

APPROVED MINUTES

AMERICAN FORK CITY

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

December 07, 2022

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

Present: Chairman John Woffinden

Christine Anderson

Chris Christiansen

Bruce Frandsen

David Bird

Rodney Martin

Harold Dudley

Absent: Jenny Peay

Staff Present:

Patrick O'Brien Development Services Director

Travis Van Ekelburg Senior Planner

Cody Opperman Planner 1

Ben Hunter Engineer

Jeff Mortimer Engineer

JJ Hsu Engineer

George Schade IT Director

Melissa White Admin Assistant

APPROVED MINUTES

Others Present: Ryan Forsyth, Chris Forsyth, Kurt Ostler, Richard Lee, Ken Berg,
Matthew Loveland

REGULAR SESSION

Chairman John Woffinden led the “Pledge of Allegiance”

Roll Call

COMMON CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes of the November 16, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Session.

Harold Dudley motioned to approve the minutes. David Bird seconded the motion.

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	ABSTAIN
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	ABSTAIN

Rodney Martin abstained as he was absent from the meeting.

Christine Anderson abstained as she was absent from the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Public hearing and recommendation on an ordinance amending the title of Division 17, section 15.01.1830, Section 15.01.1840 and section 15.01.1850 of the American Fork City Municipal Code relating to access management

APPROVED MINUTES

Jeff Mortimer reviewed the background information for public hearing item number 1: This code text amendment clarifies what is required for access management. It will change the wording from being “recommended” to being “required.” It also adds some verbiage to allow for variances and lays out the specific criteria that would allow any variances to be had.

John Woffinden: This was vague. It stated, “access management” and I was wondering, “access management to what?”

Christine Anderson: Is this changing width between accesses or the specifics of how accesses need to be developed?

Jeff Mortimer: It does not change any of the standards themselves, it only deals with the wording. There is a lot of wording that says “recommended,” and it changes it to “required” and adds in the ability to have variances and what the specific criteria for those are.

Public Hearing Opened

No public comment

Public Hearing Closed

Christine Anderson motioned to recommend approval of the proposed code text amendment of the American Fork Municipal Code, amending Sections 15.01.1830, 15.01.1840 and 15.01.1850.

Bruce Frandsen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

APPROVED MINUTES

The motion passed

Chairman Woffinden noted that David Bird will be acting as a voting member in Ms. Peay's absence.

2. Public hearing and recommendation on a proposed land use map amendment for approximately 0.98 acres of land located at approximately 9826 N 4800 W, from the Institutional Lands, Schools and Public Facilities designation, to the Design Commercial designation

Travis Van Ekelenburg reviewed the background information for public hearing item number 2: The applicant is applying for a land use amendment for the property located at 9826 N 4800 W from the Institutional Lands, Schools, and Public Facilities to Design Commercial. The parcel consists of 0.98 acres and the Institutional Lands, Schools, and Public Facilities land use would be replaced by the Design Commercial land use.

The proposed Design Commercial land use is being requested prior to the property's annexation into American Fork City.

Due to the proximity of the proposed new public safety use on an adjacent parcel, and the need for quick and unobstructed access, staff recommends denying the application as a more intense commercial use on the parcel would pose congestion issues at an integral intersection to be used by the public safety facility.

Public Hearing Opened

Ryan Forsyth: I am with C&N Taylorsville, the entity, and I am one of the owners and partners for the property. I wanted to say a few things about this property. We purchased this property after it went out for public bid from the County. I didn't know there was some back and forth between American Fork City and the County. Prior to American Fork proposing to do a fire station on this parcel, it was zoned commercially. All of the other properties around it are zoned commercially. When the fire station was moved behind this, I anticipated this would go back to the zone it originally came from. It's a lighted intersection right on two main roads and the highest and best use, in my opinion, is to make this commercial. My thoughts after reading some of the previous minutes were that the City wanted to protect some future use. I struggle with limiting the use of my property for some future use that

APPROVED MINUTES

nobody knows or is in need of at this point. It was originally zoned as Public Facilities when it was in need of a fire station, but that need has been filled and is no longer needed. I think the best thing to do would be to go back to the original zone that it was planned to be. Commercial would be the best use and provide the most benefit to the community.

John Woffinden: Do we know if this land is annexed into the city or is it still county land?

Patrick O'Brien: It's still unincorporated.

Public Hearing Closed

Kurt Ostler hands out two documents for the Commissioners to review. (See attachment 1 and 2) Mr. Dudley clarified the North position on the handout.

Kurt Ostler: I am with C&N Taylorsville. I have been a resident of Highland for 29 years. As Ryan had mentioned, we purchased this property in August of 2021. This property was brought before the Planning Commission on August 19, 2020, to be approved for Fire Station 52. At that time, American Fork planned to purchase that from the county. I'm not sure of all the details, but it appears that negotiation did not happen, and they were not able to come to terms. The county put it out for a bid in May or June of 2021 and we understand that it received about 12 different bids. On July 26, 2022, we came before the City Council for an annexation. They recommended we come to the Planning Commission for two reasons. Currently, if it's annexed in, the future general land use for this area is to be Public Facilities. I understand it was planned that way because a fire station would go in here. The fire station did not go in here, it went to the parcel behind. With that, [the City Council] instructed us to come [to the Planning Commission] and go through with the annexation and have it come in as a PF zone, or if we feel that was not correct, to come before the Planning Commission and do a General Plan Amendment. That is what we are doing here. We recognize the staff has made a recommendation to deny this because of a concern about congestion and unobstructed access. We went out to fire stations that have been built in the area. *Mr. Ostler listed neighboring cities in Utah County and the southern part of Salt Lake County whose fire stations are surrounded by commercial zones. *

Kurt Ostler: (See attachment #1). The red squares you see on here are commercial parcels. We have the blue parcel in the middle. We're right on the lighted

APPROVED MINUTES

1 intersection of North County Boulevard and Harvey Boulevard. The green that's on
2 here is where the current fire station is getting built. The yellow on your map is
3 residential. Everything around our lot is commercial. It's on a lighted intersection.
4 North County Boulevard has 10,343 cars. Harvey Boulevard has 948 cars. I got
5 that information from CoStar, which is a service you can pay to get some of the
6 data.

7
8 Chris Christiansen: Is that daily?

