**AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**
**MAY 4, 2022**
**REGULAR SESSION**

Notice is hereby given that the American Fork City Planning Commission will meet in regular session on May 4, 2022, at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

The agenda shall be as follows:

1. Review and action on the final plat for Rockwell Ranch Block 8, located in the area 980 West 340 South, in the TOD zone.

2. Hearing, review, and action on a site plan for Station 52, located at 960 East 1750 North, in the Public Facilities (PF) Zone.

3. Other Business

4. Review and action on the minutes of the April 20, 2022, Planning Commission Regular Session

5. Adjournment

John H. Woffinden, P.G. ,

Planning Commission Chairman

*The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the commission, city staff and the public.*

**AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING DATE:** 4th May, 2022
**STAFF:** Patrick O'Brien

**AGENDA TOPIC:** Review and action on the final plat for Rockwell Ranch Block 8, located in the area 980 West 340 South, in the TOD zone.

| BACKGROUND INFORMATION | | |
|---|---|---|
| Location: | | 980 West 340 South |
| Applicants: | | Jake Horan |
| Existing Land Use: | | TOD |
| Proposed Land Use: | | |
| Surrounding Land Use: | North | TOD |
| | South | TOD |
| | East | TOD |
| | West | TOD |
| Existing Zoning: | | TOD |
| Proposed Zoning: | | |
| Surrounding Zoning: | North | TOD |
| | South | TOD |
| | East | TOD |
| | West | TOD |

**BACKGROUND:**

The applicant is applying for final plat approval for Rockwell Ranch Block 8, in the TOD zone. The Final Plat consists of 8 lots and some associated common area of approximately 3,535 sq. ft. Each lot has an identified access off of 340 South, which is identified as a private street.

**Sec 17.7.210 Staff Submits Final Plan/Plat And Supporting Materials To Planning Commission**

Upon completion of the technical review conference and subject to a finding that the project materials are in a form suitable for action by the planning commission, the final plans/plats and supporting materials shall be placed on the agenda of the planning commission.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The Final Plat application meets the requirements of Section 17.7.210 and staff recommends approval.

**POTENTIAL MOTIONS – Final Plat**

**APPROVAL**

Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend approval for the final plat for Rockwell Ranch Block 8, located in the area 980 West 340 South, in the TOD zone

**DENIAL**

Mr. Chairman, I move that we deny the final plat for Rockwell Ranch Block 8, located in the area 980 West 340 South, in the TOD zone

**TABLE**

Mr. Chairman, I move that we table action on the final plat for Rockwell Ranch Block 8, located in the area 980 West 340 South, in the TOD zone, and instruct the developer/staff to _____.

# AMERICAN FORK CITY ENGINEERING DIVISION
# STAFF REPORT

Planning Commission Meeting Date: 5/4/2022

This report is a summary of the American Fork City Engineering Division plan review comments regarding the subject plan as submitted by the applicant for American Fork City Land Use Authority approval:

Project Name: Rockwell Ranch Block 8

Project Address: 980 West 340 South

Developer / Applicant's Name: White Horse Developers

Type of Application:

- ☒ Subdivision Final Plat
- ☒ Subdivision Preliminary Plan
- ☐ Annexation
- ☐ Code Text Amendment
- ☐ General Plan Amendment
- ☐ Zone Map Amendment
- ☐ Commercial Site Plan
- ☐ Residential Accessory Structure Site Plan

**Project Map:**

**Engineering Division Recommendation:** The Engineering Division recommends APPROVAL of the proposed development with the following conditions of approval:

1. A slope easement be provided by the adjacent property owner for the proposed fill on the adjacent property to resolve the remaining TRC comments.

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

**Standard Conditions of Approval:**

APPLICANT is responsible and shall submit/post/obtain all necessary documentation and evidence to comply with these Standard Conditions of Approval prior to any platting, permitting, or any other form of authorization by the City including plat recording or other property conveyance to the City and prior to scheduling a pre-construction meeting. All recording shall take place at the Utah County Recorder's Office.

1. **Title Report:** Submit an updated Title Report not older than 30 days or other type of appropriate verification that shows all dedications to the City are free and clear of encumbrances, taxes, or other assessments.
2. **Property Taxes and Liens:** Submit evidence that all the property taxes, for the current and/or previous years, liens, and agricultural land use roll over fees have been paid in full.
3. **Water Rights:** Submit evidence that all the required water rights have been conveyed to American Fork City.
4. **Performance Guarantee:** Post a performance guarantee for all required public and essential common improvements.
5. **Easements and Agreements:** Submit/record a long-term Storm Water Pollution Prevention Maintenance Agreement signed and dated by the property owner and any required easement documentation.
6. **Land Disturbance Permit:** Obtain a Land Disturbance Permit.
7. **Compliance with the Engineering Division Plan Review Comments:** All plans and documents shall comply with all the Technical Review Committee comments and the City Engineer's final review.
8. **Commercial Structure:** Record an Owner Acknowledgment and Utility Liability Indemnification if the proposed building is a multi-unit commercial structure served by a single utility service.
9. **Sensitive Lands:** Record all applicable documents required for compliance with the City's Sensitive Lands Ordinance.
10. **Utility Notification Form:** Submit a Subdivision Utility Notification Form.
11. **Professional Verification:** Submit final stamped construction documentation by all appropriate professionals.
12. **Fees:** Payment of all development, inspection, recording, street light, and other project related fees.
13. **Mylar:** Submit a Mylar. All plats will receive final verification of all formats, notes, conveyances, and other items contained on the plat by City staff (recorder, legal, engineer, GIS, planning).

**AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING DATE:** 4th May, 2022
**STAFF:** Patrick O'Brien

**AGENDA TOPIC:**

Hearing, review, and action on a site plan for Station 52, located at 960 East 1750 North, in the Public Facilities (PF) Zone.

| BACKGROUND INFORMATION | | |
|---|---|---|
| Location: | | 960 E 1750 N |
| Applicants: | | American Fork City |
| Existing Land Use: | | Public Facility |
| Proposed Land Use: | | N/A |
| Surrounding Land Use: | North | Residential Low Density |
| | South | Design Commercial |
| | East | Cedar Hills City |
| | West | Public Facilities |
| Existing Zoning: | | Public Facility |
| Proposed Zoning: | | N/A |
| Surrounding Zoning: | North | R1-9000 |
| | South | GC-2 |
| | East | Cedar Hills City |
| | West | Unincorporated County |

**BACKGROUND:**

Station 52 is proposed as a new Fire Station for American Fork City. The site plan application highlights the parking, landscaping, building footprint, access, and other necessary planning items. Station 52 apparatus will access onto 1750 N/Harvey Blvd. The proposed development will have sleeping quarters for fire personnel, a training/community room, a shared space to be utilized by American Fork Police Department, and an indoor shooting range for Police Department training purposes.

