want flat roofs. There may be places that we want flat  
933 roofs.  
934  
935 Dave Anderson asked if you could have a flat roof with a change in elevation.  
936  
937 Commissioner Fallon stated that you wouldn't. You could with the eave, potentially, if you  
938 want straight eaves or straight parapets.  
939  
940 Dave Anderson asked if we would have a concern with that look in the right setting.  
941  
942 Commissioner Fallon stated that he wouldn't.  
943  
944 Chairman Gonzales asked why we would have flat roofs in there from a design perspective.  
945 What are the concerns, that can help us identify whether we should or shouldn't have it in  
946 there.  
947  
948 Dave Anderson said that the idea of requiring the variation of the elevation on the roof is to  
949 force somebody to make something more visually interesting.  
950  
951 Chairman Gonzales asked about flat roofs, is it a look or is it a functionality.  
952

953 Commissioner Fallon asked if the variation in parapet height is part of it. Commissioner Fallon  
954 thinks that helps.

955  
956 Dave Anderson stated that is what you would have. If we are talking about parapet then we  
957 would want to reference flat roofs. We would want to use that phrase.

958  
959 Commissioner Fallon stated that "low slope" is the correct term.

960  
961 Chairman Gonzales asked Commissioner Fallon about when he talked about a ridgeline a few  
962 minutes ago, Chairman Gonzales is looking at the design standards and he's not sure that the  
963 eaveline is the right way to go. He doesn't mind the variation in the document, and pointed out  
964 some places where he thinks the document says what it needs to about variation.

965  
966 Commissioner Fallon stated that it is a combination to him.

967  
968 Chairman Gonzales asked if they should write it as an either or versus being rigid and saying  
969 this is how it has to be, because he can see the variation in the document as being appealing to  
970 the eye and what we are looking at cosmetically, but he also can say that is one part is flat then  
971 something else needs to alter.

972  
973 Commissioner Fallon stated that what is interesting about that design is that because of the  
974 lower slope of the roof line, it becomes less significant. So it should be once you get over a  
975 4/12 pitch, then you need to provide that change in ridgeline. He's not sure that it's 4/12; he's  
976 just pulling it out of the air. Is there a magic number where architecturally, particularly if they  
977 are over 3 stories or at 3 stories like this building.

978  
979 Dave Anderson stated that 3 stories and 45 feet is the max height. Dave Anderson asked if we  
980 would ever have anything above a 4/12.

981  
982 Commissioner Fallon stated probably not.

983  
984 Chairman Gonzales stated that they could present it saying that it is our desire to have a  
985 variation, and the ridgeline or the eve should have a variation. He just doesn't want it to be too  
986 rigid.

987  
988 Commissioner Fallon said he is still a fan of having the ridgeline as an element of it.

989  
990 Chairman Gonzales stated that it is hard to illustrate and he asked if the other Commissioners  
991 were following which illustration they are discussing.

992  
993 Commissioner Nielson said that it is difficult to get a phrase that covers all of this. He wonders  
994 if a builder could say that it wouldn't be doable to do anything less than a certain level of  
995 variation.

996

997 Commissioner Fallon stated that there are some constructability practical things in terms of  
998 getting in underneath the eave and flashing it, and putting up the siding and all those things.  
999 There is a real constructability aspect to it that a builder would be concerned with.  
1000

1001 Commissioner Tagg stated that we want them to know expectations, but we want to be careful  
1002 not to limit their designs. She wants them to feel like they can be creative and come up with  
1003 different designs the Commission wouldn't even think of. They need to know that the City  
1004 would be looking for unique designs, not just a flat square building. Who says they couldn't  
1005 come up with a cool design that would work, so she says we need to be careful.  
1006

1007 Commissioner Nielson said the builders don't want to go through too many designs iterations.  
1008

1009 Commissioner Tagg stated that it is good to use a word like ridgeline instead of roofline  
1010 because it is more clear the City is paying attention to that detail. If they say roofline it's not  
1011 giving them a specific detail.  
1012

