

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION JUNE 22, 2022

The American Fork City Planning Commission met in regular session on June 22nd, 2022 at the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:00 p.m.

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

Absent:

Staff Present:

Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Ben Hunter	Engineer
JJ Hsu	Engineer
George Schade	IT Director
Lori Faught	Admin Assistant
Melissa White	Admin Assistant

Others Present:

Ginger Romriell, Chad Maughn, Paul Rosser, Kristie Rosser, Madison Rosser, Jeff Walker, Cyndi Buhler, Frank Buhler, Mark Barlow, Keriann Barlow, Carroll Barlow, Joe Garlington, Kristin Wood, Thatium Falls, Russ Nelson, Adam Anderson

1. Chairman Woffinden led the "Pledge of Allegiance"

APPROVED MINUTES

2. Review and action on an accessory building located in the area of 434 N 200 W, in the R2-7500 zone.

Patrick O'Brien: Section 17.5.105 of the code requires that any accessory buildings in excess of 1000 square foot get approval by the Planning Commission to move forward to our Building Division. That's why this item is here before us. The requirements of the code also outline what all the setbacks, side, rear, and front would be part of that accessory building. At this point, the applicant is only looking for approval from the Planning Commission to move forward with constructing a concept design similar to what is included in the packet. Staff doesn't see any issues with the proposal, so long as they meet all of the requirements of the setback section of the code. Which would be inspected by our Building Division staff when submitted for a permit. The applicant, Mr. Buhler, is here if you've got any further questions.

John Woffinden: Can the applicant please come forward and address the Commission and tell us what you've got planned?

Frank Buhler: I'm just looking to build an accessory building in the back corner of the lot. There is a garage currently there, if you can call it a garage. All of that is going to be taken down and the buildings in the back are going to be removed and I'll make it into one nice L-building. I'm actually looking at building it out of wood because the supply chains are changing so quickly. So, I may go a little bit taller, and get a loft in there. The square footage is pretty close to the same.

Jenny Peay: Is the building going to be in any easements?

Frank Buhler: Not that I'm aware.

Patrick O'Brien: No, and that's something that will be checked by the building inspectors as those plans are submitted. This isn't something we required a site plan for. The site plan would be submitted to the building division to pull their permits at that point.

Frank Buhler: I think it shows thirty by fifty-five, I may do sixty if permitted.

John Woffinden: It's still over 1000 feet?

Frank Buhler: Yes.

APPROVED MINUTES

John Woffinden: Any other questions or concerns for Planning department?

Patrick O'Brien: I just want to add as well that you are the approving body on this item, not the recommending body, so this does not go to City Council

Public Hearing Opened

No public comment

Public Hearing Closed

Bruce Frandsen motioned to recommend approval for the Accessory Building, located in the area of 434 North 200 West in the R2-7500 Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Staff Report, or recommended by the Fire Marshal.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden AYE

Harold Dudley AYE

Christine Anderson AYE

Rodney Martin AYE

Chris Christiansen AYE

Bruce Frandsen AYE

Jenny Peay AYE

The motion passed

John Woffinden states that David Bird will not be voting but will be a part of the conversation and discussion on each item.

3. Hearing, review, and action on a proposed zone change from the R1-9000 zone to the Professional Office (PO-1) zone, for the property located at 1096 E 50 S

Patrick O'Brien: This is similar to a couple of items we've had in previous meetings where the underlying land use designation and the zoning don't meet with one another. The land use designation here will allow for a professional office

APPROVED MINUTES

1 which will be the commercial use for the area. The applicant is just asking that the
2 Planning Commission recommend approval of the zone change to the PO-1, or the
3 Professional Office zone, to match that underlying land use designation. Our staff
4 didn't find any issues with that proposal. We'd like to look at our long-range plan in
5 terms of our land use as our guide for the future.

6
7 John Woffinden: Engineering, any comments or concerns on this?

8
9 Ben Hunter: No, the only thing that we have stated is that if the zone change is
10 approved, there's a small portion of the sidewalk that currently exists that is on the
11 private property. So, we just asked that it be deeded to the city so it's a public right
12 of way and a public sidewalk.

13
14 John Woffinden: Any questions for Planning Commission or Engineering?

15
16 Jenny Peay: Do we have an idea of what they are looking to do there?

17
18 Kristie Rosser: I'm the owner of the property, and I've run a medical clinic out of
19 the property for the last six years. I just found out that it wasn't commercial. I've
20 been paying commercial taxes on it and been running the business out of it and the
21 previous owners have been running a business out of it for the last 16 years. So, it's
22 one of those things where, as Patrick said, it just isn't matching its use. It's sitting
23 on the retail and professional office street where American Fork City is really
24 building that out. So, I feel like the building meets the use of American Fork City
25 in that way. It really is for medical office space only, or professional office space
26 only. It couldn't be used as a home even though it does look like a home. There's
27 no kitchen or shower or anything in there. So really, the best use of the building is
28 going to be a professional office space.

29
30 John Woffinden: This is an older house on the southwest corner? It's been
31 commercial for a long time.

32
33 Kristie Rosser: Yes. It has.

34 35 **Public Hearing Opened**

36
37 No public comment

APPROVED MINUTES

Public Hearing Closed

Jenny Peay motioned to recommend approval of the proposed zone change from the R1-9000 zone to the Professional Office (PO-1) zone, for the property located at 1096 E 50 S, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Staff Report.

Christine Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

4. Hearing, review, and action on a proposed text amendment related to Section 17.7.601 of the American Fork Municipal Code.

Patrick O'Brien: This relates to Section 17.7.601 part B in terms of permitted uses for the area. This was initiated by the applicants to include language for provisions to permit the automatic carwash under that permitted use for the zoning. That's a housekeeping item in a way because there are a number of automatic car washes that already exist in that zone. There are ancillary uses to the primary use of gas stations. We don't find any issues with it on the planning side. We did outline some time conditions of use from 7 am to 9 pm. This is to ensure that it wouldn't be used 24-hours, late into the night, or in the early morning which might negatively impact the area. That's all of the information the staff has. If you have any questions on the topic, I am happy to answer them.

John Woffinden: Any questions for Planning Commission? Engineering, any concerns on this one?

Ben Hunter: No, we did not have any comments on this one.

APPROVED MINUTES

Public Hearing Opened

No public comments

Public Hearing Closed

Rodney Martin motioned to recommend approval of the proposed text amendment related to Section 17.7.601 of the American Fork Municipal Code.

Harold Dudley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

5. Hearing, review and action on final plat for Timp Hollow Plat E Subdivision, located at approximately 1190 East 1000 North, in the R1-12,000 zone

Patrick O'Brien: This relates to lots 63 through 69 in the Timp Hollow development. This is an item that was previously approved. The reason is related to cross-section approvals or changes that can be approved by City Council. Ben has more information from the Engineering perspective. Nothing has changed from a Planning perspective when we did this review from the previous submittal, apart from the area related to the roadway cross-sections.

John Woffinden: There were some new Engineering issues?

Ben Hunter: Yes, to a recent code change that was made and approved by City Council that related to roadway cross-sections. They have reapplied to be able to conform to the new code and fall under the new ordinance with that. In this particular project it allows them to match the existing right of way elements. With

APPROVED MINUTES

eight-foot side paths, narrower park strips, and the roadway widths to match the existing conditions on 1100 North so they comply with that ordinance. Engineering recommends approval.

Public Hearing Opened

No public comments

Public Hearing Closed

Harold Dudley motioned to recommend approval of the final plat for Timp Hollow Plat E, subject to any findings, conditions, and modifications found in the engineering report.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

6. Hearing, review, and action on a site plan for Cost-U-Less Carpet, located in the area of 64 N 900 W, in the General Commercial (GC-2) zone

John Woffinden indicated that Number 6, Cost-U-Less Carpet, has been pulled by the applicant and will be placed on a future agenda.

7. Hearing, review, and action on a final plat for Barratt PUD, located in the area of 144 West Main St, in the Central Commercial (CC-1) zone

8. Hearing, review, and action for a site plan for the Barratt Avenue Development located in the area of 144 West Main St, in the Central

APPROVED MINUTES

Commercial (CC-1) Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Report or recommended by the Fire Marshal.

John Woffinden indicated items seven and eight will be discussed together but voted on separately.

Patrick O'Brien: The final plat and the site plan came in together at the applicants request so we could run them concurrently. The proposal consists of six lots that need to be consolidated as a part of the overall proposal. It's on 1.31 acres in our CC-1 Zone. The proposed plan includes a Demolition Plan to demolish some existing structures on-site. It will have a mix of some retail, commercial, and residential elements in the overall development. To accommodate parking on the site, the applicant has provided a shared parking agreement with an adjacent property owner. There were no issues that staff found in our review, and it met the requirements of section 17.7.210. Related to the submission of materials to Planning Commission, we recommend approval.

John Woffinden: Engineering, do you have any questions on these two items?

Ben Hunter: The plans meet the standard specifications and requirements for the Engineering division, and we recommend approval.

Jenny Peay: Where is parking going to be associated?

Patrick O'Brien: In the theater, I believe. I can't remember the direction the applicant told me. The applicant is here and would be happy to speak more on that.