<u>Section 17.6.101.B of the Development Code</u>

Application for site plan approval shall be submitted on forms provided by the City and shall be accompanied by maps and drawings showing the following:
The location of all existing and proposed buildings and structures on the site, with full dimensions showing the distance between buildings and distances from buildings to adjacent property lines.

a. The location of all parking spaces, driveways, and points of vehicular ingress and egress.

b. A landscaping plan showing the location, types and initial sizes of all planting materials to be used together with the location of fences, walls, hedges, and decorative materials.

c. Preliminary elevations of main buildings showing the general appearance and types of external materials to be used.

d. The location of solid waste receptacles and trash pick-up areas.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

After reviewing the application for final plat approval, the following findings of fact are offered for consideration:

The site plan meets the requirements of section 17.6.101.B of the American Fork Development Code.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The site plan meets the requirements of the City Code, therefore, staff recommends approval of this item.

**<u>POTENTIAL MOTIONS – Site Plan</u>**

**APPROVAL**

Mr. Chairman, I move that we recommend approval of the site plan for Station 52, located at 960 East 1750 North.

**DENIAL**

Mr. Chairman, I move that we deny the site plan for Station 52, located at 960 East 1750 North

**TABLE**

Mr. Chairman, I move that we table action on the site plan for Station 52, located at 960 East 1750 North, and instruct the developer/staff to _____.

# AMERICAN FORK CITY ENGINEERING DIVISION
# STAFF REPORT

Planning Commission Meeting Date: 4/20/2022

This report is a summary of the American Fork City Engineering Division plan review comments regarding the subject plan as submitted by the applicant for American Fork City Land Use Authority approval:

Project Name: American Fork Fire Station No. 52

Project Address: 960 East 1750 North

Developer / Applicant's Name: American Fork City

Type of Application:

- ☐ Subdivision Final Plat
- ☐ Subdivision Preliminary Plan
- ☐ Annexation
- ☐ Code Text Amendment
- ☐ General Plan Amendment
- ☐ Zone Change
- ☒ Commercial Site Plan
- ☐ Residential Accessory Structure Site Plan

**Project Map:**

**Engineering Division Recommendation:** The Engineering Division recommends APPROVAL of the proposed development with the following conditions of approval:

1. The remaining TRC comments are addressed and verified prior to presenting to City Council.

## STANDARD CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

**Standard Conditions of Approval:**

APPLICANT is responsible and shall submit/post/obtain all necessary documentation and evidence to comply with these Standard Conditions of Approval prior to any platting, permitting, or any other form of authorization by the City including plat recording or other property conveyance to the City and prior to scheduling a pre-construction meeting. All recording shall take place at the Utah County Recorder's Office.

1. **Title Report:** Submit an updated Title Report not older than 30 days or other type of appropriate verification that shows all dedications to the City are free and clear of encumbrances, taxes, or other assessments.
2. **Property Taxes and Liens:** Submit evidence that all the property taxes, for the current and/or previous years, liens, and agricultural land use roll over fees have been paid in full.
3. **Water Rights:** Submit evidence that all the required water rights have been conveyed to American Fork City.
4. **Performance Guarantee:** Post a performance guarantee for all required public and essential common improvements.
5. **Easements and Agreements:** Submit/record a long-term Storm Water Pollution Prevention Maintenance Agreement signed and dated by the property owner and any required easement documentation.
6. **Land Disturbance Permit:** Obtain a Land Disturbance Permit.
7. **Compliance with the Engineering Division Plan Review Comments:** All plans and documents shall comply with all the Technical Review Committee comments and the City Engineer's final review.
8. **Commercial Structure:** Record an Owner Acknowledgment and Utility Liability Indemnification if the proposed building is a multi-unit commercial structure served by a single utility service.
9. **Sensitive Lands:** Record all applicable documents required for compliance with the City's Sensitive Lands Ordinance.
10. **Utility Notification Form:** Submit a Subdivision Utility Notification Form.
11. **Professional Verification:** Submit final stamped construction documentation by all appropriate professionals.
12. **Fees:** Payment of all development, inspection, recording, street light, and other project related fees.
13. **Mylar:** Submit a Mylar. All plats will receive final verification of all formats, notes, conveyances, and other items contained on the plat by City staff (recorder, legal, engineer, GIS, planning).

# UNNAPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
APRIL 20, 2022
REGULAR SESSION

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in a regular session on April 20, 2022 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 pm.

| | |
|---|---|
| Present: | Chairman Woffinden |
| | Harold Dudley |
| | Christine Anderson |
| | Bruce Frandsen |
| | Jenny Peay |
| | Rodney Martin |
| | David Bird |
| Absent: | Chris Christiansen |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Staff Present: | Patrick O'Brien | Development Services Director |
| | Ben Hunter | Engineer |
| | Rebecca Andrus | Head Engineer |
| | Cherylyn Egner | City Attorney |
| | George Schade | Communications Director |
| | Megan Crowley | Administrative Assistant |
| | Stephanie Finau | Deputy Recorder |

Others Present: Spencer Stevens, Curtis Miner, Carolyn Lloyd, Mike Smith, Cade Bradley, Shauna Gappmeyer, Robert Sheffield, Ty Johnson, Chris Florence, Nate Sechrest, Clint Feeley, Guy Larson

Chairman Woffinden led the "Pledge of Allegience"

**1. <u>Hearing, review, and action on amending Section 15.02.1525 of the municipal code of American Fork City titled "620 South/700 South Road Cross Section"</u>**

Ben Hunter: There is a slight modification that city council asked to be made on this cross section. The current cross section calls for a 4" solid white line and 6" solid white line. The current cross section has a curb in that area to separate the bike lane from the travel lane. The curb will be removed and striped so we will still have a bike lane.

John Woffinden: Any questions?

Bruce Frandsen: When was this road designated as a minor collector?

Ben Hunter: For at least four years. Prior to the TOD, there was a master plan in 2018 that identified it as a minor collector. The transportation master plan prior to that also had 620 South and 700 South identified as a collector. Harbor Village just off Storrs and 100 West area, that street was built wider when that subdivision went in because it was a minor collector.