1013 Chairman Gonzales asked if it could say 30% variation depicted by ridgeline or roofline.  
1014

1015 Dave Anderson asked if a foot is sufficient, saying a long continuous ridgeline of longer than 50  
1016 feet. He stated that maybe 50 feet isn't the right number and they could use a percentage.  
1017

1018 Commissioner Fallon stated he thinks they need to designate between ridgeline and eaveline.  
1019 He also agrees with Dave Anderson and says it is almost a duplication to require anything  
1020 longer than 50 feet and 30%. They could stick with ridgeline and eaveline longer than 50 feet  
1021 will not be permitted. He's not sure the 30% needs to be there. The 50 foot designation will  
1022 give the variation he is looking for and the 30% is a duplication of intent.  
1023

1024 Chairman Gonzales agrees with Commissioner Fallon.  
1025

1026 Commissioner Tagg stated with this language they will know the City wants variety.  
1027

1028 Dave Anderson said with this language, a lot of the bad stuff they've seen, you couldn't do, it  
1029 would have to change.  
1030

1031 Commissioner Fallon stated this can sometimes be done with a shift in the building. The actual  
1032 height change is the same but the shift in the building breaks up the length.  
1033

1034 Dave Anderson stated that he wouldn't be sure how to measure the 30%. So he likes this new  
1035 language better.  
1036

1037 Chairman Gonzales asked if design standards are a separate item on the agenda and if they  
1038 were just reviewing it.  
1039

1040 Dave Anderson said this is for review but not for action. But if the Council approves this in two  
1041 weeks, then the staff will begin to distribute it as advice.  
1042

1043 Commissioner Fallon **moved** to recommend approval to City Council of the Title 15 – High  
1044 Density Text Amendments with the following conditions.

1045  
1046 Conditions

- 1047
- 1048 1. That the language outlined for the R-4 residential district change from roofline to
  - 1049 ridgeline and eaveline.
  - 1050 2. That staff evaluate low slope roofs with parapet variations as a part of that language.
  - 1051 3. That the Infill Overlay maximum be 1.875 acres.
- 1052

1053 Commissioner Tagg **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

1054  
1055  
1056 **OTHER BUSINESS**

1057  
1058 Chairman Gonzales stated that they were presented from staff the design standards. He  
1059 asked the member of the Commission to read them more in detail and get recommendations to  
1060 staff.

1061  
1062 Chairman Gonzales asked if the standards would have to be formally approved at the next  
1063 meeting before it can be handed out.

1064  
1065 Dave Anderson stated that he didn't think so. Dave Anderson views it as an advising  
1066 document.

1067  
1068 Commissioner Fallon stated that it is a visual interpretation of the zoning code.

1069  
1070 Dave Anderson likes the idea that they will augment it regularly. As they see things they do or  
1071 don't like, they don't wait around rather than have it be subject to a lengthy approval process,  
1072 they keep it more fluid.

1073  
1074 Chairman Gonzales stated they should make a commitment to review and provide  
1075 recommendation to the staff within a week. And the staff will know that after a week they have  
1076 had time to review it.

1077  
1078 Dave Anderson stated that the staff is working on it daily so they might send them updated  
1079 versions.

1080  
1081 Commissioner Fallon left the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

1082  
1083 Chairman Gonzales asked someone to come and speak about their project.