Sam Drown: I'm with Concord Homes. The shared parking is with the theater on the East, and the agreement is an even swap of thirteen and thirteen. My new office, where we're going to be, we'll just be using that until 5 or 6 PM. They don't need it until after that time, so it seemed to be a good, even swap. That'll get us up to two and a half parking stalls per 1,000 square feet. I can't remember what the recommendation is, but it gets us to that.

David Bird: Is that agreement in perpetuity?

Sam Drown: Yes. It's been executed and it's ready to record. The city reviewed it a year ago to make sure we didn't get them to sign something that you guys wouldn't have approved of. But that was before Patrick came along.

APPROVED MINUTES

- 1 Bruce Frandsen: Has it been reviewed by our City Attorney?
- 2 Patrick O'Brien: Not that I'm aware of. But in addition to that, the recent changes
3 that the Planning Commission and the City Council approved would also allow the
4 use of any on-street parking stalls in this zone. It really helps to accommodate the
5 parking need that we're all finding ourselves in within our downtown zone. So,
6 along with this, the outcome does meet the parking in excess.
- 7 Rodney Martin: Thank you for doing something with this property.
- 8 Harold Dudley: I didn't see any elevations.
- 9 Sam Drown: I could hold some up.
- 10 Harold Dudley: Maybe I didn't see them, I'm just curious.
- 11 Sam Drown holds up the plans and references them.
- 12 Sam Drown: This is the office building. The idea is old and new. There's a lot of
13 brick old buildings around so we tried to combine the old with a modern corner on
14 the entrance.
- 15 Harold Dudley: That is South?
- 16 Sam Drown: That will be South facing Main Street. For the townhouse component,
17 I'll try and give you the best look.
- 18 David Bird: It will face Barratt Avenue?
- 19 Sam Drown: There's three buildings that would face all over the place, I guess.
- 20 John Woffinden: How many residential units do you have planned altogether?
- 21 Sam Drown: Sixteen.
- 22 John Woffinden: Your office will be in that commercial building?
- 23 Sam Drown: Yes, sir. We haven't designed the building fully yet, but we think
24 there will be enough room for us and one of our title companies or a lender. That's
25 the idea.
- 26 Bruce Frandsen: The shared parking is only relative to the office complexes, is that
27 correct?

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Sam Drown: If I understood the standard correctly. If we went one story on our
2 office building we show we would have enough. But to add that second story to
3 meet the standard we would need thirteen additional stalls. That's why we worked
4 out an agreement to swap thirteen.

5 Bruce Frandsen: But just for the office building, we're not talking about any of the
6 residences using that.

7 Sam Drown: They could, there would be no restriction on it. It's just parking for
8 the neighborhood and an office building.

9 Bruce Frandsen: You said originally that you'd only be using it until 5 PM. What
10 we're saying is residential tenants could be using that 24/7, is that correct?

11 Sam Drown: No, that would be against the rules. Our project together, the office
12 and the residential, would only be allowed by our CC&Rs to use that until I can't
13 remember if it says 5 or 6 PM. One of those two.

14 Jenny Peay: It looks like the townhomes have garages in the bottom of them.

15 Sam Drown: They all have two-car garages.

16 Patrick O'Brien: Yes, it would be guest parking that will be accommodated in that.
17 But then we also have that additional parking through the on-street provision and
18 the shared use.

19 John Woffinden: This is a unique situation. Usually, we have to fight over parking
20 spots to have enough. You're coming in with enough to start with so it's unique for
21 the Commission. Thank you very much for looking ahead. Any other questions or
22 concerns for the applicant? Any questions for Planning or Engineering on this?

23 Christine Anderson: I have a question for Planning. Does this fall into the business
24 in the CC-1 zone? Are there requirements for a minimum number of product types
25 on the exterior buildings? I recall making rules about that. Is it four?

26 Patrick O'Brien: I know what you're referring to. I think it was four that were
27 called out. This wasn't one of the ones that I reviewed; this was with Cody. I'm
28 trying to think about where he reviewed. Sam might be able to speak more about
29 the materials that are proposed for use in the building.

30 Sam Drown: Our proposal is exactly what I passed around. There are three
31 buildings. I think there's a six, a seven, and a three. They would all look like some

APPROVED MINUTES

1 variation of that based on how many units are in the place. Our intention was not to
2 change the style between the buildings.

3 Christine Anderson: Were you aware of a minimum of four different product
4 types?

5 Sam Drown: Nobody's ever commented back on that. In the design of our project,
6 we did this differently. We started with the design of housing and the building and
7 then we worked everything around that.

8 Christine Anderson: I don't mean product types like this one looks different than
9 this one.

10 Patrick O'Brien: Material.

11 Christine: Surface material.

12 Sam Drown: I think we've got plenty of that because we've got siding, stucco,
13 different kinds of siding, and metal. I think if it's the materials you're talking about,
14 we have more than four different materials.

15 Christine Anderson: On the face.

16 Patrick O'Brien: The language of the code calls for a variety of compatible exterior
17 materials. A minimum of four colors and designs shall be used on all buildings.

18 Sam Drown: I feel we well exceed that.

19 Patrick O'Brien: The architectural style shall consider the historical character of
20 the area as well.

21 Sam Drown: We had an architect come in from New York who we found through
22 Daybreak that does a lot of this kind of stuff. To drive around American Fork and
23 kind of pick out the elements. That was the idea was combining the old with the
24 new. That's the whole theme of this.

25 John Woffinden: That's what we want downtown, thank you very much.

26 Jenny Peay: I do have one last question. Maybe I'm not looking at this right, but it
27 looks like there's four buildings. You've got one that faces main, one that faces
28 Barratt Avenue, then the two buildings?

APPROVED MINUTES

Sam Drown: The one that faces Main is the office building. The one that faces Barrett is three townhome units, a three-plex building. Then there is a six and a seven that face each other with a courtyard between them. Then an alley that goes all the way around to access the garage. Does that make sense?

Jenney Peay: Yes.

Public Hearing Opened

No public comments

Public Hearing Closed

Christine Anderson motioned to recommend approval of the Final Plat for Barratt Avenue Development located in the area of 144 West Main St, in the Central Commercial (CC-1) Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Staff Report or recommended by the Fire Marshal.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

Public Hearing Opened

No public comments

Public Hearing Closed

Christine Anderson motioned to recommend approval of the Site Plan for the Barratt PUD, located in the area of 144 West Main St, in the Central

APPROVED MINUTES

Commercial (CC-1) Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Report or recommended by the Fire Marshal.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden AYE

Harold Dudley AYE

Christine Anderson AYE

Rodney Martin AYE

Chris Christiansen AYE

Bruce Frandsen AYE

Jenny Peay AYE

The motion passed

9. Hearing, review, and action on the preliminary plan and final plat for Beck Hillside Estates, located in the area of 757 North 200 East, in the R1-9000 Residential Zone

John Woffinden: We're going to do this a little bit differently. The applicant has a presentation they'd like to present. Sir, state your name for the record. We want to get the presentation over with as we've got a very long agenda tonight. We are going to give you five to seven minutes to present your presentation to the Commission at this time.

Jeff Walker: I am a counsel for Anderson Development Services and for Goldcrest Homes. I appreciate you letting us have a couple of minutes with you. We've provided you with a packet of information we hope you've been able to review. We made a few minor corrections, and a couple of spelling corrections, so hopefully if you saw those you will skip over them. I want to start just as a preliminary matter. I know this has been somewhat cantankerous and I apologize for that out of the gate. It is not our intention to be so. Certainly, projects bring out the best in people and they often don't always bring out the best in all of us. Hopefully tonight we'll go through and we can explain where we think we turned left rather than right on getting this thing finished. I think we're getting close. I put this together so that we might move things through pretty quickly. Clearly, we know that our objective

APPROVED MINUTES

1 tonight is to get a positive recommendation from you all for the preliminary and
2 final plat.

3 Jeff Walker and Patrick O'Brien discuss the presentation slides for a moment. Jeff
4 refers to the presentation as he speaks.