Bruce Frandsen: We have a few houses that front that road currently and use on-street parking, this new code amendment would prohibit on-street parking? So, they would have to figure a way to park on their lawns or something to stay off the road?

Ben Hunter: Correct. A minor collector, there is various areas in the code, ordinances, and access management plans that as you move up to that minor collector plan and move to major collectors and arterials you start to limit the accessibility and uses. It typically has more traffic in some cases may have higher volumes, especially in this instance where you have bike lanes on it. We are helping to provide safety mechanisms as well. So, bikes aren't out in the travel lane and have to worry about doors swinging out. So that is why with this cross section you would not have on street parking.

Bruce Frandsen: Are there any accommodations that can be made? Many people have lived there for decades and some of them get swept up in annexations and now they've lost that ability. I don't know where we're getting the requirements for all the bike lanes. I worry about the homes that have been there. I'm sure in the future we can prohibit that. I think it is a safety issue where they are going to be crossing in and out in those bike lanes. There is still traffic, large farm equipment that is too wide to cross the tracks without shearing off the posts, they're sheared off today. Where do we go from here? I'm not seeing that as a real safety thing to be doing along that road.

Ben Hunter: In regards to the bike lanes, engineering doesn't do much as far as bike lanes, pedestrian trails, and side paths. Since I've been here at the city that's been identified to have a bike lane on there. We follow what City Council approved per the master plan for pedestrians and cyclists. With existing homes they can still pull into their driveways they will not lose access to get in and out of their homes. Some sections will not have the full width of right of way so it may not be striped yet accordingly. At full build out that's what we anticipate with master plans, or at least within ten years. Planning purposes for the future when these roads are built out, that will be when you see the full implementation of it. We are just following what the master plans have identified where the elements are.

Bruce Frandsen: So with the existing homes is the city looking at to install the bike lanes and widen the roads in front of the homes at the city's expense? There are a couple homes not in a development right now. How is that going to affect them?

Cherylyn Egner: I'm just going to step in here. As far as how the striping is completed and the right of way. That's a process that will come with development. It may be something that council chooses down the road as they decide to expand 200 South and purchase right of way from those property owners. That is going to be a conversation that city has to engage in with each property owner if they don't have the right of way currently. This ordinance today, the revision to this code, isn't to change what is already done Outside of the fact that currently the cross section calls

for the raised curb, this eliminates that and just puts striping there. So, this particular change, I understand the questions and desires for those answers and honestly, I don't know if we as staff have those answer today. Those are council decisions, and the administration has to reach out to certain property owners and make those determinations. This code is simply removing that raised curb and putting it as just a painted stripe.

**Public Hearing Opened**

Carolyn Lloyd: I am a resident along 620 South. I am grateful we are taking away the curbed bike lane; the concern is parking on the street, that I won't be able to park. I have a large family and when they all come over, I'm not sure where they will park. My question is to the east of me is Utah County, until it gets developed and annexed can we allow Meadowbrook on the north side to do the bike lane and my side do the parking? Because I know for that development that they are currently developing they should put those things in. Once they develop further east, they can make those changes at that time.

John Woffinden: As Cherylyn stated what's before us is just that raised concrete thing in the middle, and we are going to replace it with the lines. That's all we are going to be voting on tonight. What I suggest, Carolyn is that you go to the city council with your concern. Not only for what's already there but for the county parcel to the east of you as well. Right now we are only worried about the concrete and the painted lines. I see where you're coming from where its all consistent down the street.

Carolyn: Especially for us who have lived there. I have been here for 30 years and to taking away the parking would be hard.

**Public Hearing Closed**

**Harold Dudley motioned to recommend approval of the code text amendment in section 15.02.1525 of the municipal code of American Fork City titled "620 South/700 South Road Cross Section." Rodney Martin seconded the motion.**

John Woffinden: Do we have any further comments?

Christine Anderson: Maybe we can ask city council to allow residents on the south side to have on street parking. I don't know if that can be part of the motion.

John Woffinden: It's not going to be part of the motion because we are talking about the raised bump and the lines right now. But it is on the official record so they will be aware of that fact.

**Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Nay** |
| **Harold Dudley** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |

**Jenny Peay** **Aye**
**Rodney Martin** **Aye**
**The motion passed**

John Woffinden Introduced Rodney Martin and David Bird as new Planning Commission members. Stating that David Bird will be an alternate and will not participate tonight as he has not completed the training.

*Rodney Martin: Introduced himself and let us know a little bit about himself.

*David Bird: Introduced himself and mentioned he was excited for the opportunity to serve.

Patrick O'Brien: Mr. Chairman for the purpose of the minutes can we get a record of who voted aye or nay as well as a roll call vote, for the minutes?

John Woffinden: Yes, I voted against the last item because I know that city council looks very closely to see who voted which way, especially when there is a split vote.

**2. <u>Hearing, review, and action on amending Section 17.05.128 of the municipal code of American Fork City, titled "Signs and Advertising Structures"</u>**

Cherylyn Egner: The city has contemplated a change to the sign ordinance for quite some time. There is nothing that has prompted this, no specific developments, planning commission is going to see several codes coming through in the next 6 months. We are really trying to go through and clean up a lot of areas. This code should not hurt anyone's feelings if Planning Commission decides to make significant changes. This is something we based off other communities to present something to work off. If there are significant changes, we would look at the potential of tableling. We are looking for specific direct input and approval for specific changes. While we do believe it is very close, we have some areas that changes would be appropriate. Even on sizing, that is something that staff cannot make a recommendation to the Planning Commission. It is up to Planning Commission to make that decision. We are expecting some feedback and changes prior to moving this forward.

John Woffinden: Alright are there any questions?

Jenny Peay: Patrick sent an email today addressing some Utah Sign Associations and International Sign Association signs, I haven't had time to review those. Is there a time frame that we can be able to look at those?

Cherylyn Egner: This is Planning Commissions timetable. If Planning Commission wants to go through the ordinance, it is up to the chairman how he wants to proceed forward.

John Woffinden: If I had my way, I would table this to give everyone time to look at it I know I just received this email today also. I feel it would be in the best interest of the ordinance to give

the due process that we should table it and come back in two weeks or a month and have time to really look over it and tear it apart.

Cherylyn Egner: The only request I would have chairman is that because it was an ordinance change there was a public notice required. So, I would ask that we at least accomplish that part tonight before we proceed forward.