9
10 Kurt Ostler: That is this is the daily car total. American Fork's fire station averages
11 around 3,500 calls per year. With two fire stations I'm going to assume there are
12 1,700 calls per station, and that would be four to five calls per day per station. An
13 average home has a 10-trip count. There are five trips out and five return trips. If
14 you look at the site plan for the fire station, the only access onto Harvey Boulevard
15 is going to be the fire station where the fire trucks are coming out. That would be
16 on an average of four to five times per day. I would assume it would be lighter than
17 the main station, but I just divided it in half to try to come up with that number.
18 The parking lot for the fire station and the offices are back behind and they're
19 accessed off of 1750 North. They're not accessed off Harvey Boulevard. The only
20 access will be the fire trucks when they come on to Harvey Boulevard. Harvey
21 Boulevard comes from a two-lane road and opens up going eastbound to three
22 lanes. I'm looking at the site plan and the concern that it may get congested. Right
23 as you come out the whole road opens up to help with any of the congestion that
24 might happen there. On your east side of the fire station is a shooting range.
25 There's no offices and no sleeping areas. There will be a base for the fire truck and
26 there will be offices in the area where the firemen will be sleeping. But all the
27 parking areas for the fire station is back behind it, it has no access to Harvey
28 Boulevard. Harvey Boulevard is not getting busy by the fire station other than
29 when the calls come in. I understand we've got to look out for what's best for the
30 traffic congestion. Most of the time, residential streets should have between 800 to
31 1,000 cars. Harvey Boulevard is a collector road that is probably designated to
32 have 5,000 to 10,000 cars a day. It only has 948 a day, so it's not as heavily
33 traveled. It is a collector road that goes up to 1400 West, which is a lighted
34 intersection. One of the questions that come in is regarding land use. At this
35 current time it is designated as a Public Facilities. American Fork's municipal code
36 17.4.601 states, "The PF public facilities zone is established to provide areas for
37 the location and establishment of facilities owned and maintained by public and
38 quasi-public entities..." Yet it is owned by C&N Taylorsville which is a private
39 entity; we are not public, and we are not quasi-public, so this has to be the wrong

APPROVED MINUTES

1 zone for this property. The Fifth Amendment talks about taking a property or the
2 zoning of a property. The taking clause of the Fifth Amendment of the United
3 States Constitution reads, "Nor shall private property be taken for private use,
4 without just compensation." If you want to keep this as the PF zone, we will enter
5 into negotiations with the city if that's what they want to have to protect the fire
6 station. If not, I'm asking for property rights here.

7
8 Patrick O'Brien: Mr. Chairman, as a point of clarification, this isn't considered to
9 be a taking. The applicant purchased that property as a designated PF. It was not
10 the case of the applicant owning the property and then it changing at any point in
11 time that would limit his property rights.

12
13 John Woffinden: It was designated PF when he bought the property?

14
15 Patrick O'Brien: It was designated as PF about a year prior to him purchasing it.
16 So I don't see how it can be considered a taking. The purchase happened after the
17 fact.

18
19 Kurt Ostler: I understand the legality. What was the reason you [American Fork
20 City] put PF on this? The City did not own the property when they put a PF zone
21 on it.

22
23 Patrick O'Brien: Cities do have the authority as set out in our state code to
24 designate land use and zoning as they see fit.

25
26 Harold Dudley: This is land use, not zoning. Is that correct?

27
28 Patrick O'Brien: That is correct. Because it is not annexed into the community at
29 the moment there is no zoning attached to this. The land use designates the future
30 zoning of the property as it would come in. I would disagree with the applicant that
31 this is a taking. This is information that would have likely come up in due
32 diligence of purchasing a property and [the applicant purchased it] with the
33 assumption that something could change. We have similar applicants who are
34 purchasing properties under a land use designation and they're trying to get that
35 change as a part of their agreements before purchase. If that doesn't go through,
36 then they're not going to follow through with it because it would limit their
37 potential uses.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Kurt Ostler: I appreciate the comments here. I think we have to go back to the time
2 when this came in to be a PF zone. Before the PF zone this was going to be
3 General Land Use coming in as Commercial. The City is the one that changed it
4 because they thought they were going to be able to purchase the property. They did
5 not purchase the property. I agree that we knew that. But we assumed that because
6 the City had not purchased the property [that it would be zoned Commercial] and it
7 could be an assumption that was incorrect. It might not legally be a taking, but as a
8 property owner it sure feels like it. I want you to put yourselves in my shoes as a
9 property owner when the City keeps Public Facilities on a private property owner.
10 It might not be, because I haven't had it annexed in. You can say yes or no to
11 annexation. But it feels that way to me, and maybe you all feel differently. I think
12 [Commercial] is the correct zoning. We understand the fire station. I've tried to
13 help you understand that we're sensitive to congestion. I think it's an undue concern
14 or burden.

15
16 Mr. Ostler stated his belief that there were bad feelings between American Fork
17 and Utah County during their negotiations on the property. Mr. O'Brien requested
18 that Mr. Ostler not speculate or make assumptions regarding city dealings and the
19 City's relationship with the County.

20
21 Kurt Ostler: I think we've demonstrated that this should be designated as
22 Commercial. At this time the city has it as a PF zone. We're asking for the
23 Commission to look at that situation and think about what is best. We've had
24 several retailers approach us. We have not entered into any contracts with them.
25 There would be good sales tax coming from the parks tax for the city, which is a
26 benefit. I believe [the city] has to recognize that there's Commercial around as the
27 designation. The problem with the county is that they will not let us build anything
28 on that parcel. You can say that's part of the due diligence but that's one of the
29 issues. If not, it will stay vacant. And because we're the landowner we can't do
30 anything with our property.

31
32 Harold Dudley: The County wants you to annex in before you can build? *Mr.
33 Ostler affirmed. * What is North, is that within American Fork or is that Highland?

34
35 Patrick O'Brien: Cedar Hills

36
37 Kurt Ostler: Warenski Funeral Home is in American Fork. *Charman Woffinden
38 confirmed. *

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Mr. Dudley confirmed which area was not annexed in on the map.

2
3 Travis Van Ekelenburg: This property has a land use designation, but it does not
4 have zoning attached to it right now which will not happen until it is annexed in.

5
6 Harold Dudley: The property to the north is zoned land use commercial and zoned
7 commercial?

8
9 Patrick O'Brien: Yes, because it is annexed into the community already.

10
11 Kurt Ostler: You have Highland Gardens to the south and it's Commercial and
12 across the street is Highland, and both those corners are Commercial.