5 Jeff Walker: This area on the plat. This is where the property goes North, and we
6 have to decide how we terminate that properly. The issue is whether this dead-end
7 is to be determined permanent under the then-current regulations for a permanent
8 dead-end as provided by the municipal code at the time the application was made.
9 Whether it should be a temporary dead end, which we often refer to as a dead-end
10 street, or an access road. A permanent dead-end we often refer to by code and
11 definitionally as a cul-de-sac. *Jeff thanks Patrick for his help with the
12 presentation.*

13 Jeff Walker: Being a lawyer, if I didn't do this I don't get to charge as much. I'm
14 going to educate you guys about everything you already know. The first thing I'm
15 going to tell you is that it's pretty straightforward how we interpret statutes in Utah.
16 The first thing we look at is the plain meaning of the words. We don't try to have
17 bizarre meanings or obscure meanings. Just what do the words say? Second, we
18 look at statutes of where they have things that say "shall." Sometimes they say
19 "will." Sometimes they say "may." How those words are used is very specific to
20 how we interpret statutes. As the court has noted repeatedly, when we have a
21 "shall" in this statute it means it's a mandatory condition. It eliminates any
22 discretion. We're not allowed to have discretion. And unless it's amended by the
23 legislative part of the city, the city's not allowed to have discretion in that. And
24 then the last thing, which is usually the most important, is that we have to look at
25 the statutory scheme as a whole. As you know, there's often multiple facets to a
26 project and there's different statute provisions that have to be harmonized with
27 each other. If you look at your municipal code it is pretty straightforward. Section
28 15.01.100 I, the red is the only part I'm going to focus on, it says subdivisions shall
29 provide for the future extension of public streets to all adjacent properties. It then
30 goes on to note, so when you look at this, you know that this "shall" means that it's
31 not discretionary, it's mandatory. It does not matter what an adjacent landowner
32 may want to do. That makes good practical sense, right, because land owners
33 change over time. And in this case, we have very elderly landowners to the North.
34 And we know even at the last Commission Meeting when there was an open

APPROVED MINUTES

comment period, the daughter of the owners noted that they would not want a permanent cul-de-sac there because they think that there's a significant chance that in the future, they or the owner's grandchildren may want to develop that property. It really doesn't matter what they think. As Planners, which I've done for almost all my professional life, we know that we have to contemplate things that others might not. We have to be forward-thinking. And in this case, stubbing into this road, we know that's going to be something that they do eventually. For those of us who have grown up in the Salt Lake Valley, we have seen all these properties go from farmland and pastures to development. It's just a matter of unfortunate time. And then the last thing is, therefore, the access needs to be a temporary dead end in anticipation as required by this statute to provide access to adjacent properties. And then we look at the next part. That means that the cul-de-sac requirements, as defined in Section E of this provision, are not applicable. And this is clearly evident by the most recent revisions to this section. And if, in fact, this was a new application in which this new revision that you all suggested to the City Council, and they enacted in May of this year. They're combining now both temporary and permanent dead-end situations. I think it's problematic, and I think it'll prove problematic for you guys as you move forward. I'm not in charge of any of that. I'm only in charge of one little piece of dirt in your big city. What I mean by that is if you look at the prior section before it was amended it defines in section E, cul-de-sacs. Cul-de-sacs are dead-end streets designed to be permanently closed to through traffic. And then it gives requirements, it should not be longer than 400 feet, etc, etc, how you plan a permanent cul-de-sac subdivision. How you all changed it is just the new. It does help highlight how we are existing under this particular petition and application, which is dead-end streets permanent or temporary greater than 150 feet. To define those that would be all under the cul-de-sac rules. Well, if the permanent cul-de-sac rules are not applicable, then what is? And your city, you don't have a vacuum here. We know exactly what you all required by statute. And what it tells us under Section 15.14.014 is that you've adopted the 2018 version of the International Fire Code, including all appendices. Now, this is not an obscure concept. As I'm going to show you, when your staff reviewed these applications, they were applying this standard when we started.

John Woffinden: Sir, let me warn you you've used up five minutes of your time. You've used up five minutes of you allotted time. I want to hear about your subdivision. We don't need a lesson in the law. We're here to decide on what's

APPROVED MINUTES

1 current as of today, right now. Either it fits or doesn't fit the code. You've used up
2 five of your seven minutes trying to teach us about the law. We're not lawyers. We
3 don't want to be lawyers. We're here to decide on a piece of ground in the city.
4 Now you got two minutes to sum up and move on.

5 Jeff Walker: Chairman, can I ask you a question? Who ever told me I had five to
6 seven minutes? Is that yours?

7 John Woffinden: I told you that when we started.

8 Jeff Walker: Where are we in the code that I come here prepared, I present material
9 and you're going to cut me off in the middle of my presentation.

10 John Woffinden: Yes, because we've talked about this over and over again over
11 several meetings. Nothing has changed. We're still hashing over the same stuff and
12 your folks don't seem to want to apply the rules to your project.

13 Jeff Walker: Don't argue with me.

14 John Woffinden: Now don't wait for your seven minutes if you want to keep
15 arguing. Fine. We can vote on this right here and now and move on. We've got a
16 very large agenda. There's many more people who want to be heard before the
17 Planning Commission tonight. You've been here, this is the third or fourth visit I'm
18 aware of myself.

19 Jeff Walker: I've never been here.

20 John Woffinden: This project has been here many, many times. We've discussed
21 many, many issues where your folks never want to apply the rules correctly.

22 Jeff Walker: What do you want me to do now?

23 *John Woffinden and Jeff speak over one another for a moment.*

24 Jeff Walker: If you want to disparage me, disparage my clients, disparage this
25 project, it's all on the record. So, you do what you need to do. I'm here in good
26 faith. I'm trying to resolve a problem short of a lawsuit. And I'm trying to stop it
27 from going there. Now if you don't want to stop it from going there and you want
28 to cut me off, cut me off.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 John Woffinden: I'm here to help our citizens. We allowed you five to seven
2 minutes and you want to waste the time telling us about the law. We're not in here
3 to talk about the law.

4 Jeff Walker: Of course you are. The code is the law. The code is the law, so if we
5 can't apply and discuss the law then I don't know what we're doing. And we'll try
6 over - let me finish don't cut me off - let me just finish the concept. We have made
7 multiple efforts to comply with the code. We have provided multiple iterations of
8 different applications of how you would like to do it. Now you might not believe
9 that, Chairman, and you may want to be as rude to me as I heard you are rude to
10 others. That was recorded. But that's up to you. I can't control you.

11 John Woffinden: You come in one week it's a PUD. Next week it's a subdivision.
12 Which one are we talking about?

13 Jeff Walker: I'm trying to show you but if you want me to sit down, tell me to sit
14 down. Vote no. We'll go through the City. The City may vote no. And then we'll
15 take what remedies are available.

16 Rodney Martin: Anything you've told us is exactly what we heard last time, so tell
17 us something different.

18 Jeff Walker: These are the provisions. Let's move ahead because I want to get
19 there. If you look at our applications, the first time we applied... Let's just move
20 this through because, clearly, time is of the essence. And my time is not.

21 Rodney Martin: Tell us something different. We want to hear something you
22 haven't told us.

23 Jeff Walker: Okay, these are the iterations we tried to provide under the existing
24 code for a dead-end street. It's what the code provides. We have offered all three of
25 these. *Jeff Walker indicates the presentation should be skipped ahead* I mean, I
26 just don't know what I'm supposed to do. This was the first one we did under the
27 code. You kept saying, and I heard you because I listened to all of it. Mr.
28 Chairman. It's not code. You're not meeting code. You show me how using this
29 accepted alternative option approved by the City in the Municipal Code. And then
30 we put in our first application with that hammerhead and look at what happened.
31 Your Engineers approved it. Your Planning approved it, and the only concept was,
32 will you think about doing a cul-de-sac instead of a hammerhead? Not that it

APPROVED MINUTES

1 wasn't accepted. But would you? And at that point, if I would have been involved,
2 I would have said no. We're going to get into turning right or turning left and then
3 we're going to get lost because that's what happened. Because when we put in our
4 next application, the request was considered a cul-de-sac, which is permitted
5 temporary access under the International Fire Code. We did that and what we were
6 told by Rebecca Andrus is you don't need to do as big as a permanent. Look at the
7 ones in Lehi. So we did that. We did exactly multiple points that she told us to do.
8 But when it came back, they said no, we want the full 96 feet. All of a sudden, we
9 did veer. Not us, the Planning and Mr. O'Brien. Now they want to apply something
10 different. Then we'll say if you're going to do a cul-de-sac, which is what they
11 asked us to do, we're going to treat it as a permanent cul-de-sac. Why? Because
12 they said we talked to the adjacent landowner, and they don't want to develop their
13 property. But then we know at the meeting that we just talked about when we had a
14 public comment, the daughter said, quote: "I am Merrill Beck's daughter. I am
15 adjacent to the property, and we prefer not to have a cul-de-sac, the permanent
16 remedy. Someday my kids and grandkids would like to develop. The dead-end
17 would probably be better for us than the cul-de-sac." So even the concept that the
18 adjoining neighbors, which doesn't matter, they didn't even support it. At this point,
19 that's where the wheels came off. Because all of a sudden to comply with a
20 permanent cul-de-sac, you have a 400-foot requirement. Which does not apply to
21 temporary dead-end streets even if you use one of the options available on the
22 International Fire Code, which we did. If you look at it we then said in our last
23 submission let's go back to a hammerhead. It's provided on the International Fire
24 Code. It's provided in the code. It complies with the rules of the code, Mr.
25 Chairman. So when we offer that all of a sudden fire, which is the biggest concern
26 was saying, well how are we going to make sure someone doesn't park in the stub
27 to the hammerhead and they gave some suggestions. Now remember, the reason
28 why we use fire as the criteria is they are the biggest machines we have to push
29 down these streets. It's going to take the biggest effort to turn them around. But
30 they're not the only thing on public streets that you have to get turned around. You
31 have to get snowplows and garbage trucks. Forcing a gate over it won't work. What
32 we've suggested is lining it off, having it be a penalty zone, having it be a tow
33 zone, having a tow-away with a fine so that this section could be resolved.
34 Engineering or Planning continue to then say okay, those are reasonable things.
35 There are other little nuances like what happens when the street goes through and
36 you're going to abandon that portion of the aggregate. Who gets it if it's been

APPROVED MINUTES

1 dedicated to the city? As you all know, this is an easy fix, but it's a reversionary
2 clause. Once in the future that happens. It's not something that would be
3 permanent, because we know that it's going to go North. At that point what
4 happened was last week parenthetically, Chairman, I sent all of you a letter. I cc'd
5 the attorney on that. No one contacted us. I asked them to contact us. I left a
6 message at your lawyer's City Attorney's office to say what's going on. You
7 wouldn't even give us the redline to the comments. You wouldn't even let us
8 present? Nothing. Crickets.

