

## Sanpete County Planning Commission Meeting

June 13, 2012, 6:30 P.M.

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

Present are: Planning Commission Chair Thell Stewart, Steve Anderson, Leon Day, Joe Nielsen, Sanpete County Commissioner Steve Frischknecht, Sanpete County Zoning Administrator Scott Olsen, and Sanpete County Deputy Clerk Gayelene Henrikson. (Mary Anderson, Paul Rasmussen, and Gene Jacobson, are excused.)

Meeting is called to order by Chair Thell Stewart.

**HEATH AND MINDY POULSEN: REQUESTS APPROVAL FOR A 1-LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION. LOCATED 2 ½ MILES NORTH OF FAIRVIEW WITH 5.72 ACRES IN THE A ZONE ON S 20797. THE PROPOSED NAME OF THE SUBDIVISION IS OAK CREEK VIEW SUBDIVISION.**

Heath Poulsen is present. Scott reviews his request. Mylar is provided. Location is discussed. What will be warehoused on the property? Storage containers on the property now houses things for the building of the house. Utilities are: Sewer- septic tank; water-well. Motion is made by Joe Nielsen to approve the 1-lot minor subdivision. Motion is seconded by Leon Day. Motion passes. Mr. Poulsen will meet with the County Commissioners at next meeting for final approval.

**VALEAR JACKMAN: REQUESTS APPROVAL OF A 1-LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION. LOCATED SOUTH EAST OF EPHRAIM WITH 10.42 ACRES IN THE EPHRAIM RA-1 BUFFER ZONE ON S 6248x11. THE NAME OF THE SUBDIVISION IS BLACK SUBDIVISION. EPHRAIM CITY HAS REVIEWED THE LOCATION AND BUFFER ZONE APPLICATION.**

VaLear Jackman and son, Dalan Mellor are present. Thell reviews this request. Ephraim City has been notified and approves the application. Mylar is provided. Location, boundaries and roads are discussed. The gravel road on the property was established seven years ago. The easement deeds are in place. The property uses Ephraim city water. Sewer is septic tank. Roads need to be approved by Steve Keller before receiving final approval from the County Commissioners. Motion is made by Joe Nielsen to approve a 1-lot minor subdivision. Motion is seconded by Steve Anderson. Motion passes. Ms. Jackman will meet with the County Commissioners at their next meeting for final approval.

**WORK MEETING- DISCUSSION OF INDUSTRIAL ZONE ORDINANCE.**

Discussion ensued about the different components of the Industrial Zone from Utah, Juab and Washington counties. Members researched their ordinances to get more ideas on what to include in our industrial zone ordinance Mr. Day commented on Utah county having the most detailed ordinance. If it's not listed, it needs a conditional use permit. The ordinance needs to be written so that the zone is put in place but it does not designate a property. What are the requirements included in our ordinance? They would like to

add to the previous requirements that the Planning Commission have already approved of and be more specific in the ordinance. The ordinance needs to maintain the overall infrastructure. Topics discussed to include in the ordinance are:

### **Purpose**

We need a paragraph to state the purpose of use.

### **Specific items listed**

Do we need ours to list specific items? Does the list cover everything? We have the Land Use Matrix, so the items don't need to be listed. What should we have permitted? Permitted uses- ours are designated in the Land Use Matrix. Sexual orientated business should be mentioned in the industrial zone and keep the current standards already in place. The Industrial zone doesn't allow single family dwellings, but a sexual orientated business is allowed, if they are 1,000 ft from children, churches, parks, instructional uses, etc.

### **Density:**

Areas: 20 acre minimum with specific 1 acre minimum lot sizes. If the land usage requires more land than 1 acre, then 5 acres minimum. The other counties require: Washington- 3/4 acre; Juab- less than half acre; Utah- 1 acre; Minimum 1 acre for specific lot size.