13
14 Chairman Woffinden held a brief discussion with Mr. Ostler in which he stated his
15 belief that some of the data Mr. Ostler had provided in his earlier statement was
16 inaccurate and out of date. He noted that the fire station in American Fork is the
17 busiest fire station in Utah County and had a much higher rate than what Mr.
18 Ostler had presented. Mr. Ostler stated his data was from 2018. Chairman
19 Woffinden stated the data was 4 years old and a second fire station is being built to
20 meet the need of the American Fork and surrounding cities.

21
22 Rodney Martin: What is the compelling reason for staff to tell us that we should
23 not change this designation? Is traffic the main compelling reason?

24
25 Patrick O'Brien: It's the accessibility for the public safety use for the fire station.
26 There's a reason that the staff moved around to the other side to access the parking
27 lot. Any congestion on Harvey Boulevard renders that intersection useless for the
28 fire station to be able to meet their response times.

29
30 Rodney Martin: I'm not a streets and roads legal expert, but I assume there would
31 be no access from this property on North Canyon Boulevard because it's too close
32 to the light?

33
34 Ben Hunter: You would need to confirm that with UDOT. North County is a
35 UDOT road.

36
37 Rodney Martin: My guess is that it is too close to the light. Assuming that there's
38 no access onto North County Boulevard, its main access will be Harvey Boulevard
39 or 1750 North. I'm not seeing the issue with traffic because we don't know what's

APPROVED MINUTES

1 going to go there. There are a lot of reasons and uses of this land that aren't going
2 to be [an issue]. I don't see the argument holding water.

3
4 John Woffinden: An argument for the congestion is the fact that there's a light on
5 that intersection. If the traffic gets heavy enough it could back up when waiting for
6 the light to change to go across North County Boulevard.

7
8 Rodney Martin: Emergency Services has the right of way.

9
10 John Woffinden: Yes, but if the cars are backed up through the intersection clear
11 past the exit to the first station, they can't get out.

12
13 Rodney Martin: This is assuming the residential area east of here is packing cars
14 into this street. There are a lot of other ways around there.

15
16 John Woffinden: I'm looking at the future. This area is growing fast. Cars could
17 back up waiting for the light to change on a normal traffic day.

18
19 Christine Anderson requested to hear a rebuttal from the staff.

20
21 Patrick O'Brien: One of the other challenges with Commercial use is, depending
22 on what's proposed, it may need two access points. It wouldn't be able to get two
23 access points on a single one of those roads because of the size of the parcel. I'm
24 not speaking for what the applicant is proposing. But if it did need two [access
25 points], you're having one on 1750 North and other on Harvey Blvd. To the
26 Chairman's point on statistics, if it is something you are interested in [staff can] try
27 and get some more information on those statistics. Like the Chairman mentioned,
28 the American Fork Station 51 is the busiest station in Utah County. We can get
29 some additional information on the call volume that comes out of the Cedar Hill
30 Station, which is relocating to this unit here. We serve Cedar Hills, American Fork,
31 and we also have agreements in place with some of our adjacent communities for
32 mutual aid. Whereas their teams are out for additional incidents that American
33 Fork can respond to as support. We're not talking about just serving one aspect of
34 the community, we're talking about also responding to additional things regionally.

35
36 Chairman Woffinden reiterated his concern that the data presented by Mr. Oster
37 was incorrect.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 Patrick O'Brien: If it is something you are all interested in, I can get some
2 additional information from Chief Brems.

3
4 Harold Dudley: I'm curious about something that maybe wasn't looked at. As I
5 look at a Public Facilities zone, what types of uses could go in there and what is
6 their traffic like compared to Commercial? I assume you could put a city park in
7 here. I recognize there could be some things that could be in a zone that would fit
8 into the land use of a Public Facilities. Some of those could have the same kinds of
9 traffic impacts as Commercial, maybe even more.

10
11 Patrick O'Brien: All of our parks fall within that. I do not think we would do that
12 on that lot specifically, given its proximity to North County Boulevard and the fire
13 station. If the city was proposing something on a site like that, we wouldn't be
14 looking at it as a high intense use for the same reasons. We try not to be
15 hypocritical on the standard that we are trying to hold everyone else to.

16
17 Rodney Martin: Carrying this out to the logical conclusion, if it remains as it is, the
18 landowner will never be able to do anything with the property.

19
20 Patrick O'Brien: There are additional quasi-governmental people that can develop.
21 Timpanogos Special Service Districts, power stations, schools.

22
23 Rodney Martin: But it would be limited to public use?

24
25 Patrick O'Brien: Correct. The same as if it were Commercial, it would be limited
26 to Commercial use where it could be right beside residential and residential might
27 be a better option for someone.

28
29 Rodney Martin: Going back to the previous comment you made, the landowner
30 was aware that it was Public Facilities?

31
32 Patrick O'Brien: I am not making that assumption. I know the land use was
33 designated PF prior to purchase.

34
35 Rodney Martin: So it could still be used, but it would need to be a public entity?

36
37 Patrick O'Brien: It could be a partnership with a public entity.

38
39 Rodney Martin: But it's not unusable? I just want to make sure that's on record.

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2 Patrick O'Brien: I don't believe so.

3
4 David Bird: Comparing this fire station to the one here in American Fork, I do not
5 see congestion as being a factor that would stop development on this. It's my
6 opinion, but it doesn't look like a hazard to me.

7
8 John Woffinden: There's a fire station in Pleasant Grove on 100 East which is a
9 very busy road and has a light on the corner as well.

10
11 David Bird: It's a very busy fire station, but in theory, having a second fire station
12 should reduce the amount of use for both.

13
14 Patrick O'Brien: Not necessarily, because Fire Station 52 is going to serve the
15 Cedar Hills area.

16
17 David Bird: Will the station we have now not serve Cedar Hills and divide that
18 responsibility?

19
20 Patrick O'Brien: No, because the station that is in Cedar Hills on Canyon Road is
21 an American Fork contracted unit. It is a combat unit and a paramedic unit that
22 operates out of there.

23
24 Harold Dudley: I must say something that's not popular, but I don't care. With all
25 due respect. As I've sat on this Commission for 10 to 15 years, many times we
26 request that developers provide us with a traffic plan when we don't "know." The
27 developer came up with some numbers, but I wouldn't call it a traffic study per se.
28 It was based on some numbers that I think we all agree, like the use of the fire
29 station, [were based] on what "we think." I feel the comment that the new public
30 safety building is limiting quick and unobstructed access is along similar lines. It's
31 a statement without any real data or facts behind it. That's causing me concern
32 about any action that we're taking. Without some more facts as opposed to what "I
33 think" or what someone thinks is the impact.

