Planning Commission Agenda
PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Planning Commission of Spanish Fork, Utah, will hold a regular public meeting in the Council Chambers in the City Office Building, 40 South Main Street, Spanish Fork, Utah, commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Planning Commissioners

Bruce Fallon  
Treaci Tagg  
Brad Tanner  
Brad Wilkinson  
Jens Nielson  
Richard Davis

1. Preliminary Activities

Subject: A. Approval of Minutes: November 2, 2016
Meeting: Dec 7, 2016 - Planning Commission Meeting
Category: 1. Preliminary Activities
Access: Public
Type: Action, Minutes

2. Annexation

Subject: A. Warner Annexation
Meeting: Dec 7, 2016 - Planning Commission Meeting
Category: 2. Annexation
Access: Public
Type: Action, Discussion
Applicant: Atlas Engineering
General Plan: Medium and High Density
Zoning: Not Applicable
Location: 251 East 7650 South, Utah County

File Attachments
Warner Annexation.pdf (1,058 KB)

3. Proposed Title 15 Amendment

Subject: A. Proposed Amendments to Title 15
Meeting: Dec 7, 2016 - Planning Commission Meeting
Category: 3. Proposed Title 15 Amendment
4. Other Business

5. Adjourn
Commission Members Present: Chairman Bruce Fallon, Treaci Tagg, Brad Tanner, Brad Wilkinson, Jens Nielson, Richard Davis.

Staff Members Present: Dave Anderson, Community Development Director; Jason Sant, Assistant City Attorney; Cory Pierce, Staff Engineering; Angie Warner, Deputy Recorder.

Citizens Present: David Simpson, Robyn Parker, Brian Morrow.

Chairman Fallon called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES

Pledge of Allegiance
Commissioner Nielson led the pledge.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES


Commissioner Wilkinson moved to approve the minutes of August 3, 2016; September 7, 2016; October 5, 2016. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed all in favor.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Proposed Amendments to the Moderate Income Housing Element

Mr. Anderson presented the moderate income housing plan. Mr. Anderson said by State law the City is required to have this plan. Mr. Anderson stated the definition of the plan is:

housing occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to or less than eighty percent (80%) of the median gross income for households of the same size in the county in which the city is located.

Mr. Anderson directed all to the ‘discussion and findings’ section on page 3. Staff has identified the numbers for Spanish Fork City from the US Census data from 2014. Mr. Anderson said the Planning Commission may recommend this to the City Council, then if approved, it will be sent to the State and we will be in compliance.

Commissioner Tanner asked about the surplus of 3,930. Does that mean there is that much inventory out there?

Mr. Anderson said no, that identifies both rental or owned opportunities and what they cost. Most of the City’s inventory is currently occupied.
Commissioner Tanner asked if there is a comparison to a neighboring City.

Mr. Anderson said in the past this has not been a concern for Spanish Fork. It’s the older housing in the community that is represented there. We have done well in clearly describing the surplus that we have, that we have been able to opt out of some mandates.

Commissioner Nielson made a motion to move into Public Hearing. Commissioner Wilkinson seconded and the motion passed all in favor at 6:12 p.m.

Chairman Fallon welcomed public comment. There was no public comment.

Commissioner Davis made a motion to move out of Public Hearing. Commissioner Tagg seconded and the motion passed all in favor at 6:12 p.m.

Commissioner Wilkinson clarified that these are 2014 figures. Do we know how close we are to those figures now?

Mr. Anderson said yes they are the 2014 figures because the last census count was done in 2014.

Chairman Fallon asked if we are providing enough zoning areas for the fixed income housing.

Mr. Anderson said part of the challenge is that zoning is the only mechanism we use to impact housing costs. We haven’t been real eager to do things from the zoning perspective to be more inclusive than we are. Mr. Anderson said the housing supply is also provided through some form of public assistance.

Commissioner Nielson moved to recommend approval to City Council the Amendments to the Moderate Income Housing Element. Commissioner Wilkinson seconded and the motion passed all in favor.