9 Patrick O'Brien: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add on that one. It was difficult
10 for us to provide redline comments considering the applicant had requested to
11 move forward to Planning Commission on the resubmission. We didn't have
12 information ready until the very last minute as you are aware.

13 Jeff Walker: But even last minute, and I appreciate that because we all are
14 overbooked, underpaid, and feel pressurized. But the truth of it is the day of it you
15 could have sent it to us. The day before it you could have sent it to us. Whenever
16 they got there. I know this is late. I know you're going to be scrambling, we're
17 scrambling. But it required me to get engaged to write a letter claiming violations
18 of certain open law requirements. And I'm just noting that you all got the letter. I'm
19 sure you loved it because, you know, there's only two typos. But no one decided to
20 contact us. In the end, we have provided. If you want to claim, Chairman, that
21 we're not going by the code, then read the code. Because it says what it says. I'm
22 not trying to lecture anyone about how to read contracts, statutes, I'm just asking
23 you to apply them fairly. And when staff started requiring us to treat it like a
24 permanent cul-de-sac, which it isn't, and all the attended requirements of that, it got
25 zigged where it should have zagged. What we have provided, I am confident. I
26 have probably practiced law as long as you've done this. We're probably pretty
27 close to contemporaries. It's not like I'm coming here as a young pup, lost. I know
28 how to read the code. I know how we got turned sideways, and I'm trying to right
29 the ship on it. I asked for your consideration because I believe that this project will
30 be as nice. We have even taken the next step because we have an in-house
31 construction home building company design the homes. They're going to be built
32 in this because we're going to completely self-perform this contract. I believe it's a
33 worthy project. I believe it complies with all the requisite codes of American Fork.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 John Woffinden: Now we've heard from you. You said what applies. Let's hear
2 from Planning and Engineering department and see if they agree with what you
3 say. Planning, would you please take over.

4 Patrick O'Brien: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some background on the application.
5 Currently what's before you is a regular subdivision application under the R1-9000
6 zone. There is some information on the current plan set that requires or asks for
7 omissions on items that relate to a previous plan set for the PUD. Something that
8 needs to be disregarded on this plan set in your consideration for it. What we have
9 under consideration now was submitted on March 7th of this year, just as a regular
10 subdivision. Comments were then sent out on April 11th. Revised plans were
11 submitted on May 2nd by the applicant and the applicant in the same email
12 requested to take their revisions directly to Planning Commission without staff
13 being able to conduct a thorough review. In addition to some of that information,
14 staff has also made the applicant aware that there are a number of outstanding
15 invoices as well related to the reviews that have been done that still need to be
16 settled for a significant sum of money. None of the Engineering drawing standards
17 have been addressed or the comments that have been sent back to the applicant.
18 There's no other Planning information or comments, but I'm happy to let
19 Engineering speak further. If you have questions as well, Chief Brems from the
20 Fire Department is also here in relation to some questions on fire if you have any.

21 John Woffinden: Engineering, would you address this issue? Does it, or does it not
22 meet the code?

23 Ben Hunter: As to what we've provided to the applicant, there are a couple of
24 different sections of code related to street standards that this plan set does not meet.
25 One section is section 15.01.1520. That is our local minor collector standard which
26 shows a 62-foot right of way with five-foot sidewalk on either side, eight-foot park
27 strip, two-foot curb and gutter and 32 feet of asphalt. What they propose to do and
28 dedicate to the city includes the hammerhead notch. That does not conform to the
29 local road cross-section standard. We don't have a standard that notches out or has
30 drawings like that. It's a 62-foot-wide right-of-way section. As far as the dead-end,
31 I know that they brought up the recently approved section of code which, in their
32 case, is not applicable because they're under the old section of code. Even under
33 the old section of code, you had length requirements that it had to be less than 400
34 feet for dead-end streets. The only cross-section standard that we have for dead-

APPROVED MINUTES

1 end streets is in the development code. As far as any Engineering standards and
2 specifications for roadways, which are separate from any fire access turnaround,
3 they've got to meet both sections of code, both fire code and engineering standards.
4 The cul-de-sac details are listed in section 15.01.1430 which we've also provided
5 to the applicant. And it shows the standard cul-de-sac detail with a maximum
6 length of 400 feet from the right of way that it's connecting to the beginning of the
7 cul-de-sac and their plan set does not show that cul-de-sac on there. The only other
8 section, which is also referenced, which by default references the local road cross-
9 section standards, section 17.8.304.B states that streets conform to city standards.
10 Exceptions: All streets within the subdivision project shall conform to city
11 standards for right-of-way width and alignment and be improved in accordance
12 with city standards. Again, the only city standard that we have for a local road is
13 that local road cross-section that I referred to previously. With that reference in
14 there those are the sections that don't comply with code. The local road standard
15 and the cul-de-sac standard, we have not seen a plan set which conforms to that.
16 That's why we would recommend denial because it does not meet those sections of
17 code.

18 John Woffinden: Any questions or comments from the Commission for planning
19 and or engineering?

20 Jenny Peay: I would like to hear from Chief Brems and hear his views on this.

21 Chief Aaron Brems: Any applicant, including this applicant, must meet both the
22 fire code and the development code. We enforce that for everyone. So let me give
23 you examples of where someone may meet the fire codes but they don't meet the
24 development code. Example number one, fire code states hydrants must be spaced
25 at a certain distance, right? They may meet that in the fire code, but the
26 development code states what kind of hydrant they can use and in AF city, a
27 waterous is one option.

28 John Woffinden: The city code is more stringent than the fire code?

29 Chief Aaron Brems: Yes. They have got to meet both the codes. The spacing,
30 which is the fire code, but then the development code. In this case, for example, a
31 waterous that's just for maintenance or we can buy tons of parts. It's all
32 standardized, we train on the same thing. Another example is in the fire code.
33 Some applicants meet the fire flow requirement based on density and the structure

APPROVED MINUTES

1 itself. But the fire code doesn't state what type of pipe material that has to be. The
2 development code states dollar C 900. Another example is road material. Fire Code
3 states a road has got to hold an 80,000 pound fire apparatus, but it does not state
4 what type of road material. But the development code does, which is asphalt. So
5 that's where we're at. Ultimately, they may meet a fire code, but they do not meet
6 the city development code. With that being said, the code is the law. They don't
7 meet the development code. Ultimately, the fire department recommends denial.

8 Jenny Peay: I appreciate that, thank you.

9 Rodney Martin: Are the proposed hammerheads and other things allowed in our
10 fire code?

11 Chief Aaron Brems: In the fire code it is allowed, but like Ben Hunter said in the
12 development code it is not. We have one standard that was the cul-de-sac.

13 Bruce Frandsen: Chief, let me just clarify. That plan as presented meets the fire
14 code. Is that correct?

15 Chief Aaron Brems: That is an option there. There are options that way. However,
16 I was talking to the fire marshal and it's not optimal because in a residential area
17 you don't want to be backing up. Like the applicant said it's not just fire. We ran
18 into that issue coming up with ideas. How do we secure that so no one parks there?
19 Dump trucks, or plows, street sweepers, garbage trucks, all that. Everyone's got to
20 meet the fire code and the development code. It's not one or the other.

21 Christine Anderson: What I understand is the fire code says we're okay with these
22 three options and each city chooses which option they're going to standardize?

23 Chief Aaron Brems: The development code is a little different, but like the
24 applicant said, the city has adopted the fire code. But that is a minimum. That's
25 why there's also a development code like these examples. The fire code doesn't
26 address some of the stuff that the development code does. They must meet both.

27 Ben Hunter: To add to that, and I'll make sure Chief doesn't have any more to add
28 with it. An example of uses of hammerheads, there may be projects that are
29 apartment complexes or other buildings where they're going into a parking lot, not
30 a street, and need to have a turnaround so they can access all points of the building.
31 That may be an option where it's not a street, therefore, it needs to meet the parking
32 lot standards of the city, as well as the fire code turnaround requirements of the

APPROVED MINUTES

1 city. In this case, that's part of why from the engineering side the only road cross-
2 sections that we have are the ones that I referenced earlier.

3 Bruce Frandsen: Ben, you referenced the 62-foot right of way, what does this
4 proposal not meet on that?

5 Ben and Bruce briefly clarify the question to ask what is not met in the
6 hammerhead and wait for the presentation slides to be pulled up on the screen.

7 Ben Hunter: As they're dedicating this as a public right of way, this jog, this
8 hammerhead knockout area, that does not meet city standard because we don't have
9 a hammerhead jog. And the only other instance where you see that on a public
10 street is when it would be the same width and the same standard as a public street
11 for that. I can't read what the dimension is but instead of just having that narrow
12 width of concrete, it would be 32 feet of asphalt, curb, gutter, sidewalk, park strip
13 and have the T be to the back of the curb radii that is required per code for the
14 intersection of a street. That's where it doesn't meet. It also doesn't meet the length
15 of a dead-end of 400 feet. The only dead-end that we have is the cul-de-sac
16 standard per development and public road standards.