John Woffinden: We can do that. Any other comments?

Rodney Martin: You said there was no particular person or company asking for the change?

Cherylyn Egner: Correct

Rodney Martin: So, there is nobody asking for the change?

Cherylyn Egner: Not these particular changes no. There are always changes being requested, that's a given anytime you ask if there is somebody making a request for a change, even to the sign ordinance particularly. But this ordinance is not moving forward for any particular development or company.

Rodney Martin: And do we have information telling us what cities we compared with and took these requirements from? Park City is totally different in their ordinances. They are very restrictive, have to look a certain way and have to conform. I mean what cities do we have that in here?

Cherylyn Egner: We did not include that information. What we did is we took a model ordinance and compared it to other municipalities within Utah County, South Salt Lake and South Salt Lake County. Just trying to stay comparable to surrounding cities even though American Fork is unique. You can't necessarily work off Orem in American Fork it is a very different dynamic. Even the downtown district is significantly different. If there is any ordinance brought to Planning Commission we will compare to neighboring cities.

Rodney Martin: Obviously we don't want someone nailing a 4 x 8 piece of plywood with crayon scribbled on it as their business sign. I just wanted to see where we're coming from on that.

Christine Anderson: Is there an area where different signs will differ? Like a large sign on Main Street will not work as well as a large sign pasted to the side of a PI 1 zone warehouse? Isn't it based on the size of the lot or the building?

Cherylyn Egner: Correct and there are also different zones. Main Street is a historic downtown zone. But that does not correlate with some of the downtown district throughout the code. None of the district's referenced in this code equate directly to any specific zone or otherwise noted in our code. Its looking at the districts from a signage perspective. Within one zone there may be different signs allowed on one side verses the other. Simply because of what is surrounding it. Not wanting the bright illumination backing up to a residential zone, or the lot may be in a commercial zone. That's why these districts don't correlate directly with the zoning in the city.

Christine Anderson: The issue was brought up about non-conforming uses, or preexisting signs.

Cherylyn Egner: Anything that is preexisting is grandfathered in. If they ever go abandoned, move or relocate or change their sign, then they would fall under the new code. We are not going to tell people to take current signs down.

Bruce Frandsen: I did have a chance to look through some of those emails today, some points have merit some do not.

Cherylyn Egner: I don't disagree at all.

Bruse Frandsen: You made the comment about making changes, I don't see the motion, but if we recommend approval, it than goes to Council, is it City Council who your'e expecting to say instead of 32 square feet its 34 square feet or do we go through those nuts and bolts? Who do we give those recommendations to?

Cherylyn Egner: If Planning Commission wanted to move it forward today, and say it was "We move to approve the proposed ordinance with the following changes: The permitted sign face may be up to 40 square feet, right?" You could make adjustments tonight, if there is a lot of adjustments, then I would just ask for some direction tonight so we can start incorporating some of those changes. Or so we can get something together that is closer to what the Planning Commission is thinking to present at the next meeting.

Bruce Frandsen: I just went through this with one of my businesses in another city, and I can tell you these sign codes are not really nailed down. As an owner there can be 8 different ways to read it. And it depends on who you talk to on what kind of sign you put up.

Cherylyn Egner: That's exactly why we're looking to do this. And really that's why we're looking at a lot of codes. Because there is so much development coming in and we want to make sure the changes that need to be made are made.

John Woffinden: Do we need more time to analyze this?

Rodney Martin: I don't feel comfortable recommending this. Especially with so many issues brought up.

John Woffinden: We need more time. Its not fair for us to blindly pass it without reading it in detail and making sure we know what's there.

Patrick O Brien: Mr. Chairman can I just add that that comment from the public was something we got recently. I didn't want it to be reflected that it was something that we did have and didn't give to you until the last moment.

John Woffinden: I understand but the planning commissions had the basic document, but how this big email came in, it is 58 pages long. And we need to analyze it to see if their comments are

worth regarding. It should not have been sent out if we didn't have time to review it. Its not fair for us to make a decision on something we have not had the time to review.

Patrick O'Brien: It was intended to be a public comment. Which is why it was sent for the meeting.

John Woffinden: We can make it a public comment but its way too long to read in.

Harold Dudley: I like it, but I do think we need to have the opportunity to hear people's comments. Apologized he did not get back to Patrick.

**Harold Dudley motioned to table this Action item.**

John Woffinden: This does require a public hearing as well, yes.

Christine Anderson: I would like to have some time to discuss this as well so we can give them some things to work with.

**Public Hearing Opened:**

Steve Hyatt: I am from Kaysville; I am here tonight representing Young Electric Sign Company. This reminds me of a meeting we had in Kaysville about changing our solar and we knew what we had before us was perfect. Then a bunch of industry members came and said we understand where you're headed but we have a bunch of insight that would be very valuable. As you consider to table this, you should get stakeholders together to give you some insight that would help you, the city, and businesses.

Chris Florence: I live off of 310 South on Storrs Avenue. I received a letter that I was within 500 feet of the sign. Are we including freeway signage in this?

John Woffinden: It is included but along I-15 has a whole different set of rules about spacing and size.

Chris Florence: Is that something American Fork city has the ability to control?

John Woffinden: We have to follow what UDOT puts along I-15 is that correct?

Cherylyn Egner: That's correct UDOT has its own regulations.

Chris Florence: So, complaining about the big sign in my backyard is not going to be useful here is what you're saying?

John Woffinden: It would be better to talk to UDOT about that.

Harold Dudley: The sign industry, they have a great lobby and effort at the state legislative. They are able to get a lot of state laws approved that preempt the city to do some things. That's

not bad or good. Some is the city, UDOT and state legislative that dictates what we as a city can do. I know our legal staff has taken that into consideration as they have drafted this ordinance.

Shauna Gappmeyer: I am also here representing YESCO. It is my job to read city codes and make sure our signs conform to all codes and regulations. We have found American Forks existing code to be very fair and workable. We don't have to request many variances to your existing code. The changes that have been proposed to the code are very restrictive to projects proposed in this area. They would be significantly affected by that in terms of height and area restriction to a very significant degree. A significant portion of the area would be reduced. That impacts the visibility of the advertising of our businesses. We have some concerns about grandfathered signs. There is a clause that says any existing sign that doesn't conform can be grandfathered in but if they make changes in the future they would have to conform. It concerns us because a large percentage of signs will be non-conforming. It will keep owners from upgrading their sign. Because if they make any changes at all they are going to lose the area of their signage. That is not something they are going to want to do. It is our recommendation that this be tabled until more input from the community and businesses can be had.