34
35 John Woffinden: It sounds like you suggest tabling this rather than denying it.
36 Because if we table this it comes back to us and allows us more time [to get more
37 information.]

38
39 Harold Dudley: I would like to see more facts.

APPROVED MINUTES

1
2 Patrick O'Brien: As we bring back a more factual traffic study, do you want more
3 call volume from the existing station that serves Cedar Hills that will be relocated
4 here? Because that is more where we are getting our facts, or at least the basis for
5 our argument on the call volume that they operate through.

6
7 Rodney Martin: That is 100% needed. I'd like to see the information from the Fire
8 Chief.

9
10 Patrick O'Brien: I believe we can get that, and we can request that Chief Brems
11 speaks to any fire concerns that you might have.

12
13 Harold Dudley: I'm not suggesting the city must do the study. I'm suggesting the
14 applicant provide a bona fide traffic analysis of this situation with the data that
15 they would be required to address for this situation.

16
17 Rodney Martin states his agreement.

18
19 Christine Anderson: I know it gets hairy to put limitations on the use of the
20 property, because if it gets sold then that would have to carry over. If we could
21 ensure that cars would not be able to back out onto the road to cause a problem, if
22 the cars were contained within the use, is that an avenue we could pursue?

23
24 Patrick O'Brien: We would ensure that it meets the requirements of the code.
25 Requesting anything that would constrict what is in our approved code is difficult
26 in my opinion. We have a blanket code, and the requirements should be the same
27 for everyone. If our code does restrict that naturally, such as two accesses or the
28 proximity to an intersection, or site triangles, that might be the only constraining
29 factor that exists.

30
31 Ben Hunter: We regularly look at traffic studies and the overall proposal. We
32 would review what this particular site would be generating through trip generation.
33 I don't know if the applicant has a specific use in mind, but they may need to
34 provide some potential options in that traffic study. You may have a different
35 impact from a Swig, a carwash, or a dental office. All of those are impacted by it.
36 Our code does outline criteria for access spacing requirements. Our city code
37 shows Harvey Boulevard as a major collector. 1750 North is a local road, and
38 UDOT's road [North County] is an arterial road. With some of that use, there's
39 also criteria outlined in traffic study requirements based on those classifications.

APPROVED MINUTES

1 It's based on a combination of whether your generated trips meet a certain
2 threshold or the ADT (average daily traffic) on the specific roads next to it. All of
3 that will need to be included in the traffic study to be able to gather sufficient
4 information. In addition to including information from Chief Brems, the study
5 would need to include how the calls will be distributed between the Cedar Hills
6 station and the main fire station. How many calls they receive, along with the
7 comings and goings of the fire trucks for inspections and the traffic associated with
8 the police department would be information needed to grasp the full picture.

9
10 Christine Anderson: Do we know yet if the western parcel will have access onto
11 Utah County Boulevard?

12
13 Ben Hunter: I can't speak to that as it would be UDOT approval, and they would
14 have to get any permits through UDOT. For major collectors, commercial access
15 spacing is 350 feet per city code. If you're within that proximity to North County
16 Boulevard, then that may not be an option. Regarding what Patrick talked to as far
17 as the potential for two accesses, it depends on what the use is going to be. It's the
18 big unknown of what's going to get built. On some of the previous developments
19 we've had concerns on impacts on arterial roads. We have had a couple of projects
20 come through the city for approvals, some of which didn't continue because of that
21 concern. All of that will need to be accounted for. But it doesn't just include the
22 engineering requirements as far as access spacing and whether you need two points
23 of access or one. It also envelopes into fire code. I can't speak for the fire
24 department as far as what access they would need, depending on the unknown use
25 of what they're going to build there. All of that will play into whether it functions
26 well or if it will create problems.

27
28 Bruce Frandsen: I want to know how detailed the traffic study can be. Can it tell us
29 for so many minutes a day a fire truck is not going to be able to get by because
30 traffic is backed up?

31
32 Ben Hunter: Yes, that is some of the information the study can provide. Generally
33 they'll go out in morning peak and evening peak, which is a two-hour period for
34 morning a two-hour period for night. For example, out of however many numbers
35 of cars coming on Harvey headed westbound from the east, if there's X number of
36 cars, Y turn right, Z go through, and A turn left. They will identify within that two-
37 hour block the peak hour. Based on modeling and what they've observed on site
38 during that peak hour, they will generally provide a recommended queue length
39 requirement for however many cars turn right, how many cars turn left, and how

APPROVED MINUTES

1 many cars go straight. They will also identify a level of service based on that peak
2 demand. All of that information should be included in the traffic study to get a
3 better picture. Are there 50 cars sitting at the stoplight and the firetruck needs to
4 come out, or is it two cars?

5
6 Bruce Frandsen: The queue length would be what would determine that? *Ben
7 Hunter affirmed. *

8
9 Harold Dudley: This has not yet come before us as an annexation, correct?
10 *Patrick O'Brien affirmed. * During the annexation process, we could limit no
11 access to Harvey Boulevard, is that correct?

12
13 Ben Hunter: Because of the spacing requirements in our code, I believe it would
14 not have permitted access onto Harvey.

15
16 Mr. Dudley requested to hear from the applicant. Chairman Woffinden informed
17 Mr. Ostler of his three choices moving forward: The Commission can recommend
18 approval and it will forward, the Commission can deny it and Mr. Ostler can
19 appeal to the City Council, or the Commission can table it which would give Mr.
20 Ostler the opportunity to get more data and the Commission can make a more
21 informed decision.

22
23 Kurt Ostler: Is it possible for the Commission to make a motion that we have a
24 traffic study by the time we go to City Council so they would have the information
25 to help them?

26
27 Harold Dudley: I don't like that idea. We have deliberated on it, and I would rather
28 [review the information.]

29
30 Chairman Woffinden agreed. Mr. Ostler and Chairman Woffinden had a brief
31 discussion on the benefits of doing an updated traffic study with more up-to-date
32 information. Mr. Ostler agreed that his 2018 data from CoStar was outdated.

33
34 John Woffinden: Perhaps the best decision would be to table it so we could receive
35 more information and make a more informed decision.