### **Agricultural Protection Zone**

Steve Frischknecht commented on including something for the Agricultural Protection Zone to handle those issues. It might not be included with the Industrial zone, but we should have it included in a zone. The zone has to be a certain amount of acres.

### **Roads and Setbacks**

The proposals should plan for roads, and have further set backs on county roads. We want to include a "No access to the county road directly from a driveway". The proposals need to allocate space in the set back to allow for future expansion of a road. The current set back rule states 30' from property line; 66' from center of road whichever is greater. Anytime a subdivision wants to build on county roads they need to dedicate to the county a portion of the road for future expansion- subjective by determination. The subdivisions need to dedicate the property at the time of approval, not later;.

Road access: proposals on off State Highway- Right of way set backs on State highways are 50' from highway right of way line. For aesthetics purpose- what is the view. The ordinance should require specific uses to be a specific space from road (fences and set back). Unsightly businesses as determined by Planning and Zoning require setback and fences. Auto places should be singled out.

Add our own setback distance of 200' off the highway with a fence.

### **Infrastructure and Utilities**

Water: Source of water and the quality. As per State code.

Waste: What is the classification for waste. The State regulates waste.

Fire Protection: Water usage is obligated to meet state requirements when fire protection is involved. Specific size of occupancy is required to have fire protection. Discussed the fire protection requirements. Ordinance should reference the IBC fire code.

Power: Needs to come from an established source.

Members suggested to follow Washington County's ordinance for utilities- water, fire, and power.

### **Projects in a Buffer Zone**

Is the acreage big enough to develop the land to meet the needs of the project? Are cities willing to have the project hookup to city utilities and have smaller lots? Mr. Stewart suggested having the land be specific in the ordinance concerning outside of buffer zones being this and inside of buffer zones being this- if the city is willing to approve.

If Chester area becomes industrial, then we limit the possibilities for business. If we are too restrictive it becomes bad business. Commissioner Frischknecht commented on the small cottage proposals might not be industrial but business/commercial. There is a natural overlap between the Industrial zone ordinance and the business/commercial zone ordinance.

Land is cheaper in the county, cities might not want industrial by them. Buffer zones are onboard with city ordinances by supplying services that the city has. The city ordinances dictate what is allowed in buffer zones.

### **Site Plan**

Site plan requirement approval: Site plans are created for the proposed lot development on the 20 acres. When the proposal is submitted it needs to be a subdivision plan and needs to have roads and split acreage for review. It was suggested to follow Washington county's site plan "by having a site plan submitted, drawn to scale, and of sufficient size and detail to show building locations, yard setbacks, ingress and egress drives, parking, landscape, etc areas, and other improvements as may be required by the planning commission relating to the specific use proposed." The members liked Utah County- paragraph 2 with the contents or checklist listing specific items on the plan. We would need to fine tuned the list for our ordinance, but a list should be included in the ordinance.

### **Special Provisions**

Special provisions: Washington County has a very good section on special provisions that the members want to use for this section. Particularly section A-C: Storage of Materials and Merchandise; Junk; and Solid Waste Storage Facilities. Mr. Anderson stated how reasonable Washington County's ordinance is.

Scott will summarize ordinance and talk next meeting. Mr. Day will breakdown ordinances for future work meetings and list what ordinances we want to work on.

**OTHER DISCUSSIONS**

Should the Planning Commission continue approving 1-lot minor subdivisions? They take 60 or 70 percent of their time. Should they be turned over to Zoning Administrator for approval since he makes sure all the requirements are in place. Commission members are concerned about liability, favoritism, and fairness. Commissioner Frischknecht wants the Planning Commission to continue approving the projects. Instead of just one set of eyes, the members agree it is better to have multiple sets of eyes look at each proposal. It was decided to leave it the same and not have the Zoning Administrator approve the subdivisions.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion is made by Joe Nielsen to approve the Planning Commission minutes of May 9<sup>th</sup> 2012, with no corrections. The motion is seconded by Leon Day, and the motion passes.

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

The meeting is adjourned at 8:15 P.M.