Harold Dudley: Can I ask a question, because you've looked at this more than I have. In your experience non-conforming signs, may become old and dilapidated and not improved because they will lose their size or square footage?

Shauna Gappmeyer: They would hesitate. Many different city codes read such that if you make any minor changes like a different tenant comes in it doesn't cause you to change your sign. But that is not how this code reads. This one is way more restrictive than codes I've seen. Any little change seems that they would have to bring a sign into conformity, it is alarming. There is a significant reduction in area and height.

Christine Anderson: Given that we are not Salt Lake County, what numbers would you as a developer need? That you would think would be more workable?

Shauna Gappmeyer: There is nothing in the changes about freeway zones. We are concerned that the way it is worded it would impact those signs, significantly reducing the area. Those signs are meant to be read from a far distance at great speed. American Fork is not Salt Lake City. Salt Lake Cities downtown area is very compact with slow moving traffic. American Fork has a highway running through it, and it's not 25 miles per hour. It is not based on population it is based on property size. The lot size, size of building, the zone, and how it is designed to be read by traffic. You want it large enough to be read. So people can safely make decisions to turn in time. Those are the calculations when writing a proposal for a sign for permitting.

Christine Anderson: When I'm looking at these numbers, they don't mean a whole lot to me. I need to know what the better numbers are if you disagree with them.

Shauna Gappmeyer: We have a proposed sign in the freeway zone.

Harold Dudley: What kind of sign? An off premise sign?

Shauna Gappmeyer: It is an on-premise sign that is designed to be seen from a freeway. These people have frontage on the freeway. Their sign is on their property, advertising their business. The proposed area is about 350 square feet. That is according to our engineering calculations for it to have good visibility on the freeway.

Christine Anderson: So, part of our code needs to apply to our freeway zone?

Patrick O'Brien: We do have a number of overlay maps in the code that highlight these areas.

Christine Anderson: So, there is provision for that kind of thing with the proposed code.

Shauna Gappmeyer: Our proposal is to table this so we and the business community can give you more feedback. And maybe they can get some feedback from you as to why the signage that they have now would be cut back.

Harold Dudley: I think we have more people coming up. I do have a question of staff. Did we advise?

Patrick O'Brien: We did speak to professionals in the advertising industry and did some of our research. I understand some of the concerns that these advocates from the advertising industry are providing as well. We are also trying to strike a balance from their perspective. We're concerned about character, districts, and placemaking as well. Without over advertising and we're not hearing that side of the argument from the community.

Harold Dudley: Just so everyone is aware we've had quite a staff turnover as of late. So our staff members are stretched and we appreciate their efforts.

Nate Seacrest: On behalf of Reagan advertising, I am a resident of American Fork. We are also interested in which communities you are taking your input from on this. We've worked with several cities on their sign ordinances, we want to make sure that you get this right. We are excited to work with staff. It is our request that you do table this so we have more of a chance to work with them.

Christine Anderson: Cherylyn is it helpful during the public hearing to get specifics of what we can do. Or is your job over the next few weeks to meet with them and get the specifics?

Cherylyn Egner: Given the feedback, I would ask these individuals to leave their contact information today. I'm happy to reach out to them and try to incorporate some changes into the code. We are looking to have a quick turnaround on this we want to move this forward. Some of the things mentioned was the decrease in signage area. We are happy to go back and make changes with direction from Planning Commission. Even if the Commission has general feedback, I can incorporate it when I speak with these individuals. I think the requests form the sign industry are going to be opposite from the residents. I think we are looking to strike a balance.

Harold Dudley: I don't think our signage along American Fork State Street are major collectors. I understand the importance of the businesses to advertise in a way that is appropriate for the city and for their economic stronghold. I don't want American Fork to look like some of State Street in Orem. I think we as a Planning Commission need a little more industry input.

Cherylyn Egner: There is a notice that goes out to the sign companies and the property owners within a certain distance of the sign. I'm also happy to put together a bullet point of their requests and put together what has and hasn't been incorporated.

Rodney Martin: Do you have a side by side or red line of what the current ordinances are compared to the changes?

Cherylyn Egner: No because the current ordinance is a page and a half, and this is much longer than that. This is a complete rewrite from scratch. I can highlight some of the changes from size and distance requirement. But it would be impossible to do a red line.

Rodney Martin: Where are we at now? Mentioned if his business sign conforms to current code. I need time and we as a Comission need more time.

Christine Anderson: I would like to talk about a couple of specifics. The curfew11pm-5am for businesses unless the business is open late. How do we feel about that? I know residents may feel differently but what do we think?

John Woffinden: You mean how close it is to residential areas?

Christine Anderson: Yes, what kind of feedback do we have about that?

Rodney Martin: Turning off business signs that are part of our marketing, people should know where businesses are. We should be able to have them on, maybe at a reduced brightness. Having main street be a dead zone, I don't think that is something that should be done because lack of light produces crime.

Jenny Peay: I have a question on the grandfathered portion. Businesses that want to replace an existing sign do you calculate that based on the current square footage and what's already been there. Or once they take it down does it have to conform?

Cherylyn Egner: It would have to conform when it was replaced. That is the current code, if you are replacing it would have to conform with current code. The concern with that is that this ordinance would make many signs non-conforming. Replacing an old sign would be replacing it with a conforming sign. The issue is if this ordinance reduces to create non-conforming signs.

Jenny Peay: What if they were just to add lighting or change the tenant?

Cherylyn Egner: Changing a tenant wouldn't trigger that but adding lighting would change the type of display so that would trigger it. That's been a concern with the comments that have been made over the last couple of years. That some of these signs that are conforming in the city now

that have been switched over to illuminated signs are more then what we wanted for the size of an LED sign. But the code doesn't have those restrictions in it now. If you're changing the type of sign it should have to conform with the current code.

Christine Anderson: What about the restrictions of the level of illumination of signs.

Cherylyn Egner: I cannot speak to the level of illumination. I am glad to speak to everyone here about what they would like to see.

John Woffinden: It depends on how close it would be to a residential zone too.

Cherylyn Egner: Correct, we did have a Council work session to discuss signage and that was a great concern to council.

Harold Dudley mentioned that illumination were discussed 3 years ago.