1084  
1085 Fred Clark, the engineer for the project, stated that Somerset is to the west of the proposed  
1086 project. That project is in 3 phases, is about 25.2 acres, its 201 units at 8 units an acre. So  
1087 they are just mirroring what is happening in the neighboring project, Somerset. Also, the lots  
1088 are deep enough that they are already including a 2-foot offset of each building. He talked to

1089 Cory Pierce at the beginning of the meeting and addressed all the concerns he had. He thinks  
1090 he has a good project.  
1091  
1092 Commissioner Fallon entered meeting 7:44 p.m.  
1093  
1094 Fred Clark discussed UDOT. He pointed out the road to the east and stated that it will curve  
1095 in. He stated that UDOT will t-off in the south east and make a cul-de-sac out of the road to  
1096 the south. Fred Clark's intent is to tie into that and he has met with them twice and they will  
1097 have a directional island there. They don't want any left hand turns, they want right hand turns  
1098 only. They are hoping to construct that road in the next 5 years. Also, they want 400 foot  
1099 spacing for the entrances and he pointed out the one space it could work for that.  
1100  
1101 Chairman Gonzales asked Cory Pierce about the distance between the entrance and the main  
1102 road after construction.  
1103  
1104 Cory Pierce stated that it would be under UDOT's review. It is 400-feet and they would decide  
1105 between full access versus right in and right out. He thinks it would be okay as a right-in-right-  
1106 out because of its proximity to US 6.  
1107  
1108 Fred Clark stated that when he mentioned building it this way, they said it would be great, they  
1109 seemed to be amenable to the whole project. He will make the corrections Cory Pierce  
1110 suggested. He thinks he has 35% green space and open space.  
1111  
1112 Chairman Gonzales asked if there were any questions for the applicant.  
1113  
1114 Commissioner Nielson said that makes sense to build that part out. It is consistent with the  
1115 other stuff.  
1116  
1117 Chairman Gonzales asked Cory Pierce to show the zoning for that area.  
1118  
1119 Commissioner Tagg asked if they would have to rezone the area to R-3.  
1120  
1121 Commissioner Fallon asked if it was medium density.  
1122  
1123 Chairman Gonzales asked what the General Plan designation for this area is.  
1124  
1125 Dave Anderson said it is medium density.  
1126  
1127 Commissioner Fallon asked how that fits within the terminology.  
1128  
1129 Dave Anderson stated that medium density is 5 to 8 units per acre. Dave Anderson said the  
1130 next step is public hearing for a Zone Change.  
1131  
1132 Fred Clark stated they would have a neighborhood meeting next week.  
1133

1134 Commissioner Fallon asked if development needs an additional exit to the east. Do they need  
1135 to have two exits for this development?  
1136  
1137 Cory Pierce stated that they do. The construction standards state that single accesses for  
1138 permanent can have 36 units. Temporary can be up to 50.  
1139  
1140 Chairman Gonzales asked the number of units this development has.  
1141  
1142 Fred Clark asked Dave Anderson if this already fits inside the current zone.  
1143  
1144 Dave Anderson stated that it doesn't. They can talk more about this later. Dave Anderson  
1145 stated that they have changes the zoning regulations.  
1146  
1147 Fred Clark said 45 units.  
1148  
1149 Cory Pierce stated that it fits for a temporary single access knowing that something will  
1150 connect for the permanent 35 unit standard.  
1151  
1152 Chairman Gonzales said that they are okay with this concept. He asked Dave Anderson if  
1153 anything additional was needed besides giving their nods of approval.  
1154  
1155 Dave Anderson stated that anything else would be inappropriate.  
1156  
1157 Dave Anderson discussed walls. The staff is asking the Planning Commission to select a style  
1158 of wall that we would adopt as the City standard that would be used by developers when they  
1159 build a wall that the City will own. The staff wants something that is consistent for aesthetic  
1160 purposes and maintenance purposes. There are many styles to choose from. He has an image  
1161 of one that a developer is currently building in town that might be a good model to follow.  
1162  
1163 Chairman Gonzales asked what spurred this conversation. What are the concerns and what in  
1164 the Commission trying to address. Obviously, there is an aesthetic they are trying to reach but  
1165 are they also addressing height and durability.  
1166  
1167 Dave Anderson stated that on the durability side, Cory Pierce knows more than he does, but as  
1168 he understands it, masonry walls have industry standards and it is very similar in terms of  
1169 durability for precast walls that one company might build to another company. We don't  
1170 anticipate a big difference in durability.  
1171  
1172 Chairman Gonzales asked about durability because he is wondering if we look at it from  
1173 protecting citizens from a vehicle, or if in another area we are just doing it because of sound or  
1174 as a barrier between two zones. A fence between two zones may not need to be as durable as  
1175 one that acts as a barrier on a major road.  
1176  
1177 Dave Anderson stated we are talking about walls to be installed on roads. And we aren't so  
1178 much concerned about a vehicle impacting it as much as having a durable fence on a property

