

**PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH
September 17, 2013 – 5:00 PM**

PRESENT: Chairman Ron Bracken
Commissioner Kim Campbell
Commissioner Nathan Fisher
Commissioner Julie Hullinger
Commissioner Ross Taylor
Commissioner Ro Wilkinson
Council Member Jimmie Hughes (arrived at 5:15pm)

CITY STAFF: Project Manager Todd Jacobsen
Development Services Manager Wes Jenkins
Planner I Craig Harvey
Planner II Ray Snyder
City Attorney Shawn Guzman (arrived at 5:20)
Administrative Secretary Genna Singh

EXCUSED: Commissioner Ron Read
Community Development Coordinator Bob Nicholson

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Ron Bracken called the meeting to order and led the flag salute.

1. **FINAL PLATS**

- A. Consider approval of a roadway final plat for “**Deserts Edge Drive.**” The representative is Mr. Roger Bundy, R & B Surveying. The property is located within the C-2 (Highway Commercial) and PD-R (Planned Development Residential) zones and is located off of the Southern Parkway Exit 6, Desert Canyons Parkway (south of the Southern Parkway). Case No. 2013-FP-033 (Staff –Todd J.).
- B. Consider approval of a final plat for “**Deserts Edge Phase 1**” a twenty-two (22) lot residential subdivision. The representative is Mr. Roger Bundy, R & B Surveying. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential) and is located off of the Southern Parkway Exit 6, Desert Canyons Parkway (south of the Southern Parkway). Case No. 2013-FP-032 (Staff – Todd J.).
- C. Consider approval of a final plat for “**Blackrock Condominiums at Stonebridge Phase 6**” a twelve (12) unit residential condominium subdivision final plat. The representative is Mr. Brandon Anderson, Rosenberg Associates. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential) and is located at approximately 2250 West and 230 North (north of Stonebridge Drive and west of Country Lane). Case No. 2012-FP-039 (Staff –Todd J.).

- D. Consider approval of a final plat for “**Painted Desert Phase 11**” a two (2) lot residential subdivision. The representative is Mr. Clay Tolbert, Southwest Consulting Services. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential) and is located at approximately 1430 East and 2480 South (in the Painted Desert development). Case No. 2013-FP-035 (Staff –Todd J.).

Chairman Bracken opened the items for questions.

No questions were asked.

MOTION:

Commissioner Kim Campbell made a motion to approve Final Plats A, B, C, and D.

Commissioner Julie Hullinger seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

2. **FINAL PLAT AMENDMENTS – PUBLIC HEARINGS (5:00 P.M.)**

- A. Consider approval of “**Bella Terrazza at Sunbrook 2nd Amended and Extended**” a condominium residential subdivision to change some common area / limited common area to private area within the condominium units. The representative is Mr. Bob Hermandson, Bush and Gudgell. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential) and is located at approximately 2090 West and 280 South (south of the Sunbrook Drive and west of Luce Del Sol Drive). Case No. 2013-FPA-046 (Staff –Todd J.).
- B. Consider approval of “**Bella Terrazza 2 at Sunbrook Amended**” a condominium residential subdivision to change some common area / limited common area to private area within the condominium units. The representative is Mr. Bob Hermandson, Bush and Gudgell. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential) and is located at 2090 West and 280 South (south of the Sunbrook Drive and west of Luce Del Sol Drive. Case No. 2013-FPA-047 (Staff –Todd J.).

Staff Comments:

The purpose of the Amended and Extended as well as the Amended Plat is to change some common area/limited common area to private area within the condominium units. No other changes were made or intended.

Commissioner Ross Taylor asked for clarification that this is just a change in the common area.

Todd Jacobsen responded that because it’s common area it is owned by the HOA.

Commissioner Ross Taylor asked if the HOA has to sign off.

Todd Jacobsen said yes.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher clarified that the subject area is going from common to limited common.

Todd Jacobsen answered, correct.

MOTION:

Commissioner Ross Taylor made a motion to approve items 2a and 2b

Commissioner Nathan Fisher seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

- C. Consider approval of “**Cox landing Phase 2 Amended**” a 4 lot residential subdivision final plat. The representative is Mr. Scott Woolsey, Alpha Engineering. The property is zoned R-1-10 (Single Family Residential 10,000 square foot minimum lot size) and is located at approximately 1085 South 900 East Street (east of Cox park). Case No. 2013-FPA-042.