17 Bruce Frandsen: Ignoring the 400 foot, let's just take these one at a time. If the
18 hammerhead was 62 foot, add the park strip, all of that. The hammerhead would be
19 ok? If we exclude the 400 foot requirement. Is that what you're saying?

20 Ben Hunter: No. Generally, when we allow for a street intersection like that, it
21 would be because typically they have a future phase of a development that will
22 extend that road. In this case, it would go to the backyard or somebody's existing
23 house. There wouldn't be a need for that road to extend through because it doesn't
24 go anywhere.

25 John Woffinden: Is a hammerhead legitimate in the middle of a walk?

26 Ben Hunter: We don't have a standard that allows a hammerhead for a public street
27 in the middle of the block at the end of the street. The only standard we have is that
28 62 foot wide right of way and for the dead-end of the cul-de-sac.

29 Jeff Walker: If I may just add, that's if the engineer is considering that turnaround
30 as a public street, it's not a public street. It's never going to go anyplace. He's now
31 applying apples and oranges. This is the standard of the International Fire Code
32 that allows this sort of turnaround because it's never a public street. It's never

APPROVED MINUTES

1 connecting to another street, so you must meet the width and the other amenities of
2 a street. That is where we get confused. Either they should eliminate the
3 International Fire Code requirements so the only requirement is the cul-de-sac
4 requirements, or they should say if you meet the turnaround purposes of this
5 hammerhead under the International Fire Code as adopted by a municipal code,
6 then you're good to go. This matches that exactly. He's trying to apply a standard
7 that, as developers, we are never going to try to apply. Because this was never
8 going to be a public street with sidewalks and trees and a walking trail.

9 Ben Hunter: The challenge with that is they're dedicating that hammerhead as a
10 public right of way, and it doesn't meet public street standards. An example of
11 when a hammerhead would work, and obviously I can't speak for the fire
12 department and Chief Brems, but from what I've seen on plan sets, Villas at Aspen
13 Meadows apartments at 860 East and 620 South have hammerheads within their
14 parking lot. Because of the location of the building and the layout, firetrucks still
15 have to get there and need a turnaround. It's not a public street, it's a parking lot.
16 Hammerheads are an option that meets fire code within a parking lot. In this case,
17 it is not meeting public road standards as they're showing to be dedicated on the
18 plat and the dead-end does not meet the cul-de-sac standard as required per code.
19 It's the only dead-end option that we have for a public street.

20 Joe Garlington: I'm with Goldcrest Homes. This mimics the movement of the cups
21 that happened to us on the cul-de-sac. Originally, we had comments from every
22 department that said yeah, this is allowable, what you consider the cul-de-sac. We
23 always try to be good neighbors, so we considered a cul-de-sac in our plans. And
24 two iterations later, it was now considered a permanent cul-de-sac and they shifted
25 the standard on us from the original comments. With the issue at hand here, our
26 previous application with this hammerhead had that turnaround as an easement. It
27 was not to be dedicated. It was an easement. The fire marshal, being concerned
28 about parking, said it's difficult to enforce parking on an easement, please dedicate
29 that. So once again the cup has moved and now engineering is saying that it doesn't
30 meet the cross-section for the street. Pardon my frustration in this, but once again,
31 it's the movement of the cups.

32 John Woffinden: Chief Brems, as a professional firefighter, when your big
33 apparatus comes down the street do you prefer a cul-de-sac or would you prefer to

APPROVED MINUTES

1 back into a hammerhead and move around? Which is safer for the firefighter and
2 the public?

3 Chief Aaron Brems: In this example, obviously a cul-de-sac would be optimal.
4 Like Ben is saying, this is an option, but it's designed for a commercial apartment
5 style that's in a parking lot. Technically the way this sits out would work, but the
6 last few lots would be eliminated because that hammerhead should be at the end of
7 the street. Backing up is an option in the fire code. But again, that does not meet
8 the building code or the development code.

9 John Woffinden: You avoid backing up if at all possible?

10 Chief Brems: Yes, not just for us, for everyone.

11 John Woffinden: You prefer it?

12 Chief Aaron Brems: Correct.

13 Scott Sensanbaugher: I am the Public Works Director and I supervise Engineering.
14 Just to make sure it's clear, it's not an option for this subdivision that would fit with
15 the code. Rather than trying to rehash all the history on this project, which does go
16 on for a while, I'll just say for the record that I would disagree with some of the
17 characterizations of some of the comments and some of the ways that the
18 discussions took place. I would characterize them quite differently. I don't really
19 want to go into details right now as I don't think that is a profitable use of time. Our
20 position is that this does not meet the development code and we recommend
21 denial.

22 Christine Anderson: I would just like to say I love the slides of what you're
23 proposing to build here. It looks very nice. It would be a beautiful spot in the city.
24 And I really hope that something can work here. You've put a lot of time into it,
25 everyone has. We want to make it work. We're bound by following rules, but I
26 hope that you don't go away thinking, "they hate us." I really want this to work. It's
27 not the spot here to go through different options, but there are options that that can
28 fall within the code. Connecting to 700, other access ways that you can do this.
29 And I just hope that we can see something that will work for all of you.

30 Joe Garlington: I apologize, I'll keep this brief again. At the time of our
31 application, the phrasing in the development code does not call out what a
32 temporary turnaround is. We have to rely on what is in the code, which is the

APPROVED MINUTES

1 International Fire Code, which describes a temporary turnaround and it allows for
2 those types of turnarounds.

3 Christine Anderson: We must understand that this can't be called a temporary
4 turnaround. If there's no agreement with the other side that this will indeed happen
5 in the future, it can't be called temporary it has to be called permanent.

6 Joe Garlington: It's a difference in phrasing. If we do a cul-de-sac that is going to
7 landlock the property to the North.

8 Patrick O'Brien: No, it's not. They have access back to the East.

9 Joe Garlington: I apologize, I stand corrected. It's not going to landlock the
10 property, it will drastically limit their ability to develop because they will have one
11 point of ingress-egress, not two points of ingress-egress like we're trying to provide
12 for them.

13 Christine Anderson: *Refers to presentation* You could come back down to that
14 street right there and connect.

15 Joe Garlington: We can't.

16 Christine Anderson: I just know that this doesn't fit the numbers that we are bound
17 to, that 400. We can't approve it.

18 Joe Garlington: One question that I have, and I'll just finish with this. Our first two
19 applications had a hammerhead and a temporary cul-de-sac. Our red lines
20 comments from staff called a temporary cul-de-sac and those both had approval
21 from various departments. So collectively, those two did get approvals. And then
22 they shifted their position.

23 Christine Anderson: I've spoken to Rebecca, and I hope I'm not speaking out of
24 place, but not everything that is said ends up being true. She said, "I apologize, I
25 spoke out of what I thought was true at the time, but I was wrong."

26 Patrick O'Brien: Commissioner, we don't have the authority to actually approve
27 anything.

28 John Woffinden: We're here to talk about the current application.

29 Ben Hunter: As we had discussed options early on, we did look at the possibilities
30 of a temporary cul-de-sac to give further guidance. We looked at Lehi's code and

APPROVED MINUTES

1 we thought maybe it could be a possibility. We discussed it further with
2 administration and with the City Attorney's office. We haven't approved a detail
3 that looks like that temporary cul-de-sac. We don't have that mechanism to allow it
4 because it doesn't exist in our code. The only one that we have is the cul-de-sac
5 details that we've referenced before. They do not meet those requirements as
6 shown in that detail.

7 Joe Garlington: If we do a cul-de-sac, we will not be in compliance with code
8 100% because it says we shall provide for future access. So, we will be in violation
9 of the code if we have to put a cul-de-sac in.

10 Christine Anderson: A “shall” class can't conflict with another part of the code.

11 Joe Garlington: Correct. It shouldn't, but it does.

12 Jeff Walker: It preempts it. Statutorily.

13 Bruce Frandsen: You're telling me a “shall” clause would require you to provide
14 access to the people to the North?

15 Jeff Walker: Correct.

16 Bruce Frandsen: That's not how I would look at it. I would say as long as the
17 people to the North have access to the road, they're good. If you have a neighbor to
18 the East, to the West, who had a 10-foot-wide strip coming up to it you're not
19 required to build a road up to them. As long as they can access a city road on the
20 other side of their property. You have provided them access by allowing them to
21 come from the East onto their property. I don't see it as saying you have to build a
22 road and stub it to their property because you haven't landlocked them. They still
23 have access. You have provided it for them. Go over there and put your access in.

24 Jeff Walker: On one of the screens I skipped because we were just pressed, it is
25 showing your bike and pedestrian trails.

26 Bruce Frandsen: And that can change.

27 Jeff Walker: I know. But if you look at what your plan is, and these are successive
28 pastures. The legitimate use of those successive pastures as they get developed, as
29 you guys are contemplating how you want your bike trails to go through, is they're
30 going to be continuous up through the middle of those pastures. You guys start
31 giving us indications of what we should try to accommodate to happen so that we

APPROVED MINUTES

develop our property in alignment with what your master plan is. If you would have written on your master plan, these are just ideas. We're throwing mud at the wall and hoping something sticks. This is the organizational master plan of how you want the trail system to work, and it will be precluded if under proceeds the idea which may be right for now is going to be successive of cul-de-sacs.