1179 line that keeps the sound out of backyards and kids out of roads. This is just talking about  
1180 applications where the City will own the wall.

1181  
1182 Dave Anderson state he likes things that look less fake.

1183  
1184 Chairman Gonzales asked how we write that.

1185  
1186 Dave Anderson said he is looking at both pattern and color or something like that. Then they  
1187 tell developers to find a wall manufacturer that builds to a certain spec that makes a pattern  
1188 like this and a color like that and that is what we approve.

1189  
1190 Chairman Gonzales asked if he is looking at one color or multiple colors.

1191  
1192 Dave Anderson stated he thinks one.

1193  
1194 Chairman Gonzales stated some HOAs say earth tones or a certain percentage of wood. If  
1195 they did a standard would that conflict with design patterns for HOAs.

1196  
1197 Dave Anderson stated we are only looking at public-right-of way where we end up owning it.  
1198 People can build what they want as our ordinance allows. You can still have individuality within  
1199 a neighborhood and a project, but in the public right-of-ways, it would be the same. The one  
1200 issue with this is monotony. Dave Anderson believes that monotony is better than a change  
1201 every 400 feet.

1202  
1203 Dave Anderson stated that they hadn't contemplated any CMU, which is a masonry block kind  
1204 of wall. Ivory Homes did that, and Dave Anderson believes it is the best looking wall in this  
1205 type of setting in the City. Dave Anderson is only presenting precast walls, not block walls.  
1206 Developers use precast so they might be cheaper, but might not be as easy to repair or look as  
1207 real as block walls. There are 2-3 companies that supply walls in Utah County. We can pick  
1208 from a palette of patterns and colors and providers should come close to that. Dave Anderson  
1209 said it is all fake, not stacked stones, but we prefer things that look less fake.

1210  
1211 Commissioner Fallon stated the border makes it looks fake.

1212  
1213 Dave Anderson shared an image with the Commissioners of an image of a wall a developer has  
1214 proposed most recently. Dave Anderson stated he thinks it looks better than most of them.

1215  
1216 Chairman Gonzales has a hard time saying that it can't be fake.

1217  
1218 Dave Anderson state this is a subjective thing but it sets an aesthetic tone and Dave Anderson  
1219 feels the Commission is the appropriate body to say what the standard should be.

1220  
1221 Chairman Gonzales said that we should have a color that looks like the rocks that we have in  
1222 the area.

1223  
1224 Dave Anderson stated that is excellent reasoning.