Cherylyn Egner: It was for a certain project that the approval of the plan had to have a special light. I don't recall changing our sign ordinance to this nature. I know we changed it two years ago but that had more to do with the political signage.

Patrick O'Brien: We do have some language in the code about illumination levels. But it's for lighting plans not related to advertising but for lighting actual lots. Ensuring everything is downlit and making sure we don't have upward spillage of light.

Rodney Martin: That came up when IFA went in, and the neighborhood behind them wanted a certain level of light and times of light with the light shining in the neighborhood.

Christine Anderson: So, we already have something similar to this with signage where its abutting a neighborhood or something like that rules might be different

Cherylyn Egner: We can create barriers. Patrick and I were talking about another overlay on portions of North County. That's not something that's included in this. That might be something to consider as well.

Patrick O'Brien: That's given the uniqueness of American Fork Hospital and the lighting for life flight and managing those lights.

Christine Anderson: mentioned animated signs, flashing signs, signs that scroll and flash text and graphics. That's one of the main issues other than signs.

Cherylyn Egner: This is one we will take the direction of planning commission. One of the objections was the 8 second scrolls.

Christine Anderson: Would that be like American Heritage school that has that?

Patrick O'Brien: We don't regulate the schools. But it is similar to that type of sign.

Christine Anderson: what about the one by the library does that one scroll?

Cherylyln Egner: That sign is likely to be altered because it would not be in conformance. Because the way that it scrolls is ineffective given the speed limit and the scrolling speed and the concern for distraction.

Rodney Martin: So, the council asked for an 8 second delay between scrolls?

Cherylyln Egner: They didn't say this is what we want. They didn't give direction knowing it was coming through Planning Commission. They left it fairly open because it is a distraction.

Rodney Martin: You don't want the changes to turn it into a flashing sign. I recommend staff look at speed limit, road size, and time that a driver needs to read the sign. Scrolling signs are heard to read, and ineffective because 50 MPH is a lot different the 20 MPH.

Jenny Peay: I would also include height in that too.

Rodney Martin: Yes, because one height can be visible in one place like main street and invisible in another place like North State.

Harold Dudley: I do believe staff can save time. I do trust the signage companies and understand that they have the knowledge of what needs to be done.

Christine Anderson: Is flash text a certain speed or can the text change for 5 seconds and that's a flash?

Patrick O'Brien: I think it is the abruptness, the illumination levels. I kind of know it when I see it.

Christine Anderson: Does there need to be a definition?

Patrick O'Brien: I think we need to clearly define it so everyone can work within that parameter.

Cherylyn Egner: There is not as much concern if it is limited to 8 seconds. If you're not allowing a change every 8 seconds, you're not allowing flash.

Rodney Martin: Are you going to require it to fade in and out or what?

Cherylyn Egner: It has to be hard change.

Christine Anderson: Animated signs, what feedback do we have about that?

Rodney Martin: You don't want a sign that's going to cause crashes. We can't have anything GIF level or a commercial type of movement because people will get distracted.

John Woffinden: I think we have enough for today. The sign industry is aware so hopefully we can get this right.

Jared Johnson: Do not close public hearing – we would like to work with staff and get public input.

Patrick O'Brien: We limit our public hearings to 20 minutes, and we are close to the 40-minute mark.

Jared Johnson: I'm saying if the planning commissioners choose to continue this item, we should not close the public hearing.

Partrick O'Brien: I think we were planning on noticing it anyway for transparency.

Jared Johnson: There is a state requirement for noticing. That's why nobody showed up until tonight because that notice should have taken place at the beginning of this, but it did not until last week.

Patrick O'Brien: Clarification: That was when this text came together.

Jared Johnson: We didn't see a text until last week. This is the first public hearing we've had to make a comment to the Planning Commission. I'm with Media Resources we've done many signs in this area.

John Woffinden: Can we leave the public hearing open at this point?

Cherylyn Egner: You can we will just re notice.

John Woffinden: We will leave the public hearing open and accept public comments in the future. We will get as much information as possible to make a decent decision when we make it.

**Christine Anderson motioned to table amending section 17.05.128 of the municipal code of American Fork City, titled "Signs and Advertising Structures." Harold Dudley seconded the motion. Voting was as follow:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Harold Dudley** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**3. <u>Hearing, review, and action on amending section 17.05.133 of the municipal code of American Fork City, title "Off-Street Parking Standard"</u>**

Patrick O'Brien: The packet has an updated map and allows on-street parking along the frontage of properties to be calculated in the off-street parking requirements. It is not the whole CC-1 zone but basically our main downtown. It replaces a map that is in the existing code and eliminates the no parking requirement for certain places as well. It would help projects downtown to use on street parking in the off-street parking requirements.

John Woffinden: Questions for Patrick or engineering on this one? It is in conjunction with the Harrington school.

Cherylyn Egner: It will impact Harrington School. But it will allow for other businesses to proceed forward for parking requirements.

Patrick O'Brian: This is city led and not being pushed by anyone else.

Christine Anderson: This is only for pre-existing?

Patrick O'Brien: For existing spaces that are on street.

Christine Anderson: That the business can now include for their required parking?

Patrick O'Brien: As long as it is directly in front of their frontage. They can't use anything in adjacent spaces.

Christine Anderson: So previously if they had on street parking in front of their building, they couldn't call it theirs but now they will be able to?

Patrick O'Brien: Correct, it will still be public parking, but it will be allowed to go into the calculation.

Cherylyn Egner: This not just for existing buildings and parking spots, with consent of Council, stalls could be rotated from horizontal to diagonal or diagonal to horizontal. The city would have to agree because that is a city road. Parking that is there can be counted.

Rodney Martin: So, none of them could place a no parking or tow away zone if you are not a customer?

Cherylyn Egner: No.

John Woffinden: Are there any other comments?

**Public Hearing Opened:**

Spencer Stevens: I am the Vice President of Harrington center of the Arts and a downtown resident. The current downtown code in CC-1 is inequitable based on how the map was drawn. It created a lot of uncertainty based on where the current stalls are drawn. There is a risk at the city level of what can be proposed under the current code. As a stake holder downtown, we are

supportive of these changes and a wholistic downtown approach. By expanding the boundaries of the map, we create a more uniform downtown area, I think that drives value to the property owners and the city as a whole. Allowing for use of on street parking stalls regardless of the size of the improvement, speaks to the urban nature of downtown. This will facilitate more impactful improvements downtown by providing more clarity and flexibility to how businesses can park by counting these stalls.