Staff Comments:

The purpose of this Final Plat Amendment is to adjust the south lot line of Lot 39 to match existing grading on the ground. The original Lot size was 12,800 sq/ft or .029 acres. With this adjustment the new Lot size will be 12,321 sq/ft or 0.28 acres. No other changes were made or intended.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nathan Fisher made a motion to recommend approval of item 2C.

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

- D. Consider approval of “**Dolce Vista at Sunbrook Phase 1 Amended**” a thirty-nine (39) lot residential subdivision final plat. The representative is Mr. Brandon Anderson, Rosenberg Associates. The property is zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential) and is located at approximately 2080 West and 510 South (off Alienta Drive and Alba Drive). Case No. 2013-FPA-045 (Staff – Todd J.)

Staff Comments:

The purpose of this Final Plat Amendment is to adjust the Lot Lines and Common Area between Lots 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. The reason for this is because the house on Lot 18 was not built on the original building pad and encroached into the common area. In order to maintain the minimum zoning requirements the other lots needed to be adjusted. No other changes were made or intended with this Final Plat Amendment.

MOTION:

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson made a motion to approve Final Plat Amendment item 2D.

Commissioner Julie Hullinger seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

3. **LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT / LOT SPLIT**

- A. Consider approval of a lot line adjustment within a recorded subdivision; **Lot 62 and Lot 63** of the **“Springs Estates Phase 5 Amended.”** The owner of Lot 63 needs 1,239 square feet of Lot 62 to accommodate the layout of the home he would like to build on the lot. This change will allow Lot 63 to place the driveway in the location needed for the home. The representative is Mr. Scott Woolsey, Alpha Engineering. The property is zoned RE-12.5 (Residential Estate 12,500 square foot minimum lot size) and is located at approximately 1240 South Sierra Vista Circle (in the Springs development). Case No. 2013-LRE-016 (Staff – Todd J.)

The neighbor and owner have agreed to move the lot line so the driveway can go across this area.

Chairman Ron Bracken opened the item for questioning.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if there is an issue with the lot size for lot 62.

Todd Jacobsen responded that the future plan was to go into this area. The guy still owns the surrounding lots. So I think they did that so he could amend the plat easily.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if the minimum square footage for the subdivision is met on that lot.

Todd Jacobsen responded yes.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nathan Fisher made a motion to recommend approval of item 3A.

Commissioner Ross Taylor seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

- B. Consider approval of a lot split not within a recorded subdivision at **“274 West Sunset Boulevard.”** The representative is Mr. Ried Pope, L.R. Pope Engineering. The zoning is C-3 (General Commercial) and is located at 274 West Sunset Boulevard (Papa Murphy’s). Case No. 2013-LRE-017 (Staff – Todd J.)

Commissioner Ross Taylor clarified that the address should be 1274 West, not 274 West.

Todd Jacobsen explained that we have made sure the zoning for the existing building has gone back the 10’ as required as well as easements around the lot.

Chairman Ron Bracken opened the item for questions.

MOTION:

Commissioner Kim Campbell made a motion to approve item 3B.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

4. **PRELIMINARY PLAT**

Consider a preliminary plat request for **“Meadow Valley Farms – Phase 4 - 6”** to create sixty-seven (67) single family residential lots on 56.31 acres. The applicant is Development Solutions Group and the representatives are Mr. Stacy Young and Mr. Logan Blake. The property is zoned R-1-10 (Single Family Residential 10,000 square foot minimum lot size) and RE-20 (Residential Estate 20,000 square foot minimum lot size) and is located south of Rancho Verde Estates and west of Little Valley Road at approximately 2420 East and 4000 South. Case No. 2013-PP-039. (Staff – Wes J.).

****Council Member Jimmie Hughes entered at 5:15 pm****

Staff Comments:

The existing erosion hazard boundary extends through proposed phases 4 and 6. The developer will be required to provide an erosion hazard study for these phases indicating what mitigation measures will be required to build homes within this area.

Before the final plat is submitted the erosion hazard will have to be dealt with. They are proposing to dedicate a bit of open space to the city. Parks has stated they do not want it without the bottom portion. The developer does not want to do that. They want to maintain it and keep it with those lots. Unless more area is dedicated; Parks is not in favor of the dedication.

Commissioner Ron Bracken opened the item for questions.

