

# Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

March 14, 2012, 6:30 P.M.

Sanpete County Courthouse, 160 North Main, Room 101, Manti, Utah

Present are: Planning Commission Chair Gene Jacobson, Steve Anderson, Thell Stewart, Mary Anderson, Leon Day, Joe Nielsen, Paul Rasmussen, Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Scott Olsen, and Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Gayelene Henrikson. Bryon Glathar from media.

Meeting is called to order by Chair Gene Jacobson.

**RONALD REEVES, JERRY HAMLING, AND NORMAN PARCELL: REQUEST APPROVAL FOR A ZONE CHANGE OF 120 ACRES OF THEIR PROPERTY FROM SENSITIVE LANDS TO AGRICULTURAL. LOCATED WEST OF FAYETTE AND WEST OF YUBA RESERVOIR ON S 7471x1 AND S 7411x1. THE PROPERTY IS ADJACENT TO THE A-ZONE ON THE EAST SIDE AND EAST OF THE WEST SIDE CANAL**

Ronald Reeves, Jerry Hamling, and Norman Parcell were not present for this item. Scott Olsen reviews their request to change the property from the Sensitive Lands Zone (SL) to the Agricultural Zone (A). The property is located west of Fayette and west of Yuba Reservoir. It is adjacent to A zone on the east side and also east of the West Side Canal. Pictures of the lower property are displayed. Joe Nielsen asked about the allowed uses in the SL zone. Can you still farm it? Mr. Olsen states that you may farm it. The land can be taxed agricultural or Greenbelt. In the SL zone, 40 acres is required in order to build a residence or to divide for agriculture. What is the motivation to change the zoning? Discussion ensued concerning the broad brush of the sensitive lands and how they drew the lines for the sensitive lands to agricultural. They drew it on a section line on the west side and the south side follows the difference between the sensitive and agricultural. This land is more agricultural. The property owners are changing the zone so they can change the required lot size from 40 acres down to 5 acres. They aren't applying for anything yet other than changing the zoning.

Winona Rivera who owns property east of the proposed property is present to object to the proposal. She stated the property is agricultural, with a few trees. In answer to her concern about developing the property, the property will need water, roads, and a lot of steps to develop it further. Mr. Olsen states that the other 4-5 adjoining property owners have no problems with the proposal. Motion is made by Steve Anderson to approve the change of the S 7471x1 and S 7411x1 from the SL zone to A zone. Motion is seconded by Mary Anderson. Motion passes.

**LLOYD STEVENS AND CHARLES STEVENS: REQUEST APPROVAL FOR A PLAT AMENDMENT TO THEIR LOTS C2+L2 AND C1+L1 IN THE STEVENS MOUNTAIN SUBDIVISION ON S 60904, S 60905, S 60907, S 60908. THE LOT LINE CHANGES WILL BRING THE LINES CLOSER TO THE ROADWAYS**

Richard Stevens is present. The property was subdivided and cabins were built years ago. This lot change will square up the property trading feet for feet and maintaining the lot sizes. Mr. Stevens provided new copies of the plat map. Frontages meet zoning requirements. Leon Day commented that this issue should have been done at the beginning of development. Mr. Day also stated the lots will need to be deeded again. Motion is made by Leon Day to approve the plat amendment to lots C2 + L2 and C1 + L1 in the Stevens Mountain Subdivision. Motion is seconded by Paul Rasmussen. Motion passes.

**SCOTT OLSEN, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR: RECOMMENDS APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF: FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION ORDINANCE, 60.3(D). THIS ORDINANCE IS DRAFTED BY FEMA AND FIRM AND MUST BE ADOPTED BY SANPETE COUNTY BEFORE MAY 2, 2012 TO PARTICIPATE IN (NFIP) NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM**

Scott Olsen is present. Mary Anderson stated that we have no choice, but to adopt the ordinance. Leon Day stated that if we don't sign this ordinance the residents of Sanpete County can't receive help from FEMA. This ordinance comes down through the State FEMA. To alleviate the need to adopt every time, a change is made. County Attorney Brody Keisel included a section on automatic adoption of the ordinance upon notification of any amendments and changes. How the maps were created was discussed. Motion is made by Mary Anderson to approve and adopt the flood damage prevention ordinance, which is drafted by FEMA and FIRM. Motion is seconded by Leon Day. Motion passes.