36
37 Kurt Ostler: If that is what the Commission would like to do. If the Commission
38 could give me a positive [recommendation] and I could move on to City Council
39 [with recommended approval] that is what I would rather do. If you feel like you

APPROVED MINUTES

1 need that data and it will lend to a positive recommendation, I can do that.
2 *Chairman Woffinden repeated Mr. Ostler's options. * Can I get a sense of [if it
3 would be approved?]
4

5 Harold Dudley: I do not think that would be wise on our part.
6

7 John Woffinden: I think it's more of a tabling issue from what I've heard so far.
8

9 Kurt Ostler: It might be better to have it tabled and to bring it back with a traffic
10 study.
11

12 Christine Anderson: Does the traffic study find the peak hour? Because the peak
13 hour on this road would not be five o'clock. It would be three o'clock when people
14 are picking up for school with two junior high schools and a high school.
15

16 Chairman Woffinden confirmed that Mr. Ostler would provide a traffic study. Mr.
17 Ostler confirmed. Mr. O'Brien stated the traffic study would help alleviate any
18 concerns regarding Mr. Ostler's project.
19

20 Rodney Martin: Our main concern is access to Harvey Boulevard?
21

22 Ben Hunter: Not necessarily. There are two other points of clarification I would
23 like to point out. Although our spacing requirements would dictate that it would
24 not be able to have an access onto Harvey, one of the other things identified in the
25 traffic study is where all of the traffic is coming from. Even though you may not
26 have access directly onto Harvey, if cars are coming through that intersection to
27 get to this site you are adding the congestion onto that intersection. If they are
28 coming from the east and they choose Harvey as the road they travel on, they've
29 got to come to the intersection, turn right, and then turn right again onto 1750
30 North, and come into the site which adds to that potential congestion. To answer
31 Christine, one of the things we have also done in certain circumstances due to
32 location is during peak times like with school they can evaluate from 2:30 to 4:30
33 and then evaluate during your normal peak to help identify which time is actually
34 the peak. Typically they do the morning and evening commute because that is
35 when you have a lot of traffic. The traffic study can identify when the peak will be
36 to establish when the true impact will be.
37

38 Kurt Ostler: It appears they're all worried about the traffic coming off of our lot. I
39 have faith that the traffic study will come back okay. On the Highland side I know

APPROVED MINUTES

1 they are adding another road called Featherstone from the high school to Canal
2 Boulevard to take some [traffic] off of 4800 which may open up the intersection
3 more.
4

5 Chris Christiansen: What I've heard is the main concern is this access to Harvey.
6 As Ben stated, our current code does not allow that to happen. To me, I don't
7 necessarily see the benefit of saying we've got to stop this because we need to have
8 a traffic study. Ben brought up a great point. Technically speaking, I think you're
9 right, but I just don't see an additional amount of traffic here as this is a collector.
10 They're coming that way anyways because [North] County Boulevard is where all
11 the traffic's coming from. This parcel is not going to be impacting all that. So that
12 said, if the landowner was able to make sure they could get the access from UDOT
13 and then off the north side and come back with a proposal that would make us
14 reconsider, I think I'm more open to that. The fact of the matter is that the land use
15 was PF before it was purchased so I have to default to that. Looking at this, it does
16 make sense that this would be Commercial. But because of the timing of things,
17 we're stuck in this situation. I really don't think a traffic study is going to do much,
18 but I'm a data fan. I like data and data provides more information, so I'm not
19 opposed to it. In my opinion, I don't think this can move forward.
20

21 Mr. Frandsen stated his agreement that he does not believe that the traffic will be
22 impacted by whatever will be built on the parcel. Mr. Dudley concurred and added
23 that he believes a traffic study will add more data and information and remove
24 speculation from the situation.
25

26 **Harold Dudley motioned to table action on the Land Use Map Amendment to**
27 **Design Commercial, for the property located in the area of 9826 N 4800 W,**
28 **and instructed the developer to provide to staff and the Planning Commission**
29 **a bona fide traffic study to include viable information in regards to the**
30 **following:**

- 31 • **The traffic study ensures all aspects are reviewed regarding zoning that**
32 **would allow access to Harvey Boulevard.**
- 33 • **A review as to what UDOT will allow for access to North County**
34 **Boulevard and access to the north to ensure all unknowns are taken into**
35 **account.**
- 36 • **Real, accurate data on fire and police station traffic.**

APPROVED MINUTES

- Information from the fire station and police department should be obtained regarding their opinion on what their use will be.

Christine Anderson seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	NAY
David Bird	AYE
Harold Dudley	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

The motion was tabled

Mr. O'Brien stated that the fire department and police department will be invited to the future Planning Commission meeting that discusses this project.

Harold Dudley excused himself from the meeting.

Chairman Woffinden confirmed the steps required of Mr. Ostler. Mr. Ostler confirmed his understanding.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review and action on the Site Plan for Cost-U-Less Carpet, located in the area of 64 North 900 West, in the General Commercial (GC-2) Zone.

Chairman John Woffinden noted the applicant asked to be removed from the agenda.

2. Review and action on a Site Plan application for a pylon sign for Doug Smith Autoplex, located at 523 W Main St, in the Planned Shopping Center (SC-1) Zone

APPROVED MINUTES

Travis reviewed the background information for action item number 2: The applicant is applying for a Site Plan approval for Doug Smith Autoplex, for a pylon sign in the SC-1 Zone, located in the area 523 W Main Street. The proposal consists of 1 lot intended for the pylon sign placement near I-15. The entire development parcel consists of approximately 6.99 acres. The new pylon sign will add an electronic message center.

When the application first came in it was reviewed as section 17.6.115, non-accessory signs and billboards, and it came down from staff and administration that in needed to be reviewed as 17.5.128 which is a freestanding pylon sign. This made it so the electronic message center had to come down in size and the sign height had to come down approximately seven feet. New plans were sent by the applicant yesterday that staff has not reviewed yet.

The Site Plan application does not meet the requirements of Section 17.6.101 and staff recommends TABLING the application.

Chris Christiansen motioned to table action on the Site Plan application for Doug Smith Autoplex, for a pylon sign, located at 523 W Main St, in the Planned Shopping Center (SC-1) Zone to allow staff the time to review the resubmitted drawings and plans associated with this project.