Patrick O'Brien: Mr. Chairman, there's nothing that we have that outlines that our bicycle network or trail system needs to follow actual roads. We do have trails in other parts of the city that run away from roads. There's nothing to say they need to stick to that road and that's something that was brought up recently. And that's not up for discussion tonight.

Jeff Walker: Of course it is.

John Woffinden: We're here to discuss the current application. We've talked this thing to death. It's time to open for the public hearing.

Public Hearing Opened

No public comments

Public Hearing Closed

Jenny Peay motioned to deny the preliminary plan for Beck Hillside Estates, located in the area of 757 North 200 East, in the R1-9000 Residential Zone.

Rodney Martin seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

APPROVED MINUTES

John Woffinden: You do have the right to go to City Council. Is there any idea when that date would be possible for City Council?

Patrick O'Brien: I need to check with the City Recorder. It would just be when the minutes have been approved for this meeting.

Jeff Walker: Can we get a vote on the final?

Jenny Peay motioned to deny the final plat for Beck Hillside Estates, located in the area of 757 North 200 East, in the R1-9000 Residential Zone.

Rodney Martin seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden AYE

Harold Dudley AYE

Christine Anderson AYE

Rodney Martin AYE

Chris Christiansen AYE

Bruce Frandsen AYE

Jenny Peay AYE

The motion passed

John Woffinden: As I was saying earlier, you can go to City Council. You have that legal right. Contact the Planning Department. It probably won't happen for at least another month it looks like right now. They have the final say.

10. Hearing, review, and action on a proposed land use map amendment from the Residential Very Low-Density designation to Residential Low-Density designation, for the properties in the area south of the Residential Low-Density designation, between 100 W and 570 W

Patrick O'Brien: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is just the city-initiated item. We're looking at removing our residential very low-density designation throughout the southern portion of the city and changing it to residential low-density. The main reason for this is some of the other areas of land that fall into our residential very low-density land use designation have been annexed into the city and have

APPROVED MINUTES

1 been annexed in under a zoning that would be more closely aligned with residential
2 low-density. For that reason, we're trying to look at future development for the city
3 and to provide the best and most aligned use of our space by proposing residential
4 low-density designations where we can use PR 3.0 as the recommended zoning for
5 any future development that would be zoned down in that area of the city.

6 Jenny Peay: I do have a concern about the water table and turning that into a
7 residential use area. What are the proposals to mitigate that?

8 Patrick O'Brien: Ben, you could probably speak better to that in terms of
9 geotechnical. We already do have a number of other residential areas. This isn't
10 approving any residential development right now, just changing the designation.

11 Jenny Peay: I've lived here my whole life and I've seen the water table and it's
12 come up a lot further in that area and I do have some concerns.

13 John Woffinden: That's the least of it in that area. Basements to start with.

14 Ben Hunter: Correct. There will be a few different things at play here. Most of it is
15 derived from the sense of land ordinance. One of those items would be the
16 floodplain area which FEMA updates. About two years ago they adopted a new
17 floodplain map in this area. Generally speaking, there are ways of addressing that
18 and there are certain requirements in the code. Our sensitive lands wouldn't allow
19 basements and that's a combination between flood water as well as high
20 groundwater. That would be prohibited. A lot of the time in these particular areas
21 they actually build up the subdivision such that it elevates it to get above those
22 additional hazards and those elevations. Not only do we have limitations in not
23 allowing basements, but there are also certain requirements of the roadway. Part of
24 that roadway is generally required to be one foot above the floodplain elevation.
25 The southernmost point would be one point above that floodplain elevation. On top
26 of that, the land ordinance also requires that the finished floor of any homes that
27 are occupied must be at least one foot above the average elevation of the asphalt.
28 There are several requirements and code that would mitigate those hazards and
29 those concerns that way, and they would have to comply with those ordinances.

30 Jenny Peay: Do you provide a Geotech report with each proposed home, or is it
31 just the standard development?

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Ben Hunter: Generally, they'll do it as the standard development and the
2 Geotechnical Engineer, as standard industry practice, and based on the size he'll do
3 so many borings or test kits into the ground to identify the soil types as well as the
4 groundwater. One of the other things that I know the Chairman always has a
5 concern about is liquefaction. That's also a high potential and high hazard in this
6 area. Those require, depending on the circumstances, 30 to 40 foot borings down
7 into the ground to be able to determine a sort of liquefaction hazards and things
8 like that as well. I wouldn't be able to guess how many borings the Geotechnical
9 Engineer will do, but it will be multiple borings. And then when the subdivision
10 gets approved, it's approved based on those borings and based on that geotechnical
11 report. After they get approval, and when they move forward to the building permit
12 stage, they also must conform to that same geotechnical report that was part of the
13 whole development.

14 Jenny Peay: If I'm understanding this, the Geotech report would standardize what
15 the elevations would be. Not so much the code, is that correct?

16 Ben Hunter: It wouldn't standardize the elevations; it would identify where high
17 groundwater is. It's two feet below the surface, three feet below the surface, five
18 feet below the surface, and these are the soil types. This is the level of liquefaction
19 it has. Those are some of the things in the report. All that it identifies is current
20 conditions. But then based on those current conditions, the sensitive lands
21 ordinance requirements will kick in and that would dictate, okay, the southernmost
22 road here would have to be a foot above the high floodplain elevation. In any of
23 your residential homes, the finished floor would have to be a foot above the
24 average elevation of the asphalt on the street in front of that home.

25 Jenny Peay: Would it also call out where buildable areas are and where non-
26 buildable areas are?

27 Ben Hunter: Yes, it will typically identify, again, you have a combination. If there
28 are, for example, wetlands, they wouldn't be able to build on wetlands. But there
29 are also setback requirements the city code has that would define those buildable
30 areas. It's a combination of both code as well as what the findings are for the
31 existing conditions on-site.

32 John Woffinden: This whole area has been identified by the state of Utah and the
33 zone code engineers as a high liquefaction area. It has a lot of specifications that

APPROVED MINUTES

builders have to comply with. That's the purpose of the test is to find what kind of conditions are in the subsoil so they can engineer their product so it doesn't sink.

Jenny Peay: That's my biggest concern with doing this as a residential. My other question is where does the Vineyard connector road come in here?

Ben Hunter: *References the presentation slide* Those are a couple of the parcels that are currently owned by UDOT. Now whether they modify that or change that or anything like that, I don't know. We'll have to wait and see what UDOT does, but UDOT currently owns those pieces of property.

Public Hearing Opened

Mark Barlow: *References the presentation slide* I am Mark Barlow. If we're talking about the flood plain, I'd like to say a few words. On the left side there, the bottom rectangle is my property. In 1984, Utah Lake level was up to the corner of my sidewalk, elevation 4500 feet above sea level. If your bottom slant line there is pretending to be the floodplain level where Utah Lake comes up to, I disagree with it. It comes up higher than that. *Mark clarifies where his property is on the presentation slide* Utah Lake level was up that high.

Carroll Barlow: We still have a dyke. It's still there.

Patrick O'Brien: The intention of that slant line is just to outline we're our Shoreline Protection area and our residential very low-density or potential residential low-density would be. It's to show where two different designations are.

Ken Berg: I'm with Berg Civil Engineering. If we can go back to the map. If you're all familiar with what we did on AF crossing, we used the Lakeshore Boulevard as the designation between the defend and the no-defend line. We build houses North of Lake Shore Boulevard, everything South of Lakeshore Boulevard is that Shoreline Protection Zone. And the line we show there was a previous road alignment when this was an annexation 10 plus years ago that never got finalized. Currently, we're laying out plans we have looked at the wetlands and are defining and designing the alignment of Lakeshore Boulevard. My request to you is to give me, or someone, the flexibility that the South boundary line is the zoning as defined by the alignment of Lakeshore Boulevard. In your next agenda item, you're looking at the annexation of that piece. I've already prepared a road dedication plat as part of that annexation, that defines that alignment. That's not the

APPROVED MINUTES

1 alignment that we're hoping to get to the city. What I'm trying to avoid is against
2 Lakeshore Boulevard on the North side. That we must build up above the FEMA
3 floodplain undeveloped land because it's part of Shoreline Protection. That's my
4 request.

5
6 Keriann Barlow: We own the property just North of Mark Barlow. We lived in
7 California where homes are built on top of each other and it's very dense. There's
8 no parks and it's not fun. I hope that you are smart about how you plan it, and that
9 you make sure you spread it out. We know that there have been problems with
10 water being diverted so farmers are getting some of the land down there. It's a
11 beautiful, very nice place to be and I want to encourage less dense housing.

12
13 Dane Hill: I am with Property Reserve. We manage the Investment lands for the
14 Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. We're the neighboring landowner of
15 those parcels to the West of the proposed area change. We are supportive of the
16 change. We appreciate the city staff for creating more opportunities for housing in
17 the area.

18
19 Ginger Romriell: I'm with Woodside Homes. *References the presentation slide*
20 We are the subdivision that's to the top of this. We are working our way down
21 towards that line right there, so we support the change from the 2.0 to the 3.0.

22
23 Carroll Barlow introduces herself and speaks of her love of her home in American
24 Fork and thanks the Planning Commission for what they do.