**SCOTT OLSEN, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR: DISCUSS AND REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE SANPETE COUNTY LAND USE ORDINANCE, ADD CHAPTER 14.51 IN- INDUSTRIAL ZONE, TABLE OF STANDARDS AND INFORMATION**

Scott Olsen is present. He presents a new interpretation and recommends approval. Motion is made by Thell Stewart to amend the Sanpete County Land Use Ordinance, by adding Chapter 14.51 Industrial Zone, Purpose, Table of Standards and Information. Motion is seconded by Joe Nielsen. Motion passes.

**APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF SPRING CITY BUFFER ZONE**

Cheryl Bartholomew, Chair of Spring City Planning & Zoning, is present representing Spring City. Aerial maps with section lines are shown. Mr. Olsen recaps last months review item- Spring City Mayor brought a proposal of the zone approval last month with Spring City Planning Commission & City Council being 100% in agreement with the proposal. They want the buffer zone put in place to keep the zone in place before other issues come up. The city sent a letter to the County Planning & Zoning members recommending a half-mile buffer zone, having the designation of R-2 zoning, or one acre lots in this half-mile buffer zone. 1) The road grid is followed in the half-mile buffer zone if the road grid can be followed, or as close to it as possible. 2) There are no Cul-de-sacs allowed within the buffer zone due to access for emergency vehicles, snow removal, etc. 3) Spring City Council would like to reserve the right to re-address the buffer zone when the Master Plan is updated. Spring City Planning and Zoning are working to update the master plan for their city. They are hoping to have a rough draft by the end of the year. The city doesn't want clusters that will create Cul-de-sacs with ½ acres. The proposed buffer zone does not affect the historic status of Spring City. Mrs. Bartholomew stated that Spring City residents are fearful of over growth in population and the taxes being raised.

Joe Nielsen brought up the looming taxes in the buffer zone and what answers do we have for citizens in Spring City that it will affect. Scott Olsen spent 2 hours with the County Assessor to understand how the taxes work and how the buffer zone will affect the taxes. The County can't change the tax on property currently in Greenbelt, these are set by the state. The value can change on property with Greenbelt status but not the taxing. On Greenbelt their rate is never changed for assessed value. The buffer zone has nothing to do with Greenbelt. Property not on Greenbelt, over time, will be affected by FAIR MARKET VALUE, but that takes sales to change the fair market value. If the property is not on Greenbelt now, being moved to the buffer zone could raise the rate, by establishing the value. A person who develops the land may face a rate increase, but not the neighbor who doesn't develop their land.

Gene Jacobson, who did not appear at last month's meeting, wanted clarification to some of the minutes from that meeting. Spring City does want to allow businesses in the buffer zone. They are in the process of determining what kind of business to allow. Steve Anderson had a question about creating a new zone to meet the needs of Spring City. Has Spring City applied for this? He clarified his question with having a goal of RA-2, which is a minimum of 1 acre. Can we have a particular stipulation of the buffer zone that the streets meet the road grid? Spring City would love the County to help them create a zone that fits with the master plan of Sanpete County that isn't a long process. Spring City may come back and go through the proper channels to change the zone. They don't need to reserve the right to come back; they are welcome when the need arises. Spring City will control power & the water system within the zone. If the city doesn't provide power, the developer can apply for alternative power if in the buffer zone.

More discussion ensued about the road grid. The grid would tie the street width into the buffer zone. Mr. Stewart comments on the road grid being in the future. Spring City can stipulate in the Master Plan for the road grid. Mr. Olsen states the buffer zone leaves it to the city on how the streets work, and how developers work with both County and City to work out road grid systems. The cities are responsible for how the streets are developed. With major county roads, the County works with cities and developers. Mr. Olsen states that road grids are not included in buffer zones but are part of the city's responsibility under the city's plan. We are giving them the right to say where they want to establish the road grid.