Rodney Martin seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

The motion was tabled

3. Review and action on a site plan application for the DBN Tax Project, located at 34 W 100 N, in the Central Commercial (CC-1) Zone

Travis Van reviewed the background information for action item number 3: The applicant is applying for a Site Plan approval for DBN Tax Project, for a new commercial development in the CC-1 Zone, located in the area 34 W 100 N. The

APPROVED MINUTES

1 proposal consists of 1 lot intended for commercial development. The entire
2 development parcel consists of approximately 0.47 acres.

3 Due to the development being in the CC-1 zone, the Planning Commission is the
4 approval body for the Site Plan.

5 Project conditions of approval include:

- 6 1. Per 17.12.214, 17.1.502, and 17.4.401. This access needs to be closed if the
7 West Lane could not meet the city code.
- 8 2. If want to add a new access to the West Lane for this project. Need to meet
9 the following:
 - 10 a. Dead End Streets, per code 15.01.100 shall be a cul-de-sac.
 - 11 b. Additional 45 ft of ROW along the West Lane needs to be provide
- 12 3. The commercial driveway requirement is 26 ft.
- 13 4. Grading for the drainage
- 14 5. The commercial access spacing for minor collector road is 150', per
15 15.01.1850

16 The Site Plan application does not meet the requirements of Section 17.6.101 and
17 the applicant has an outstanding invoice, therefore the staff recommends TABLING
18 the application.

19 John Woffinden: You stated fees were not paid at this time?

20 Travis Van Ekelburg: Correct.

21 Ben Hunter: One of the challenges on this particular project was that we provided
22 comments to them, and a lot of the comments have not been fully addressed. Some
23 of it revolves around access to West Lane on the north end. Their site plan shows
24 access to West Lane which does not meet current city code requirements for roads.
25 That's one of the comments that we provided to them that they would need to meet
26 city standards, which would also impact some existing dwellings and things like that.
27 There's several other typical code requirements that they haven't met. That's part of
28 why we're supportive of our recommendation to tabling.

29 Greg Cronin: I'm here with UBA (Utah Business Alliance). We began this project
30 about a year ago. This is an existing lot within your community. It has two access
31 points. One is on 100 North and the other is on West Lane which is on the backside
32 and has been used historically for that lot. I do not know exactly how to approach
33 this tonight. We've had a lot of back and forth on this project. We have had

APPROVED MINUTES

1 comments from Engineering and the Fire department that are nearly impossible to
2 meet for an existing lot that has existing access points off roads that are currently
3 platted in public. We're getting told we can no longer use a publicly dedicated road
4 as an exit point that they've been using historically because of the sizing. We're
5 being told that everything has to be pushed to 100 North which is the traditional
6 entry point into this location. The challenge is there. It is C-1 and it was rezoned. It
7 has the challenges of the existing lot. We went through a planning site review
8 [Concept Plan Meeting] with the city staff prior to beginning and contracting this
9 project. We showed a site plan and its general format with the same existing access
10 points. It was all stated that it was sufficient and that we should move forward as
11 there weren't any major details to work through. That became incorrect as we got to
12 the end and the requirements changed and we were told that we were not going to
13 be able to use the existing street and we would have to go out to 100 North. We are
14 expanding on an existing building for this project. Are the Commissioners familiar
15 with this site? *The Commissioners confirmed they were. * West Lane is very
16 narrow, it's 14 feet and does not meet your city standards. People enter in on 100
17 North and they exit out the back on West Lane which is the only use it's ever been
18 primarily used for. It's worth keeping the same historic use that's always been used
19 on the lot. They are simply adding 12 offices to the back of the building to expand
20 their tax accounting practice. We were contracted to come in and carry out the
21 process, and we thought it would be rather simple. There are not numerous things
22 that have not been addressed. There are a couple of items that have not yet been
23 addressed because we frankly do not know how to address them to tell you the truth.
24 We have provided comments back. I believe the fees were paid two days ago, there
25 might be one that was paid today. One was for \$100 from the fire department for
26 review. We have six months of history of paying our bills. This one did not get paid,
27 so we were held up from coming to the Planning Commission for less than \$300. I
28 thought it interesting that we would be held up on our project. We do pay for those.
29 We were informed of that a couple of days ago. We rushed over to American Fork
30 and got those checks cleared because engineering withheld their comments because
31 of a few outstanding items that were not paid. But we did pay those. I have a client
32 who is here as a resident of your community who has been working for months on a
33 site plan that was turned in. We thought it would be pretty simple. The objections
34 that have come in through engineering have been almost insurmountable to the
35 extent that they have told us to either proceed, get an opinion from the City Council,
36 or simply we're just done. So that is what I'm presenting to you. I'm under the

APPROVED MINUTES

1 direction of my client as they can't wait any longer. It's been going on too long. I
2 have my engineer here who would like to address the comments and I would like to
3 give him a moment to speak.

4 Chairman Woffinden informs Mr. Cronin that he has the same three options as Mr.
5 Ostler. Mr. Cronin stated his understanding. Mr. Cronin restated that he would like
6 his engineer to address the Commission and reiterated his feelings that there was an
7 insurmountable situation between staff interpreting the code and what his team has
8 been able to accomplish with an existing lot and a peculiar situation. Mr. Van
9 Ekelenburg clarified that the city shows an outstanding invoice of approximately
10 \$1,300 and it had not been paid at 10 o'clock in the morning on this day. Mr. Cronin
11 clarified that his team had been working on getting the checks sent in and he did not
12 know for certain that they got put in today. He knows his team has been working on
13 paying for them for the last three or four days. He stated he was personally aware of
14 invoices for approximately \$600 and there may be others he is not aware of.
15 Chairman Woffinden reiterated that he was made aware that the invoices had not
16 been paid as of 10 o'clock that morning. Mr. Cronin stated his intention was not to
17 state that the invoices had been completely taken care of and he was trying to clarify
18 why [receiving comments back from American Fork] was stopped.