Proposed Amendments to the City’s Landscaping Requirements

This item is not ready and still needs some additional changes. This item will come back at the December meeting.

Mr. Anderson asked to talk about masonry walls. The City requires masonry walls to be installed on certain streets or areas. Staff would like to go through the code and make the terminology for masonry walls the same all the way through. Mr. Anderson said there is a new product that looks like a masonry wall but is a foam/fiber product. It is being proposed to include this product description in the code. This item was talked about in Development Review Committee this morning and the proposed language was recommended to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Anderson has some concerns with this language and the nature of the product. Masonry walls are anticipated to be there for a long time and they are hard to deface and deform, etc. With this new product, he feels that it does not have the same durability.

Brian Morrow, the President of Rhino Rock said they manufacture this product in Provo. Mr.
Morrow said about a month ago, city staff visited the Rhino Rock facility. Mr. Morrow gave a
history of the company. Mr. Morrow said the original concrete product weighs 4,000 pounds
for each panel and requires cranes to install. This new product is light and can be installed
without using heavy equipment. Their staff has been working with Junior Baker to get the right
wording to be included in the code. This product has a concrete shell with a foam core. Mr.
Morrow said this product does not have the impact durability as the cement panels, but none of
the concrete fences are designed to be crash barriers. There is a warranty if a panel is
damaged, they will just come replace the damaged panel(s). This product is cheaper to
purchase and cheaper to replace than the cement panels.

Commissioner Nielson asked if this product is in Spanish Fork and with adding this wording, is
it allowing more projects.

Mr. Morrow said yes and we feel that the product qualifies to be used and this helps clarify to
clear up the confusion.

Commissioner Nielson asked if it protects from noise.

Mr. Morrow said it is similar to a cement fence. Sound is due to reflection of the sound. So if
a fence does not have gaps it has a better reduction.

Commissioner Davis asked what the standards are right now.

Mr. Anderson feels that this product does not meet standards that require a heavy/masonry
wall.

Commissioner Davis said so if this isn’t in our standard, how did it get installed.

Mr. Anderson said that there are some internal disagreements whether it qualifies or not.
Engineering feels that it is okay and Community Development does not, that is why we want to
clarify the description.

Mr. Morrow reviewed how the product is installed.

Commissioner Davis asked, what was the purpose of what the City has required with the
cement fencing?

Mr. Anderson said to require something that lasts a very long time and doesn’t require very
much maintenance.

Discussion took place about safety.

Commissioner Davis said he remembers in the past that something like this was supposed to
go through the Engineering Department.

Mr. Pierce said that is the way the construction standards are written.

Mr. Morrow said they have an engineering study and have presented that information. It had
to meet the following reasons: low maintenance and be aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Davis asked how long the warranty is.
Mr. Morrow said the typical is 10 years and they also have a vandalism warranty. He would be willing to do more if the City would like. A concrete panel is 1-year.

Commissioner Tagg made a motion to move into Public Hearing. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed all in favor at 6:46 p.m.

Chairman Fallon welcomed public comment.
There was no public comment.

Commissioner Davis made a motion to move out of Public Hearing. Commissioner Tagg seconded and the motion passed all in favor at 6:46 p.m.

Commissioner Tagg said with approval of developments, from a planning or engineering perspective, in what areas will this not work?

Mr. Anderson said with concrete walls, this is what has been used and we can see the track record. With this other product, his concern is the durability and we don’t have a track record yet. Mr. Anderson said that he understands that in another city a lawnmower picked up a piece of metal and ejected it such that it went straight through the wall.

Commissioner Davis asked how many concrete panels the City has replaced.

Mr. Pierce said there were some on 400 North west side from a settlement issue and on 400 North on the east side from a car hitting them. The purpose of the wall is different for the different areas. From an engineering side, none of the walls are built for crash barriers. There is not a huge variety of fence options, so this gives a cheaper option. If someone wants to vandalize a fence they could do it to any fence. If a car hits any fence, the fence is going to get replaced.

Chairman Fallon asked the Commissioners; are we okay with this product and are we okay with the description.