1225  
1226 Commissioner Fallon stated he likes the precast concrete cap.  
1227  
1228 Commissioner Tagg stated that she liked the variety in the pattern. The borders add variety,  
1229 or there can be variety in the size of the bricks.  
1230  
1231 Cory Pierce stated they have accentuated the wall with different colors, but colors that match.  
1232  
1233 Chairman Gonzales stated that rocks should vary in size. If I go to a rock quarry they should  
1234 vary in sizes. A color that is indicative to the natural environment around here. But should  
1235 have color difference within the wall.  
1236  
1237 Dave Anderson said we can match the wall presented that a company recently used and we  
1238 might see a slight variation in pattern and colors, but it would be close. If the Commission likes  
1239 that design, it is easy to take the next step.  
1240  
1241 Chairman Gonzales stated that if we want a variation in sizes maybe we should specify inches.  
1242 Maybe we can get specs from the company.  
1243  
1244 Dave Anderson stated that a picture is worth a thousand words and we can give them this  
1245 image.  
1246  
1247 Chairman Gonzales stated that we can get the specs from the manufacturer.  
1248  
1249 Cory Pierce said we don't want to choose only one provider.  
1250  
1251 Commissioner Nielson asked if walls have a lifespan, a standard 40 years or something.  
1252  
1253 Cory Pierce stated the developers have probably done studies and we can ask them.  
1254  
1255 Commissioner Nielson stated that the City can do the same thing with the wall as we have with  
1256 the Development Standards. They can develop standards that meet the purpose and that way  
1257 they have a little choice. Builders want to meet the standard and not be required to spend a lot  
1258 more. But it is nice to have a standard that looks nice and has uniformity.  
1259  
1260 Dave Anderson stated that we show the example we have been looking at, and we know it is a  
1261 cost effective option.  
1262  
1263 Commissioner Tagg asked if they needed to approve anything on that.  
1264  
1265 Dave Anderson stated that he heard what they are comfortable with, and based on that, they  
1266 are going to go with that.  
1267  
1268 Commissioner Fallon asked where this is codified.  
1269  
1270 Dave Anderson stated it will be in the Construction Standards.

1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316

Cory Pierce stated that the code says a 6-foot masonry wall, with block brick and pattern as approved by the City Engineer. It doesn't talk about color and staining. Getting some consistency will help Cory Pierce as he is reviewing.

Chairman Gonzales **moved** to approve the proposed wall as indicated in the provided image tonight and that the staff adds to the Construction Standards to resemble different size rocks and the coloring in the image provided.

Commissioner Fallon **seconded** and the motion **passed** all in favor.

Chairman Gonzales stated he helped his kids on a solar energy paper and did a lot of research in codes. Spanish Fork does not have a lot in the code to prepare for solar energy. Chairman Gonzales wants the staff to research what the City will allow in terms of the size of solar panels where can they be placed, etc. The City needs to be proactive in addressing solar energy and the social responsibility.

Dave Anderson said that John Little and either Kelly Peterson or Tom Cooper from the Power Department are who the Chairman needs to talk to. Today someone called about wind turbines, which are not allowed in the City, so it would be good to talk that through. There are a few residences and businesses with solar panels. It is interesting to hear the pros and cons and speculate whether we will see more in the future. There are real issues that come into play with functionality and safety of panels on the house and what happens to wind load.

Commissioner Fallon stated he knows that Rocky Mountain Power has incentive programs. Being that we are on our own grid, would we have the same things?

Dave Anderson stated we are obligated to do the same things as Rocky Mountain Power by way of net metering, what power providers are required to do. We are required to pay people a certain amount for power they generate with their system that goes back into the system. So you have a meter that measures both ways. The theory is if they generate enough power like with solar that only operates when the sun is shining, so they put power back on the system, so they earn enough credit during the day so when they use power during the evening, it is a wash. It doesn't usually work out that way.

Chairman Gonzales said there are legal aspects. Economic impact is that we still have to maintain a certain amount of traditional power. So even if 70-80% of the home is solar, you still have a legal obligation to maintain a certain amount of traditional power.

Dave Anderson said that legislature is discussing how much people should be charged in order to be connected to the grid. If they do have some power generation on their site, Rocky Mountain Power charges more for that connection because even though they produce power at their home, it doesn't lessen Rocky Mountain Powers need to maintain this big grid. Francis Gibson, the representative for this area who lives in Mapleton, took a pretty strong stance.

Cory Pierce left the meeting 8:10 p.m.

1317

1318 Chairman Gonzales thinks it is a huge topic and it might take years and months to look at, but  
1319 we should start talking about it now.

1320

1321 Dave Anderson stated this issue will not go away.

1322

1323 Chairman Gonzales moved to adjourn meeting at 8:11 p.m.

1324

1325

1326 Adopted: September 7, 2016

1327

1328

---

Andrea Allred  
Management Intern