19 Mr. Nathan Dye, Mr. Cronin's engineer, gave a brief description of the comments
20 that his team had received from American Fork City regarding their project and what
21 changes he made to accommodate those comments. Chairman Woffinden asked Mr.
22 Dye if the owner to the east had been approached about shared access on 100 North.
23 Mr. Dye stated the owner was not interested in shared access. Mr. Dye expressed the
24 difficulty and hurtles he feels his team is encountering and his lack of understanding
25 of how to satisfy the comments from the city. Chairman Woffinden asked if Mr. Dye
26 understood that answering a question may create new questions that will need to be
27 addressed. Mr. Dye stated his feelings that city staff may not be seeing that his team
28 is addressing comments. Further discussion ensued between the Commission, Mr.
29 Cronin, Mr. Dye, and Mr. Hunter regarding comments on the site plan. Mr. Cronin
30 requested a recommendation of approval to move forward to the City Council to ask
31 them to approve the conditions. Chairman Woffinden confirmed his right to do so.
32 Ms. Anderson stated her hope to work with the existing lot. Mr. O'Brien clarified
33 that the invoice notification had been sent out two weeks prior as well as when
34 comments were ready, and when the item was noticed for the agenda. Mr. O'Brien
35 also clarified that because the item is in the CC-1 zone, the Planning Commission is

APPROVED MINUTES

1 the approving body, not the recommending body, and it would not go to the City
2 Council. He noted that if the item was denied, the item would need to go through the
3 appeal process. Mr. Cronin clarified that if his item was tabled it would come back
4 to the Planning Commission on January 4th which was confirmed by Mr. O'Brien.

5 Greg Cronin: We have addressed a few issues like West Lane. If the Commission is
6 the approving body, are they the ones that would say they approve the condition of
7 allowing us to continue to use West Lane for vehicular traffic? Do they make that
8 choice, or does it go to the City Council?

9 Mr. O'Brien stated he would need to look into that question.

10 Ben Hunter: There's a site plan that came through in 2018 that didn't show access
11 on West Lane. We gave comments and those were never addressed back then. *Mr.
12 Cronin states they were not on the project at that point. * There was a site plan that
13 came through with some remodel work for the site in 2018 which did not show and
14 include [West Lane] it only showed it as native ground. I am curious to know when
15 the City Council approved that site plan granting access. There is a difference
16 between access and frontage.

17 Mr. Cronin stated there was no objection to the path when they initially met with the
18 city for a concept plan meeting. Mr. Hunter stated the meetings were for guidelines
19 and it wasn't possible to cover everything and to ensure the project would meet every
20 part of the code in a twenty-minute meeting.

21 Ben Hunter: I'm not aware of a site plan that was ever approved granting access to
22 West Lane. When you change the use of a property you must conform to the current
23 code. West Lane does not meet current road standards which is why a comment was
24 made. *

25 Further discussion ensued between Mr. Cronin, Mr. Dye, and Mr. Hunter regarding
26 comments on the site plan.

27 Mr. Dye stated that the city engineer, JJ Hsu, had requested existing and proposed
28 elevations to be called out on the site plan. According to Mr. Dye, Mr. Hsu had stated
29 in an in-person meeting that the edits Mr. Dye had provided would be sufficient.
30 Following that meeting, Mr. Dye said he then received comments on the site plan
31 stating the grading was not provided. Mr. Hsu clarified that he had told Mr. Dye at
32 their in-person meeting that as long as the information he requested was labeled on
33 the site plan, it would be sufficient.

APPROVED MINUTES

Mr. Martin stated that the only direction [the Commission] can go on this is to table it. Chairman Woffinden agreed. Mr. Cronin restated the difficulty of the back and forth with comments from the city. He expressed his understanding that his team was unable to receive comments prior to the meeting due to their outstanding invoice. He stated he was unsure if the item would come back to the Planning Commission if it was tabled but agreed that tabling seemed like the wise and smart thing to do and they were there following the direction of their client. Chairman Woffinden stated that the Commissioners were following the direction of the city staff and were making a decision based off their recommendation. Mr. Cronin stated his understanding. Ms. Anderson stated her hope to see the item back in January and her hope that it could move forward. Mr. Martin stated his understanding of the difficulties that can arise when developers make changes to old lots in the city. He stated his hope that the project could move forward with the issues getting addressed as needed.

Rodney Martin motioned to table action on the Site Plan application for the DBN Tax Project, located at 34 W 100 N, in the Central Commercial (CC-1) Zone, and instruct the developer/staff to work together to address the final comments and return to the Planning Commission meeting on January 4, 2023.

David Bird seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

The motion was tabled

4. Review and action on a final plat for Meadowbrook Plat A seeking approval of a final plat consisting of 14 lots, located in the area of 620 South 850 West, in the Transit Oriented Development Zone

APPROVED MINUTES

5. Review and action on a final plat for Meadowbrook Plat B, seeking approval of a final plat consisting of 46 lots, located in the area of 460 South 740 West, in the Transit Oriented Development Zone

Chairman Woffinden stated that action items numbers 4 and 5 would be heard together and voted on separately.

Cody Opperman reviewed the background information for action item number 4: The applicant is applying for a Final Plat approval for Meadowbrook Plat A, located in the area of 620 South 850 West in the TOD Zone. The proposal consists of 14 lots for a multi-staged development intended for single family townhomes. The development area consists of 1.08 acres. Meadowbrook Plat A will be located within the Garden District – Edge District in the Transit Oriented Development Overlay Zone. Due to the development being in a neighborhood edge, lower density is permitted to transition out of the higher density designations located closer to the Frontrunner Station. The most updated plat was provided yesterday (12/06/2022) and the staff has not had enough time to do a thorough review.

The Final Plat application does not meet the requirements of Section 17.7.210 and Section 17.7.211. Staff recommends TABLING the application.

Cody Opperman reviewed the background information for action item number 5: The applicant is applying for Final Plat approval for Meadowbrook Plat B, located at approximately 460 S 740 W in the TOD Zone. The proposal consists of 46 dwelling units on approximately 3.55 acres. The most updated plat was provided yesterday (12/06/2022) and the staff has not had enough time to do a thorough review. The applicant has not received final block and lot approval.

The Final Plat application does not meet code sections 17.7.210 and 17.7.211. Staff recommends TABELING the application.

Matthew Loveland: When this project was put on the agenda about two weeks ago, Woodside staff felt that we were close and able to get [our item] done prior to tonight. There were some comments that were provided and have been submitted and we feel that they meet the intent. There is one outstanding item which I do want to talk with you about tonight that is frankly out of our control as it's an internal decision. The item that is out of our control is related to our storm drain outflow for the community. Within the City Master Plan, they're trying to determine if the stormwater needs to go east or west. Woodside and Berg Engineering cannot decide

APPROVED MINUTES

1 that; it's purely an internal staff decision. We have provided information that justifies
2 one way or another. When this agenda was put together, there was an understanding
3 that it would be sorted out. All the items that are still out there are related to
4 construction drawings. If the Planning Commission feels that the final plat meets the
5 requirements, we ask that they give a positive recommendation with the condition
6 that staff finalize the review of the last one or two items. Ken Berg can bring you up
7 to speed on those, but they are extremely minor. The second item would be prior to
8 coming to City Council for the final approval that staff determine if we are we going
9 east or west with the storm drain outflow. We've been through this for a long time,
10 and we're excited about continuing this project and starting development.