Curtis Miner: I also serve on the board of the Harrington center of the arts. Reviewing the text there is one that concerns us, item 2 in the proposed ordinance. Which reads the proposed reconstructing or expansion will not reduce the number of off-street parking spaces along the frontage of the project. As we worked on the site plan for the school, we are going to be sliding some things around, providing fire department access. It gives us no flexibility to modify or adjust or count in parking. Our encouragement is to not restrict yourselves so there is no room to get what needs to be done, done. Our recommendation might be that the proposed reconstruction or expansion will not significantly reduce the parking spots. Or another may be revied by the Community Development Director or the Planning Commission.

Christine Anderson: Are you saying if they're adding extra accesses, they may be reducing the total number of on street parking?

Curtis Miner: For example, I'm making up numbers, let's say along the west edge of the Harrington School we have 15 parking stalls and with the repositioning we end up with 14, the way this is written is that it is not allowed. We need to give ourselves a little bit of room to work with the city and the developer. We are not asking for significant reductions we are just looking for a provision that allows a conversation to happen.

Rodney Martin: The proposed reconstruction or expansion will not reduce the number of off-street parking spaces unless required by public safety. Because the Fire Department may say we need parking to be 20 feet wide and not 7. So, you shouldn't be penalized for that is that what you're asking?

Curtis Miner: Yes, that is what we are concerned about is the public safety requirement. When that building was built the international fire code didn't exist and now there are requirements of that code that put a fire truck within a certain distance. You may also want to allow for other adjustments to be made.

Rodney Martin: I think because when we say significantly it means something different to everyone. So, if we can keep it well defined, I think we are in safer waters there.

Christine Anderson: Cherylyn is there a specific wording for that kind of adjustment?

Cherylyn Egner: Defers to Patrick.

Patrick O'Brien: Significant is not a precise word. I am fine with the proposal to leave this to the zoning administrator and development director. Working with them on issues like public safety allowing fire apparatuses to get close to buildings. Working though some challenges for public

safety issues, I'm fine if at the end of point 2 if we can add in "unless approved by the development services director" that would work from a legal perspective.

Cherylyn Egner: I agree, that is my preference. The word penalize, this is something to help the businesses in this area to say as long as you meet this criteria you do get the benefit. Every other project in the city has to meet the parking on site requirements. So, if these standards are rigid, it's not penalizing anybody its not giving them extra that the city is trying to accommodate. Allowing the development services director, the ability to make some exception if there's a fire safety concern would be appropriate.

John Woffinden: Anybody else want to step forward?

**Public Hearing Closed**

Christine Anderson: Clarify outward boundary, this applies to the inside curb not the outside curbing.

Patrick O'Brien: Correct. The boundary is intentionally set in the center of the road.

Jenny Peay: Any frontage on any of these businesses that would allow any parking? Or that would prohibit it for safety reasons?

Cherylyn Egner: There would be some prohibition to parking toward a drive aisle or and entryway. Because you can't park within so many feet of an entryway. It depends where the businesses are and how close they are to an access way and how many access ways are along their frontage. Example The Harrington may have more, once they fully develop but they may have more access points and are more significantly impacted by not having that on street parking.

Jenny Peay: And the city will regulate where the parking stalls will be?

Cherylyn Egner: I don't think the city intends to alter the parking as it sits today. As development comes in, they may look to submit plans to the City Council that would alter that parking, council has ability to say yes or no. As it sits now that is the parking that exists.

Patrick O'Brien: It would be a case-by-case basis at the expense of the developer to address that on street parking issue. And enable them to avail themselves of that.

Cherylyn Egner: The city has no obligation to alter the parking as it sits today.

**Rodney Dudley moved to recommend amending section 17.05.133 of the municipal code of American Fork City, title "Off-Street Parking Standard with its proposed changes to part one section one E2. Jenny Peay seconded motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Harold Dudley** | **Aye** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

***Harold Dudley excused from meeting at 8:29 pm***

**4. <u>Hearing, review, and action on amending the American Fork City General Plan to adopt the Parks Master Plan.</u>**

Scott Roudabush: I am the chairperson of the parks, trails, and recreation committee. Major changes to this were separating core park and special use space. Which came to core acres 150.54. Level of service proposal on page 3, recommended to city council 5 acres/1000 residents. Impact fees are assessed with that level of service. If the city falls behind that after a number of years, an audit can be done and there will be a payback for the difference. We are currently at 4.52 acres/1000 residents. This would make it 5 as a standard.

Chrisitine Anderson: Do you have land set aside or purchased? How does it work for the TOD are you able to keep up?

Scott Roudabush: There is 30-acre purchase south of the freeway, set aside it's a done deal there is a three-year waiting period, 2 acres of that is for the fire station. There is a mixture of wetlands and not north of Boat Harbor, most of it is special use because it is wetlands protected. There is an acquisition on page 6 of this that starts with 2019 and shows our proposed 5 acres in 2022. It is an estimate of what would need to be purchased to keep up.

Jenny Peay: Would that 30 acres calculate for the next 2 or 3 years?

Scott Roudabush: Yes, some wanted to shoot for more some for less. 5 is achievable and we need to stay really close to that and not worry about a payback if they audit the impact fees.

Jenny Peay: If you purchased the land fully, the 30 acres, can you calculate that for the next 2-3 years?

Scott Roudabush: Camden Bird would have the answer. It's not going to be developed for 3 years.

Jenny Peay: Sometimes you get a better deal when you buy in bulk. Per acre is greater with smaller purchases. I just wondered if that would be an option.

Scott Roudabush: 1.9 annual increase based on 4-year average from 2016-2019. The city is looking for bigger land purchases. We're trying to get away from the small parks. The 30-acre park would be more like a regional park.

John Woffinden: I have a question about upkeep I know they are replacing the playground equipment at Martin Park. What they're putting in is less then what was in there before. Now there's 4 slides, nothing for the kids to climb on, no monkey bars, just 4 slides. Why are they going backwards when they're updating?

Scott Roudabush: Jason Thomson has presented the plan for update and to replace playgrounds because they went a number of years with no replacement in some of the parks. Jason has a schedule to replace those because they were run down. At Centennial Park they will be replacing that equipment with swings only. Jason looks at park traffic. I know they are replacing the ones in Hunter Park with play structures. That is something that the public has voiced concerns about what needs to be placed there.