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson noted that it looks like we’re getting into more and more low density down there. Are we not looking for more open space? It looks to me that there is more low density out there.

Wes Jenkins asked for clarification on what Commissioner Ro Wilkinson meant by “open space”.

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson clarified that more parks should be there because there is a lot of low density out there.

Wes Jenkins responded there is a lot of low density out there. Parks has indicated that there should be another park out there besides the Silkwood Park.

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson continued by adding that it seems to that they we’re going to have larger lots, and now there are smaller lots.

Chairman Ron Bracken pointed out that these are large lots and corrected Commissioner Wilkinson that she is referring to low density when she means high density.

Wes Jenkins noted that they are ½ acre lots.

Commissioner Ross Taylor asked if the plat was drawn to scale because some of the R-1-10 lots look larger than the RE.

Wes Jenkins answered that the plat is to scale; it looks that way because there is a no disturb area and some hillside. He added that if you get behind that little slope you can’t really see the Little Valley area.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher pointed out that the developer wants to dedicate open space to the city but the Parks does not want it.

Wes Jenkins responded right, because it’s just that little remnant piece. So what we need to do on the plat is note it as no disturb.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher clarified that all of the open space will be removed from the plat.

Wes Jenkins responded, right, unless they give more area to the city.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher inserted that if we recommend approval it will be with the note to remove that wording.

****Shawn Guzman arrived at 5:20****

MOTION:

Commissioner Nathan Fisher made a motion to recommend approval of item 4 with the condition that the notation referencing open space to be dedicated to the city is either removed and noted as no disturb OR the parks department's desire for more space will be provided if it's to be dedicated.

Commissioner Julie Hullinger seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

5. **ZONE CHANGE**

Consider a request for a zone change for a future subdivision to be called "**Cornerstone**" on two (2) parcels from RE-12.5 (Residential Estates 12,500 square foot minimum lot size) on 10.6 acres and A-1 (Agricultural 40,000 square foot minimum lot size) to R-1-10 (Single Family Residential 10,000 square foot minimum lot size) on 11.9 acres. The parcel is generally located southeast of the intersection of Seegmiller Drive and 3000 East and directly south of the Bridle Gate Estates subdivision. The applicants are Three Thousand East LLC., Borley Enterprise Trust, and Charles Larsen, Trustee. The representative is Mr. Paul Blackmore, Blackrock Engineering. Case No. 2013-ZC-009. (Staff – Craig H.)

Staff Comments:

This property is within a one-hundred foot equestrian buffer (a General Plan requirement) that surrounds the Bridle Gate Estates property. The applicant has shown that buffer line on the exhibit. The buffer requires that no dwelling (Primary homes & Casitas/Guesthouses) can be built within that 100' foot buffer. The applicant has indicated that all dwellings will be well out of that buffer zone.

The 22.54 acres are low density residential with 4 dwelling units per acre on the general plan.

Speaking with Paul Blackmore, there will be a wide trail over the canal there. The nearest dwelling will be well beyond that 100' buffer. The adjacent zones are RE-12.5 and R-1-10.

Chairman Ron Bracken opened the item for questions to staff.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if the 100' no build zone is condition for Bridle Gate.

Craig Harvey responded that the condition is on the general plan for anyone who comes in near Bridle Gate. It applies to zones that are more dense than the existing.

Chairman Ron Bracken opened the item up to the public.

Richard Basset (of Bridle Gate Estates) expressed the following:

"My concern is that with the first two houses built in Bridle Gate, those two lots and both of those houses were about one million dollars each. About a year later they put the subdivision to the south of us in as 12,500 sq ft lots. Why would you want to lower them to smaller lots with what is across the street that was pre-planned? Everything in Bridle Gate, all 108 lots, will be lowered in value. You've done an amazing job so far making sure that they haven't changed Bridle Gate. So why can't we stay at that same 12,500?"

Chuck Spilker (owner of 10 acres adjacent and 40 acres east of the project) expressed the following:

“My properties are A-1. My concerns are like those of the Bridle Gate residents. My concern is not so much on value, although that is a concern, you make a big investment based on the master plan because it’s zoned A-1 then down the line people come in and want to change it. I know that 10,000 sq ft is more homes to build and more money. I just feel like the infrastructure is not adequate. I had to pay the cost to chip and seal Seegmiller Drive. Right after my house is just dust – the city does not want to pay for it. They want a developer to pay for it. So now we come in with 10,000 sq ft lots and we increase the density by a substantial amount. The high and elementary schools are out that direction. We’re just going to dump traffic on that road that is not even paved. I don’t think it works. As we go down 3000 East, before Smoot’s hill, you have to be careful with the huge dump trucks that can throw you down the ditch. This is not smart.