11 Bruce Frandsen: Which direction does your engineering currently show the outflow
12 going? West?

13 Matthew Loveland: West. Through the existing Lakeshore outflow put in by Red
14 Pine.

15 Patrick O'Brien: One of the challenges for us is that we generally like the lot plan to
16 be approved as part of everything. Where the plat matches the lot plan and what
17 we're looking at in terms of some engineering issues related to the storm drain, if the
18 Planning Commission sees fit to recommend it for approval tonight, the only
19 condition that I would ask from a staff perspective is that it cannot go to City Council
20 until the lot plan has been approved. That would shorten the process. We want to
21 help applicants where we're able, and this is a situation where we could do that. Some
22 of the things relate to a decision that the city needs to make in terms of the
23 calculations and whether or not that is the direction the city wants to go. The plats
24 do match what is in the lot plan. If the lot plan had to change for any reason, then
25 these plats would not match, and we would change our recommendation as it goes
26 to the City Council. I don't see that being an issue. It's completely different items.
27 But we would still require the block plan and the lot plan to be approved before it
28 can be placed on an agenda for City Council.

29 Bruce Frandsen: Who is the approval for block and lot plans?

30 Patrick O'Brien: Staff.

31 Bruce Frandsen: I thought in the past they would come here [to Planning
32 Commission].

APPROVED MINUTES

Patrick O'Brien: The District Framework Plan comes to the Planning Commission and then goes to City Council. Naturally we would prefer it if the lot and the block plans were approved beforehand. That is our standard.

The staff and Mr. Ken Berg affirmed.

Bruce Frandsen motioned to recommend approval on the final plat for Meadowbrook Plat A, located in the area of 620 South 850 West, in the Transit Oriented Development Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Staff Report and contingent on the lot and block plan being approved by staff prior to going to City Council.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

The motion passed

Bruce Frandsen motioned to recommend approval on the Final Plat for Meadowbrook Plat B, located in the area of 460 S 740 W in the TOD Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Staff Report and contingent on the lot and block plan being approved by staff prior to going to City Council.

David Bird seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

The motion passed

APPROVED MINUTES

6. Review and action on a request for approval of a low-power radio antenna located at 74 E Frontage Road, in the Planned Industrial (PI-1) Zone

Travis Van Ekelenburg reviewed the background information for action item number 6: The applicant is applying for Commercial Site Plan approval for a Wireless Facility, located at approximately 74 E Frontage Rd. in the PI-1 Zone. The proposed Wireless Facility is for AT&T Wireless and will be a monopole design that is sixty (60) feet in height, with additional ground equipment. The current use on the property is a self-storage facility and the proposed Wireless Facility will be located at the west end of the property. The property is approximately 5.64 acres.

Project conditions of approval:

1. Provide Approvable Geotechnical Report

The Commercial Site Plan application meets the requirements of Section 17.6.112 and staff recommends APPROVAL.

John Woffinden: I have not reviewed the Geotechnical report.

Jeff Mortimer: No further comments on top of having an approvable Geotechnical report that staff and Chairman Woffinden has reviewed.

Richard Lee: I'm here as an agent for AT&T Wireless. The staff has been awesome to work with. Initially, we were not going to be able to move forward because of the Geotechnical report. There are a lot of steps at the Federal level that we have to go through before we can even get to the Geotechnical report. To have it approved subject to an approvable Geotechnical report is great for us.

John Woffinden: For your information, a Geotechnical report is required because south of the freeway can be a geologic nightmare and could trigger liquefaction and other things. That is why we require it, especially in that part of town.

Richard Lee: I completely understand. The last thing that we would want is to build a sign and have it sink.

APPROVED MINUTES

Rodney Martin motioned to recommend approval on the Commercial Site Plan for AT&T Wireless, located in the area of 74 E Frontage Rd in the PI-1 Zone, subject to any conditions found in the Staff Report and provided the Geotechnical report is completed to the satisfaction of staff.

Chris Christiansen seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE
David Bird	AYE
Rodney Martin	AYE

The motion passed

COMMON CONSENT AGENDA

2. Adoption of 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

Patrick O'Brien: There are a few months on the proposal where the first day of the month is a Wednesday and, in those instances, we move it to the second Wednesday of the month to ensure it does not conflict with City Council scheduling.

Chairman Woffinden noted meeting dates are subject to change with proper notice to account for holidays.

Bruce Frandsen motioned to adopt the 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

Christine Anderson seconded the motion.

John Woffinden	AYE
Christine Anderson	AYE
Chris Christiansen	AYE
Bruce Frandsen	AYE

APPROVED MINUTES

David Bird **AYE**

Rodney Martin **AYE**

Concept Plan Report & Upcoming Projects

Patrick O'Brien: Our next meeting has been canceled for December 21st. The next meeting after that will be January 4th. We started drafting our agenda. There will be a few items on it as new projects, a few items from tonight may be coming back if they're ready. We'll still notice the item for the DBN Tax project in anticipation that it will be ready. If it's not we will deal with that when we get to it.

John Woffinden: Will Cost-U-Less be back?

Cody Opperman: I did contact them regarding the January 4th meeting and they do want to be on it.

Patrick O'Brien: I will have a beginning of year report on what happened in 2022 related to the Development Services Department. It will include the overall breakdown of actions that were taken by the Planning Commission following through to City Council. In 2023 we'll have a quarterly report to keep you as a Commission informed on what's happening in terms of development in the city. We hope to get more statistics on our website and available overall for you and the community. We would like to go for a more professional feel with frequent reporting so everyone can stay in the loop. I think it's good for anyone who wants to develop in our community that all of this information is available so they can see how busy we are. A lot of other communities around are slowing down in terms of volume of work coming in. We're still doing pretty well considering how fast things are dropping off around us. I also appreciate the positive comments that we received tonight.

Other Business

Adjournment

Christine Anderson motioned to adjourn the meeting. Chris Christiansen seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 8:59

APPROVED MINUTES

- 1 Melissa White
- 2 Administrative Assistant II
- 3 The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the
- 4 commissioners, public and staff.
- 5
- 6