25
26 Carroll Barlow: Here are my concerns. One, the American Fork roads are really
27 crowded. Are there any plans to solve that? As a citizen of American Fork, there
28 are certain times when I may not want to go down Main or State Street. That's a
29 concern. Our State is talking about water preservation and we continue to have
30 dense housing. They have built all around me. We used to have Harbor First Ward
31 and now we're to Harbor Sixth Ward. As a citizen, those are things that concern
32 me. That we'll run out of water as we continue building so many homes. Are we
33 going to be able to go down our road? I remember in Saratoga Springs, was it two
34 years ago, they had a big fire. Do you remember that? It got very close to
35 residential housing, and I think one fence even melted. They were blessed those
36 houses didn't catch on fire. But when they tried to evacuate Saratoga Springs, it
37 was backed up. People couldn't get out of there. That's poor planning as far as I can
38 see. Are we going to do those same kinds of things? What road are we going to

APPROVED MINUTES

1 have for those houses that are going to go in there? This is just a citizen's
2 perspective. And then when they did their probing, whatever it's called. And
3 they're doing it in drought? I don't know, it's drought time and they're probing.
4 They may accept housing, but in 1984 they wouldn't I'll tell you that right now. So
5 those are just my emotional concerns as a citizen in American Fork. Water and
6 infrastructure. I don't know why there's so many accidents on the freeway closer to
7 American Fork, but they all divert to American Fork, and you can't even move.
8 When there aren't any accidents, it's really crowded. Those are my concerns as we
9 continue to have, what is it called, low-density? I'm not even sure what that means.
10 Does that mean apartment buildings? What's low-density?

11
12 Christine Anderson: 3.0 means they can have three units per acre.

13
14 Carroll Barlow: That's low, not very low?

15
16 Christine Anderson: Very low means you can have two units per acre. You can
17 also have a lot that is 50 acres if you want to, it's not saying you can't have
18 something large.

19
20 Carroll Barlow: When you say a structure, how big is the structure? Is an
21 apartment building a single structure?

22
23 Christine Anderson: No, apartment buildings would not be allowed here.

24
25 Carroll Barlow. Those are my thoughts, thank you for listening.

26
27 Christine Anderson expressed her thanks and agreed with Carroll's love for
28 American Fork. She explained the Planning Commission's goal is to grow
29 American Fork's infrastructure and roads in the smartest way possible.

30
31 Carroll Barlow expressed her thoughts that many people are coming to American
32 Fork because it is beautiful, and many people love it. She asked the Commission to
33 consider her thoughts.

34
35 Harold Dudley thanked Carroll for coming to the meeting and expressing her
36 thoughts. He describes a recent newsletter by the Mayor regarding water and
37 growth which he felt was well thought out and based on facts and recommended
38 that Carroll read the newsletter.

APPROVED MINUTES

Public Hearing Closed

Rodney Martin motioned to recommend approval of the proposed land use map amendment from the Residential Very Low-Density designation to Residential Low-Density designation, for the properties in the area south of the Residential Low-Density designation, between 100 W and 570 W.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	ABSTAIN
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

Bruce Frandsen noted that he abstained due to part ownership in a significant amount of the ground.

11. Hearing, review, and action on an agreement for the Harbor Road Annexation, consisting of 85 acres and located at approximately 6500 W 6800 N

Patrick O'Brien: This relates to some land that's within the area that was shown on that map previously. As you mentioned in the title, it is 85 acres. If the City Council approves the land use update that the Planning Commission has recommended it would fall under the new land use of Residential Low Density and with that staff would recommend the annexation of that property coming in under the PR 3.0 or Planned Residential 3.0 Zoning. Some of the area being annexed in fall within the Shoreline Protection area, so that would remain the same and there wouldn't be any changes with regards to that. The General Plan does provide for some development of an open space that's identified at the Vineyard Connector and

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Linear Park that will traverse a portion of the annexed property. This is the first
2 step towards the development of that property if it's recommended for approval.
3 The appendices to this document come at a later point through our attorney and
4 City Recorder, so they're not available right now. You would be recommending
5 approval of the language of the agreement itself that is contained in the packet.

6 Ben Hunter: There are several roads that are identified on the Master
7 Transportation Plans. Some connectors, some arterioles, and all of those right of
8 ways are included in the annexation agreement to be dedicated to the city as a
9 condition of approval for the annexation and we would recommend approval.

10 Mark Barlow: Your location is incorrect. The location is just North of my
11 daughter-in-law's house and Christiansen's field. Which was to remain
12 unincorporated in Utah County. That is not part of the drawing I received showing
13 the land to be annexed into American Fork City. You have got to go further East to
14 get to that land. You need to change the address up there for the location.

15
16 John Woffinden: What would the address be in your estimation?
17

18 Mark Barlow: Maybe 6400 West if I were to guess.
19

20 Patrick O'Brien: I can try and clarify that. I was going off land that was identified
21 on the map. Do you have anything more accurate on that, Ginger? We can have
22 it approved under the parcel numbers if that's something that you have?
23

24 Ginger Romriell: Yes. I can get that. We will get those parcel numbers for you.
25 This is a beautiful 85-acre parcel that we are hoping to add on to our Stonecreek
26 project. Everybody wants to live down there.
27

Public Hearing Opened

28
29

30 No comments were made.
31

Public Hearing Closed

32
33

34 Bruce Frandsen: I have a question on that. Are we going to exclude the
35 Christiansen property, the Barlow property, the parcel South of the Barlow
36 property?

APPROVED MINUTES

Patrick O'Brien: This isn't annexing in all of the land that was shown within that last map. This is annexing in the PHI property. *References the map on the presentation* It's not all of what was shown on the last part, but we were getting the chunk between both roads for updating all the land use. All of that is not being annexed in. We're not doing a city-initiated annexation for people who have not requested to be annexed in. This is only for Ginger and Woodside Homes property. Those are the 85 acres that are coming in as a part of that.

Bruce Frandsen: We're not sweeping anybody?

Patrick O'Brien: No. Anyone who wants to stay in the county is still in the county in that regard.

Chris Christiansen motioned to recommend approval of the agreement for the Harbor Road Annexation, consisting of 85 acres and located at approximately 6500 W 6800 N.

Harold Dudley seconded the motion.

Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

12. Hearing, review, and action on a request for variance from the required setbacks of lots located in the Stonecreek Plat H & I Development, located in the area of 1000 South 400 West in the PR-3.0 Zone

This is substantially similar to an agenda item that you had a couple of months ago. The applicant is requesting some reductions and setbacks. Part of the code calls out

APPROVED MINUTES

1 that the Planning Commission would be the approving body for this, and it
2 wouldn't go to City Council. You would have the final say on this item. I can allow
3 Ginger to speak in more detail about it. George has an image of what Ginger had
4 provided that he can display. Staff doesn't have any major issues with this item.
5 We would just ask if it has been approved that it would be approved with the
6 conditions that there would be nothing placed or protruding from the structures
7 into the reduced setback areas. That was at the request of the Fire Marshal.

8 Bruce Frandsen: I know we've done this before, but now my question is different.
9 Is this an actual variance and do variances come to this committee? Do they go to
10 the Board of Adjustments?

11 Patrick O'Brien: This is a variance and generally variances do go to the Board of
12 Adjustment. But the code specifically calls out that a variance within this zone
13 would go before the Planning Commission. There are a couple of those in our
14 code. But generally, most of them go to our Board of Adjustment. We now have a
15 fully appointed Board of Adjustment. You are the approving body for the zoning
16 variance specific to this property.

17 John Woffinden invited Ginger Romriell to address the Commission.

18 Ginger Romriell: We are here today to request a variance to the setback
19 requirements for Stonecreek plat H & I. Stonecreek is a little over 400 plats and we
20 have built out 4 of them to date, so we are on the last two plats here. The reason
21 that we're asking for our setback today is because of those 400 plats we went with
22 a variance on our architectural style and for the opportunity to have a three-car
23 garage. We can do it as our layout sits. We have three lots going forward that will
24 have the ability to have a three-car garage. With the setback, we can get a little
25 more than three. That, and the opportunity to have a fireplace or a side patio. All
26 those things do affect the setbacks as well. So that's our ask for today. There are no
27 basements here so that's why it's important for us to have a three-car or bigger
28 home where they can store their stuff and so they are not parking on the road. A
29 couple of months ago you approved our setback requirements for a plat G.
30 However, I won't name names, Patrick. He came in a little too late and we had
31 already sold out for our last plats. So, this is now finally going forward to our last
32 two plats so we're anxious to see this happen.

Public Hearing Opened

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2 No public comments

3
4 **Public Hearing Closed**

5
6 Chris Christiansen: You said the reason we're doing this is to be able to have a
7 three-car garage. What I am looking at here, the existing site setbacks had a three-
8 car garage. And the three-car garage was the request, so it looks like there is the
9 ability to have a three-car.

10 Ginger Romriell: Yes, on some lots there is the ability, but not on all. Right now,
11 the setback requirements are eight feet, and with a five-foot that will allow us to
12 have a fireplace on one side or a pop-out of some kind. As long as we're making
13 sure that we don't interfere with the five-foot requirement.