Another concern I have is that we “ag” people are different. We have animals and livestock. Livestock create issues. If you put that density right in the middle of an “ag” zone your phones are going to go off with “I can’t stand the smell, the flies are bad, what are you [gonna] do”. For example, when I came home from a vacation, there were 4 goats that pooped all over my deck and jumped on my furniture. If you’re not in agriculture what do you do? You call the city madder than heck and you want to sue somebody. If you’re an “ag” person what do you do, you clean it up, and you deal with it.

There needs to be a buffer. You don’t go from 1 acre to 10,000 sq ft. Cornerstone was approved at 12.5. It gives us that lower density that is okay. As you look at a map that yellow section is surrounded by green. It should be ½ acre lots at least. There needs to be some kind of buffer. You don’t throw beautiful nice homes right next to commercial. You always phase things in. I don’t see this as a good proposal and I hope you see our views and put a stop to this density. I don’t think this is right. We’re trying to put too many homes in a place that can’t handle it.”

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked Mr. Spilker where he lived.

Chuck Spilker responded the northwest corner. He added that he paid for the road in front of his house. It blows his mind that so much traffic goes across that road.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if that road takes you to Little Valley.

Chuck Spilker said yes, and it can take you to River Road. Any high school kids in that subdivision would go through that dirt road.

Chairman Ron Bracken asked if Mr. Spilker meant that the subdivision will not go straight but will take Seegmiller Drive, so traffic will be increased.

Chuck Spilker responded yes, they’ll go both ways. If you’ve got two big vehicles going down the road by Smoot’s hill it’s pretty scary. We just can’t pack that many homes in that location.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked Mr. Spilker if his concern is that they won’t improve Seegmiller Drive with this subdivision.

Chuck Spilker retorted, oh it won’t be. The city has never given an indication that they’re going to pave it. They usually don’t unless a developer comes in and develops the property. Really my biggest concern is putting those kinds of people around agriculture. People will love the price and move in, but they’ll have concern with the flies and smells. The Bridle Gate people are great people but even they have some concerns with some of the corrals. All that just needs to be taken into consideration.

Richard Basset re-approached the podium to add:

“On 3000 East about a block north of Bridle Gate is Washington Charter School. This year they’ve expanded about 2/3 bigger. They make it so people can’t go down 3000 at the curve of the road and turn in. They come all the way down to Bridle Gate, turn around, and then pull into the school to pick their kids. They found a shortcut; if they go down the corner and take the dirt road around Bridle Gate they can make a loop and miss all the traffic. You need to be there in the morning and around 2:30 in the afternoon to see what traffic a little charter school adds.”

Mr. Martindale (of Bridle Gate) expressed the following:

“When we moved in we did so because the lots were bigger. According to the map, the area south of Bridle Gate is 12.5 the same as Bridle Gate. When you put out these Master Plans and maps, people buy according to that. When someone wants to make the lots smaller it has a direct effect. My backyard faces that south side.”

Austin Anderson (Cornerstone Developer) approached the podium to state:

“We weren’t the original developers who did the 12.5 layout. When we purchased it, it made sense to abandon the existing utilities and run the roads East and West. That gave us North and South facing lots and helped with the lay of the land. It took any access from 3000 E which will be a major thoroughfare eventually. We’ve changed it to 10.0 and it has only added 5 lots to the subdivision. So we’re not talking a big difference in traffic. The Arbors is already zoned at 10.0. We feel that the 125’ and the elevation grade is a great buffer.

To add to the Seegmiller Drive argument, the more houses in there, the more impact fees the city can use to pave Seegmiller.

We also have pressure from the Water Conservancy District. We have a limited amount of water. The conservation groups say we can save water with an average lot size is 6.0. I don’t think the difference between 12.5 and 10.0 will make a big difference in traffic, or flow, or property values. So when we develop 3000 E we’re going to take pressure off.”

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked about the elevation change.

Austin Anderson responded that Cornerstone is quite a bit higher. That’s also why we changed the roads to E/W. It makes for a better grade difference. We’ve done some planning with the Arbors and feel that we’ve found the best solution.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if the underground is already in place.