John Woffinden: Martin Park has had two or three Eagle projects to fix up the pavillion and the city pulled three sets of horseshoe pits out and put two swings in. They could put more swings and Pickleball Courts there. This is totally ridiculous because the park has kids in there all the time. The new structure is less then what they had before. Martin Park is used all the time by kids and when they replace the structure just this last week it's smaller than it was to start with.

Scott Roudabush: Yes, Jason has a replacement plan and its been reviewed by the parks department.

John Woffinden: There were three sets of horseshoe pits that were taken out even though they were used all the time. It makes no sense for it to be smaller than what it started with. It's just ridiculous.

Scott Roudabush: I can take this back and discuss it with Jason. In this it talks about a scheduled replacement.

Christine Anderson: Is there a way to sign up for agendas emails or notices?

Scott Roudabush: For Park meetings?

Christine Anderson: Right, I know I've done it before. I'm sure there's a way somewhere.

Scott Roudabush: All I do is make sure Carolyn (or Terilyn?) gets a copy of the agenda 72 hours before the meeting.

**<u>Public Hearing Open</u>**

No Public Comment.

**<u>Public Hearing Closed</u>**

**Bruce Frandsen moved to recommend amending the American Fork City General Plan to adopt the Parks Master Plan. Jenny Peay seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Harold Dudley** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

**5. <u>Hearing, review, and action on a land use map amendment from the Residential Medium Density designation to the General Commercial designation, located at 355 East 200 South</u>**

**6. <u>Hearing, review, and action on a zone map amendment from the R2-7500 Residential Zone to the GC-1 General Commercial Zone, located at 355 East 200 South</u>**

Applicant Ty Johnson: We run a residential daycare next to GC-1 next to Calgary Church. We are trying to change our home to commercial daycare. The lot directly in front of us is in a lease with Wendy's and cannot be developed because it is residential.

Christine Andrerson: So, Wendy's owns that land but its residential?

Ty Johnson: It's owned by a resident in American Fork but its in a lease with Wendy's.

John Woffinden: For future expansion?

Ty Johnson: When I talked to the owner, he said his family owned the land for years and they are collecting lease payments from Wendy's.

Patrick O'Brien: Sometimes there is a franchising agreement to lease the land but not actually own it. Commissioners do you need anything else from a planning perspective? I know this is not how we usually do things. From a planning perspective I looked at the lot and current land use designation and what is being requested to change. As well as the current zoning that the applicant is asking to change it to. Because it is already adjacent to that existing zone that the applicant wants to move down. I would look at 200 South as being that hard boundary that the GC-1 zone would not go further south. Future development in that area may warrant that moving that GC-1 zone down to the residential properties north of 200 South. Staff supports the request of the applicant. We would not look unless instructed by council or commission. I wouldn't look at moving commercial zoning any further south.

Christine Anderson: Do we have any other commercial down to 200 South on that road?

Patrick O'Brien: One other one further East on the development because where state street comes in at a diagonal not everything to the west is going to go down to 200 South. Its going to come down mid-block and upper block for first South so 200 South won't be the hard boundary for everywhere along it, but I think we need to just look at future potential development especially with that road layout on state street because it is so unique.

John Woffinden: Does Engineering have any problems with this project?

Ben Hunter: No, the condition we had in there is that if the zone change is approved there's additional right of way on 200 south that would need to be dedicated as outlined in our engineering report.

**Public Hearing Open for both**

No Public comment.

**Public Hearing Closed for both**

**Christine Anderson motioned to recommend land use map amendment from the Residential Medium Density designation to the General Commercial designation, located at 355 East 200 South. Rodney Dudley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

**Christine motioned to recommend a zone map amendment from the R2-7500 Residential Zone to the GC-1 General Commercial Zone, located at 355 East 200 South. Rodney Martin seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

**7. Review and action on a final plat for Station 52, located in the area of Harvey Boulevard, in the Public Facilities (PF) Zone**

**8. (Pulled from the agenda and moved to next meeting) Hearing, review, and action on a site plan for Station 52, located in the area of Harvey Boulevard, in the Public Facilities (PF) Zone.**

Patrick O'Brien: New Fire station for American Fork in the northeast section of town, final plat application is being provided just to consolidate existing parcels. Very straight forward from a planning side of things. Engineering has a couple conditions just on moving forward. We were working through it until the last minute that's why we have a few things to condition.

Ben Hunter: The outstanding TRC comments related to the plat, they've been working on that. A lot of it is text changes that needs to be removed or added and be addressed and finalized prior to going to city council.

**Jenny Peay motioned to recommend final plat for Station 52, located in the area of Harvey Boulevard, in the Public Facilities (PF) Zone. Bruce Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

## 9. Discussion on upcoming Projects/Concept Plans (formerly Site Plan Meetings)

Patrick O'Brien: For the last couple months we've been pretty busy, turns out it was a lot of catch up of people trying to get into the system. We've slowed down on our site plan meetings. We're just dealing with concept plan meeting which is four every Monday we have a manageable workload ahead. No major developments coming down the pipeline. There may be a couple text amendments that we discussed with developers. Establishing specific uses in a zone to specify the language and clarify everything. That will come before planning commission in 4-6 weeks depending on developers. Nothing major, we are caught back up and moving forward.

## 10. Other Business

- Planning Commission dinner next Wednesday for Planning Commission, meet at 6 pm Sol Agave.
- Planning Commissioner training. Additional training information together with Cherylyn and how to deliver that to everyone and look into other options to get additional training.
- On the upcoming agenda we will have station 52 site plan.
- Rockwell Block 8
- Sign ordinance a couple meetings away
- Chairman Woffinden: stated that where Planning Comissioners are appointed and City Councilors are elected, that city council can talk to developers but not Planning Commission members. Any discussion between developers and commissioners MUST take place in front of the entire Commission. This is per State Law as he understands it. Patrick mentioned that a discussion needs to happen with Cherylyn and get more information about that.

## 11. Minutes of the March 16, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Session

**Rodney Martin moved to approve minutes of March 16, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Session. Jenny Peay seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Abstain** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

**12. <u>Adjournment</u>**

**Christine Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting. Bruce Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Chairman Woffinden** | **Aye** |
| **Christine Anderson** | **Aye** |
| **Bruce Frandsen** | **Aye** |
| **Jenny Peay** | **Aye** |
| **Rodney Martin** | **Aye** |

**The motion passed**

The meeting adjourned at 8:57 pm.