Mr. Nielsen wondered what we were approving. Mr. Jacobson answered his question concerning the citizens of Spring City- we won't approve things that don't fall within the discussions we are having. The Planning Commission wants Spring City to plan their future and will help them as things come to the Planning Commission. Mr. Anderson also added that without the Buffer Zone, Planning & Zoning will more than likely approve a development. Without the buffer zone a developer could buy up land in the county and have 3 properties on 5 acres. The buffer zone will protect what Spring City plans for the future, the City has input on the development. Developers go to the cities and show their proposals before applying with the county.

#### Discussion from the Public:

Sharon Pritchett lives in the proposed buffer zone on a 2.91 acre lot that doesn't qualify for Greenbelt. She is concerned about her taxes increasing. An article she read in the Sanpete Messenger stated that "property taxes with lands located in buffer zones have increased significantly." Mr. Olsen reiterates the fact that since she has a home on her property, her taxes won't change. The property will already be assessed as residential. Referring to the Spring City 2011 survey from people who live within the city, she thinks the people in the county haven't been consulted on any of these issues. Planning and Zoning received 5 notices of people in favor of the buffer zone. Ms. Pritchett wasn't pleased with the map. She would like to see an actual map showing the grid. Mr. Anderson answered that no map would be available until development comes. She continued with these points: Spring City needs to do more research. Most county people don't want to deal with the city. The buffer zone will create a reduction of agriculture. Irrigation will be affected. Mr. Jacobson stated that she can't control other people lands just hers, not her neighbor's. Dennis Watson- The road grid will not be extended in Spring City. Planning & Zoning will do what they want. The buffer zone has been tabled because Spring City didn't have their homework done. His request is to have his 100 acres not included, for whatever reason, in the buffer zone. Mr. Watson shows on the map where his property is located. The buffer zone possibly diminishes his options to develop his property. Mr. Jacobson said because of the logistics of a spot zone or zigzag zone, he would be opposed to that plan.

Shauna Stevens- There are still horse & buggy drivers around Spring City, so the city does need the wide roads. The road grid can keep wide roads. Mr. Day stated that it's a monkey wrench to do a road grid.

Finality of the buffer zone needs to be reached. According to Mr. Olsen, there have not been building permits applied for in a five-mile radius around the outside of Spring City in the last six months. The Buffer Zone is ½ mile wide with 1 acre lots around the city. Planning & Zoning is not committing anyone to the road grid or having no Cul-de-sacs allowed within the buffer zone. Mrs. Bartholomew complimented the county for bringing this issue to a head. Planning Commission will send a letter to Spring City stating what was approved tonight.

Motion is made by Thell Stewart to approve and adopt a ½ mile buffer zone as proposed by Spring City, without any future grid or mention to grid. Not approved are the first and second conditions stated in the letter from Spring City. Motion is seconded by Mary Anderson. Motion passes. Leon Day and Steve Anderson abstained from voting. Mr. Day abstained because of the road grid proposal. Mr. Anderson abstained with the concern of having people who are outside city limits that don't want to be in the buffer zone, he suggested shrinking the zone to a 1/4 of a mile.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Scott Olsen presented the 50 page Resource Management Plan to the Planning Commission to review for the next meeting. He mentioned changing the wording on page 25- addressing protection on public lands and page 34- which allows the narrows, prohibiting the proposed transmission line going through the narrows. This plan is under the original General Plan. Kevin Christensen with Economic Development and Mr. Olsen are working together on the plan.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion is made by Paul Rasmussen to approve the Planning Commission minutes of February 8, 2012 with no corrections. The motion is seconded by Joe Nielsen. Motion passes.

With no further business before the Planning Commission, motion to adjourn is made by Joe Nielsen. The motion is seconded by Mary Anderson. Motion passes.

The meeting is adjourned at 8:26 P.M.