Austin Anderson responded that the underground is already in but it will be taken out. We’re trying to make the best flow in the area.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked Craig Harvey how large the Arbors subdivision is.

Craig Harvey answered that the Arbors covers 75 acres.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if the Arbors is all R-1-10.

Craig Harvey responded that most is but some is R-1-8.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if that one just went through City Council.

Craig Harvey noted that yes, the Arbors went through City Council two weeks ago.

Paul Blackmore (Cornerstone Engineer) approached the podium:

“We understand there is quite a bit of dust on Seegmiller Drive. There is an existing corridor with an irrigation canal. The way we have it planned there is an equestrian trail that will go over the storm drain and secondary water. We plan to align with Seegmiller Drive.

Some improvements we've made to the previous layout– there was a mix up with where the main road was going to come through; by changing the lot orientation there is a difference of 5 lots. What it does for overall flow of the land and long-term land use it changes from E/W facing lots that are very narrow and does not allow for a 3-car garage it also helps with the significant hill relief. What it does is allows less of a wall impact. It also allows us to do some terracing that makes the area a more attractive place to live. There will be no structure closer than 125' to any Bridle Gate property line. There is a significant elevation change, plus the equestrian trail, and the easement. By extending the road straight through, we connect to a master plan road and the existing stub. What I hope is that by pulling the traffic into this road it will lighten the traffic in Bridle Gate. We also want some estate lots.

When all is said and done we plan to use part of the existing road. The rest of the infrastructure we'll pull out and replace. We've worked with The Arbors and are trying to do what flows the best. We're trying to make the buffer as significant as possible and I believe 125' is a significant buffer. I imagine there is an issue with Seegmiller, but that is not our problem as well as the problem with the school. We did not create those problems; they already exist. We have thought through this. There is a benefit to the city."

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson asked what the maximum square footage is for these lots.

Paul Blackmore answered that there is no maximum, a 10.0 sq ft lot lends to a variety of house sizes.

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson countered that Paul mentioned putting in a 3-car garage.

Paul Blackmore responded that R-1-10 gives us that option more freely because of the lay of the land.

Commissioner Ro Wilkinson asked if the lots could have basements.

Paul Blackmore answered that some will have daylight basements. We are coming from the equestrian trail and Seegmiller Drive there is a bit of relief. We are trying to terrace the roads to maximize views.

Austin Anderson addressed Commissioner Ro Wilkinson, stating that even though the lots are smaller they can do the 3 car garage because of the differing widths of the lots. The 12.5 gives you a narrow home with large backyard.

Paul Blackmore added that by preserving the views and the number of choices people can have on their lots I believe property values will increase.

Chuck Spilker questioned the engineer (Paul Blackmore) on his calculation pointing out that right now the lots are at 12.5 but the other 11 acres is A-1. You're getting more than the stated 5 homes. If you take 22 acres down to 10 – maybe if the whole thing is 12.5 maybe it wouldn't be so significant.

Paul Blackmore responded that the difference of the 5 homes is based on taking the property to the east to R-12.5.

Chuck Spilker continued to state that we're talking about another 11 acres. That's a lot more than 5 homes.

Paul Blackmore inserted that it sounds like no one has a problem with the 12.5. So I do believe we're only talking about 5 lots.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher asked if the 5 lots are throughout the entire subdivision.

Paul Blackmore answered, yes. He added that he went through a lot of effort getting the two owners to talk to each other. What we're trying to do is create a better final product and compliment both sides. We've made a huge effort to try to make something good.

Chuck Spilker – I want it stated that I am NOT okay with the 12.5 on the other 11 acres. I would like to see ½ acre lots. Crimson Cliffs have been great; people can put pools in and do things. This is a density issue. Keep in mind we already have R-1-10 behind it. Let's just keep a little bit of a buffer there.

Paul Blackmore concluded that he appreciates the value of a .5 acre lot. The reason these are not .5 acre is because of the relief of the land. The slope is too great. To do that here you would have walls that are much higher. To create a larger lot you're creating more costs and terracing. You can see that on the lots nothing grows here. We're increasing water usage and things to no value for the people who live in them. If I bought a lot here I would have to do much more terracing with much more money. It's not a flat field – it's a rolling hill. That's why it .5 acre is not a good idea from an engineering perspective.