14 John Woffinden: This keeps us from having a solid line of just garage doors?

15 Ginger Romriell: Exactly, and people parking on the road.

16 Jenny Peay: Maybe you can help me understand as far as a variance request. My
17 understanding is that applicants must show unreasonable hardship and they must
18 demonstrate that as a reasonable hardship for the property. When you're looking at
19 this, does this qualify as an unreasonable hardship?

20 Patrick O'Brien: I had a similar concern and I discussed it with Rebecca Andrus
21 who is our City Engineer. We concluded that the hardship trigger relates to our
22 Board of Adjustments and not to our Planning Commission. That's the language we
23 saw so that's why we didn't have an issue bringing it forward to Planning
24 Commission. There was nothing in there that required that hardship test for
25 Planning Commission to grant a variance. I assume a variance for something like
26 this would come to Planning Commission and not go to the Board of Adjustments.
27 I think there was a method perhaps in the madness of separating the variances that
28 went to Planning Commission.

29 Jenny Peay: Is this something that the land use attorney needs to verify?

30 Harold Dudley: I still get confused about our code compared to our traditional
31 zoning ordinances. I have become comfortable finding that these variances allowed
32 by the Planning Commission are different than a typical Board of Adjustment
33 variance. There have been others that have been on the Commission, and we've

APPROVED MINUTES

1 granted the variances. The term variance is what is used, but it's just a discretionary
2 review and doesn't need to meet those same requirements. Based on that, we have
3 done stuff similar to this without those hardships and other Board of Adjustment
4 requirements. I'm not saying it's right or wrong. We have traditionally done that
5 when it's allowed in the development.

6 Patrick O'Brien: There's a separation of roles. As I said, I was assuming that this
7 variance is different from the variance that the Board of Adjustment would deal
8 with. Where it would be a variance on developable land because there's not
9 enough frontage or not enough square footage or some issues related to that.
10 Where this is specifically for these larger types of zoning developments.

11 Jenny Peay: My concern is if we needed to go through an attorney before we can
12 make a decision on this.

13 Patrick O'Brien: I don't know if it needs to go before an attorney. If that's
14 something that you want to request, we do have that option. Cherylyn does review
15 the upcoming items. We discuss everything with her so she's aware of what comes
16 forward. There has never been an issue raised about a variance request like this.

17 Chris Christiansen: We approved one a few months ago.

18 Bruce Frandsen: We approved some for Woodside Homes, but those were two or
19 three specific lots. We just had a little lesson here from a visiting attorney an hour
20 and a half ago that the words matter. And definitions matter and maybe we ought
21 to look. I think we shouldn't be calling these variances when they're coming here.
22 Maybe there's something legal in the State Code that says a variance has to go to
23 the Board of Adjustments and we ought to be calling them exceptions to the rule. I
24 don't know.

25 Ken Berg: You have several areas in your code where it gives me as the engineer
26 the option to propose different setbacks than your blanket city standard setback.
27 PUDs, PRDs, etc. In your code it lists the standard setbacks with an asterisk that
28 states, "Unless you come to the Planning Commission to present your proposed
29 setbacks for your development." That's what we're doing. We're not coming to say
30 we need a variance. We're just following your code. For this project for some
31 additional flexibility in our planned residential, we would like these setbacks.
32 These are the proposed setbacks for this. It's not a variance to your code.

APPROVED MINUTES

Jenny Peay: I agree, I think we should call it something else.

Chris Christiansen: I said this before. I lived with the five-foot setbacks and it's not fun. At our last meeting we were concerned about a pool house that was 15 plus feet, right? Here we are saying that we've got another structure that's 10 feet. I'm not a fan of it but it is within our prerogative to make that change.

Harold Dudley motioned to recommend approval of the request for the reduction in setback requirements as outlined in the applicant's request for Stonecreek Plat H & I Development, with the condition that no structures or other items protrude into the reduced setback area, such as porches, balconies, decking, A/C units, or any other similar structures or items that may be placed or built in the setback area.

Bruce Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	NAY
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

13. Hearing, review, and action on a Preliminary Plan for Stonecreek Plat H & I located in the area of 1000 South 400 West in the PR-3.0 Zone

14. Hearing, review, and action on a Final Plat for Stonecreek Plat H & I located in the area of 1000 South 400 West in the PR-3.0 Zone

John Woffinden stated that items 13 and 14 are on the same project and will be discussed together but will require a separate hearing, motion, and vote on each.

Patrick O'Brien: The Preliminary Plan for Stonecreek H & I are on 77 lots on 30 and a half acres. This one was reviewed by Cody. Reviewing his notes on it he didn't find any issues. He went through a couple of consultations with Ken to work out some issues from the original submittal. The plan presented before you tonight

APPROVED MINUTES

meets all of the requirements of the code and we will recommend approval. The final plat is in our PR 3.0 zone, and it deals specifically with six lots intended for single-family homes within that area. It meets the requirements of the code and there were no Planning issues.

Ben Hunter: There are lots that are fronting existing roads that were part of the previous subdivisions and previous phases, so they have stub utility laterals for these various slots. They meet all the standard specifications and requirements of the Engineering Division and we would recommend approval.

Bruce Frandsen: I will preface this by saying we have about 40 acres down there that went totally dry this year. And Ginger and her company brought some equipment in there to resolve that. Ken, is there anything we need to be looking at water wise? I think most of the water here probably goes over to Woodside property anyway. They can dry it up if they prefer, that doesn't matter because there'll be buildings not farming. Is there anything else we need to know?

Ken Berg: As part of your Sensitive Lands Ordinance, we've gone through and identified any water rights in the half mile radius. I've looked through them and evaluated what our development would impact. They're mostly the ones that we're fixing tomorrow to get them back to the East. We've identified those. Woodside is holding most of those that are impacting themselves. We're doing those extra steps to restore flows back to some of those historic sloughs. Sloughs that the past developments have found other ways to reroute through by trenches and things like that where we found a way to redirect it.

Bruce Frandsen thanks Ken and Woodside Homes for their effort to be good neighbors and use the water responsibly. Ben Hunter states his agreement. Bruce encourages the Commission to be aware of the garbage that can build up in the bulrushes on neighboring properties from surrounding development sites. He states his hopes that the development sites will be good neighbors and help keep their surrounding areas clear of garbage. Patrick O'Brien mentions filing a code enforcement with Planning if needed. Ben Hunter reiterated both points.

Public Hearing Opened

No public comments

Public Hearing Closed

APPROVED MINUTES

Rodney Martin motioned to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plan for Stonecreek H & I Development, located in the area of 1000 South 400 West in the PR-3.0 Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Staff Report, or recommended by the Fire Marshal.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

Chris Christiansen motioned to recommend approval of the Final Plat for Stonecreek Plat H & I located in the area of 1000 South 400 West in the PR-3.0 Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Engineering Staff Report or recommended by the Fire Marshal.

Bruce Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

Chairman Woffinden	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
Jenny Peay	AYE

The motion passed

15. Review and action on the minutes of the June 8, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Session

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Patrick O'Brien: We didn't have those minutes included in the packet so we're not
2 going to vote on this tonight. We apologize for that omission.

3
4 John Woffinden: We will postpone that.

5 6 **16. Site Plan Committee Report**

7
8 John Woffinden: What have you got planned in the future?

9
10 Patrick O'Brien introduces Melissa White, the new Administrative Assistant to the
11 Development Services team.

12
13 Patrick O'Brien: We don't have anything major coming down the line other than
14 what was mentioned at our last meeting. We're still working on a couple of
15 Economic Development projects as well for the city. We will have a couple of core
16 changes coming that our staff initiated. Hopefully, we will also have our long-
17 awaited contract approved by Council so we can release our RFP for the new City
18 Code rewrite which was approved in our budget. I think it was approved in our
19 budget. That will help to update our code and get rid of a lot of the contradictions
20 that might exist in certain parts of it and modernize it to bring American Fork up to
21 date with all the major development that's happening. It's an exciting place to be
22 working right now because we're really turning into the big city as well. That's all I
23 have other than our next Planning Commission meeting is not going to be
24 happening on July 6th. We will have our next meeting on July 20th.

25
26 Bruce Frandsen: What are my guidelines about being able to speak to developers
27 and others one-on-one outside of this meeting?

28
29 Patrick O'Brien: Cherylyn had told me that Commissioners can, as members of the
30 public, still meet with people. Given the nature of some people's jobs, you may end
31 up encountering people professionally. Also, it is my understanding that you can
32 still get information from applicants. It depends on your comfort level. Remember
33 that if you're getting a couple of Commissioners together not to violate the Open
34 Meetings laws. Speaking of that, we're looking at the first meeting in August to
35 have Planning Commissioner training. It will be on Open Meetings and a couple of

APPROVED MINUTES

1 other things that we're working on it. We might try and schedule it for earlier so we
2 can have a workshop prior to the actual meeting itself.

3 4 **17.Other Business**

5
6 Harold Dudley will be gone the months of September and October and will not be
7 present for any meetings during that time.

8 9 **18.Adjournment**

10
11 **David Bird motioned to adjourn.**

12 **Christine seconded the motion. All voted in favor.**

13
14 Meeting adjourned at 9:16 pm.

15
16 Melissa White

17 Administrative Assistant II

18
19
20
21
22
23
24 The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the
25 commissioners, public and staff