Commissioner Davis said he is okay with the product, but there are some areas that it should not be installed.

Commissioner Wilkinson agrees with Commissioner Davis and said he likes having another option to have the competitive business.

Discussion took place about the right wording for the description.

Commissioner Davis moved to send this item back to staff for clarification for areas that the product would allowed in, and for better wording.

Commissioner Tagg seconded and the motion passed all in favor.

Commissioner Nielson voted Aye; and commented that he would have approved this as it was presented.
Commissioner Wilkinson voted Aye; and commented if we had the concrete and composite listed separate and let the Engineering Department determine where they would each qualify for use.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Anderson said we have had a concept presented before for this property. Mr. Anderson presented that apartment concept and also tonight, we have another concept from another developer to be presented.

David Simpson presented a townhome concept plan for the Old Rees School location that is a little over 2 acres. Mr. Simpson presented this concept that is being built in Springville right now for an example. They have the property under contract and would like some feedback from the Planning Commission on the concept.

Mr. Anderson said the property is already zoned R-3 but would still need an Infill Overlay approval.

Chairman Fallon feels that this does not fit this location. This is the old part of town and has too many drive ways onto 200 East. Chairman Fallon also likes the end units to face the road.

Mr. Anderson asked the Commissioners if a different layout would be more appealing like the ones by the sports park. Mr. Anderson asked the Commission if they would prefer apartments or townhomes?

Commissioner Davis prefers townhomes.

Mr. Simpson said they will go back to the drawing board.

**Proposed Amendment to the Land Use Element**

Mr. Anderson said this was presented to the Development Review Committee and they recommended that the text and map be adopted. Mr. Anderson reviewed the map and the proposed changes.

Commissioner Tagg asked if we should be planning the Riverbottoms.

Mr. Anderson said that whenever the Planning Commission would like to start that process, we can do that.

Chairman Fallon would like some work sessions to figure out the area plan for the Riverbottoms.

Commissioner Davis said for the Riverbottoms work session, he would like to see some of the concepts that have been presented in the past. But we also have to remember that the land is not in the City yet.

Chairman Fallon questioned #14 on the map, which is the area for the hospital. Why not capture all that area.
Commissioner Tanner questioned the area by the Doug Smith Auto Dealership.

Mr. Anderson said that area could be changed to commercial. And the area for the hospital, East of the road.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the text changes and the few changes from the Development Review Committee meeting this morning. A new designation and some clean up items.

Commissioner Tagg made a motion to move into Public Hearing.
Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed all in favor at 7:56 p.m.

Chairman Fallon welcomed public comment.
There was no public comment.

Commissioner Nielson made a motion to move out of Public Hearing.
Commissioner Wilkinson seconded and the motion passed all in favor at 7:56 p.m.

Commissioner Tanner asked about the tiny homes that are popular.

Mr. Anderson said he thinks there is a manufacturer in Pleasant Grove or Lindon and he thinks that City may have changed to allow them. We have not heard a lot from the public. In some zones, it might be able to be allowed, but the lot size would still be 8,000-9,000 square foot lots.

Commissioner Tagg moved to recommend approval to City Council the Proposed Amendment to the Land Use Element with the following findings and conditions.

Conditions

1. Changes to the map for #14 and the Doug Smith Auto Dealership area.

Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed all in favor.

Mr. Anderson said he would like to know the project priorities of the Planning Commission for 2017. Mr. Anderson would like to make a list that gives direction.

Commissioner Tanner asked for the past list, including what has been done accomplished.

The Commission expressed that they would like some more field trips and have some half-day tours.

Chairman Fallon moved to adjourn meeting at 8:05 p.m.

Adopted: _________________________

Angie Warner, Deputy Recorder
File Name: Warner Annexation

Applicant: Atlas Engineering

Number of Lots: Not Applicable

Address: 251 East 7650 South, Utah County

Application Date: 08/19/15

Acres: 90.95

File #: 15-000421

Permit #: AN15-000001

Application Approved: Pending