Chairman Ron Bracken closed the item to the public and re-opened the item to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ross Taylor started the discussion by stating:

“If this is all zoned R-1-10 and the agriculture barrier around it; it creates the possibility of someone not being comfortable with the agriculture. We've encountered this problem in the past. If you go to RE-12.5 you give the residents the option of some agricultural activity if they wanted. More than that it says, this property is adjacent to active agricultural property – if you want to you can and if you don't want to you don't have to but you know that your neighbors will. I think it gives a better mix than putting a restrictive non-agriculture property in the middle of property surrounding agriculture uses.

My thought would be in the best interest of the developer if he would only give up 5 lots by going RE-12.5 that's not a large price to pay. I'm not sure that I can go along with Mr. Spilker's idea of .5 acre lots on that A-1 property. I like the idea but at the same time .5 acre lots are quite water demanding and I don't think that is in the best interest of the city in the long run anyway. I think RE-12.5 in the whole section is the best way to accommodate the people and still give the developer a good project.”

Paul Blackmore responded that having done multiple layouts he would like to point out that this is NOT about five lots. It's about the orientation and the retaining walls; issues that are very important. So when you say give up five lots – that's not what we're arguing about. If you put me in that rolling hill the bigger the walls get. It's more than just a lot size.

Richard Basset approached the podium to add that the City of St. George put up a sign off of 2450 a few blocks down stating that this is an agricultural area. On 3000 East there is another one. The city put two beautiful signs up stating that this is an agriculture area. I like your (Commissioner Ross Taylor) idea. Thank you.

Commissioner Nathan Fisher joined the discussion stating:

"I appreciate Commissioner Taylor's comments there. I compare this to what has happened to the west. So R-1-10 and R-1-8 it's going to happen in that area eventually. So I live in this area and am a fan of keeping it as open as possible. If there were a way to preserve this agricultural area around this subdivision; then I understand that approach. But what is going to happen is that someday these people will sell this property and most likely it will be sold to someone who will develop it. That person will come in, and that point they will probably be doing what they're trying to do here. And they'll have everything around them – an RE-12.5, R-1-10 and R-1-18. It won't be so much of an argument then because there's already some structure there. Then, we're probably going to look back and think "geez, why did we make this one RE-12.5 or .5 acre"? If we could put a deed restriction on it stating that when the owners sell it, it has to stay agriculture, then it makes sense because we can plan for it. But we can't do that.

My concern is that we create a buffer where it needs to be. I think that Mr. Blackmore has tried to do that with the 100' no build area and create as much as buffer between the subdivisions as possible. At first I thought Bridle Gate had bigger lots. The difference is not much, it's 2,500 feet. My guess is that if you looked at a home on a 10,000 lot and 12,500 lot you couldn't tell the difference. Now let me preface, I want as much open space and avoiding of high density, but I don't want to do it to the detriment of the developer when we'll look back and perhaps regret doing it to that developer later on. I don't think that this R-1-10 won't be as impactful when it's already been approved to the south"

Chairman Ron Bracken told Commissioner Nathan Fisher that he agreed with him and looked to the commissioners for further discussion or a motion.

MOTION:

Commissioner Nathan Fisher made a motion to recommend approval of the zone change request of item 5 on the agenda.

There was no second on the motion so the item died and another motion was made.

Commissioner Ross Taylor: I don't believe we have the right to arbitrarily re-zone as our desires would be. My motion is to deny the proposed zone and ask the developer to consider a design that would allow the entire property to be zoned as RE-12.5.

Commissioner Kim Campbell seconded Commissioner Ross Taylor's motion.

Ayes: Commissioner Kim Campbell, Commissioner Ross Taylor, Commissioner Julie Hullinger, Commissioner Ro Wilkinson

Nays: Chairman Ron Bracken, Commissioner Nathan Fisher

Motion passes.

****Commissioner Ro Wilkinson departed at 6:05****

6. **MINUTES**

Consider approval of the Planning Commission minutes for June 11th, July 9th, August 13th, and August 27th, 2013.

There were no suggested edits to the above stated minutes up for approval.

MOTION:

Commissioner Julie Hullinger made a motion to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Kim Campbell seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Motion passes.

DISMISSAL

MOTION:

Chairman Ron Bracken made a motion to dismiss.

Commissioner Kim Campbell seconded.

Ayes: ALL

Nays: NONE

Meeting adjourned.