

Minutes of Planning and Zoning Commission meeting held May 16, 1979, at 8:00 P.M. in the City Hall at 68 East Main Street, Santaquin Utah.

Present were Lynn Crook, Fred Tasker, Dee Davis, Dan Mendenhall, Fred Thompson, Helen Kester and Clyde Naylor. Ramona Rosenlund acted as clerk. Meeting was called to order by Lynn Crook. Prayer was offered by Helen Kester.

Minutes of meeting held May 2, 1979, were read and after four corrections (date left off, wrong date of next meeting and paragraphs four and five on page 2), Dee Davis made a motion that the corrected minutes be approved and motion was seconded by Dan Mendenhall and passed.

Councilman Fred Thompson introduced Mr. Clyde Naylor, Utah County Surveyor, saying Mr. Naylor is also a licensed engineer and has his own engineering business. Mr. Naylor came to the meeting to assist in setting up a Policy of Declaration for Santaquin City and to show slides and discuss the new policy of the county regarding annexations.

Mr. Naylor explained that the legislature began looking at this new bill because of the problems ~~going~~ between Orem and Provo in annexation, but it became modified as Salt Lake and other counties problems were considered. He said the bill on boundries and annexations has two thrusts. (1) Cities will develop a policy statement for annexation or against same, if that is what is wanted, as the new law requires the establishment of some kind of policy. If, after the declaration policy comes into effect, there should be any conflict, the contesting party would have an opportunity to say what it is and if the city felt the policy should not change, it would come before the local Boundry Committee. Only taxing entities can complain as annexation can only come by petition. For example, there was a piece of property before the County Planning Commission requesting T-R-5 zoning. The county turned this down as it was adjacent to Santaquin and they felt that until Santaquin City stated it's policy, this was premature. This doesn't mean a policy declaration can not be ammended but it would require a public hearing as does the orignal policy.

Mr. Crook asked Mr. Naylor if there has been a ruling as yet on annexation of under five acres. Mr. Naylor replied that a local Boundry Committee Board is being set up. As specified under the law, Utah County commissioners appointed two members and an alternate and they are himself, County Recorder Nina B. Reid and County Assessor Harrison Conover. Various cities, through the Council of Governments, were given the responsibility for appointing two additional elected officials to the board and they are Don Christiansen, Payson City councilman and Evan Brady, American Fork City Councilman, with Ed Murdock, Springville City councilman as alternate. The four regular board members have the responsibility for appointing three additional non-elected individuals to the commission at large. The various cities of the county have been asked to nominate individuals for these three positions. The nominations must be submitted within three weeks.

Mr. Naylor said the second thrust was to provide an avenue to settle disputes between taxing entities. After May 8, 1979, if anyone wants to be annexed, it must be viewed by the Boundry Commission if there is dispute. If no one complains, it does not go before the Boundry Commission. For example, some of the counties in the state were complaining about problems because of jurisdiction such as creating islands, half of roads, etc. Some of the problems being who should maintain service, as well as taxing problems. The Boundry Commission provides a method to clear these problems before annexation. He felt it had a few imbiguities to be ironed out but that it can be a useful assistance devise for all.

Mr. Naylor asked for questions and Mr. Crook asked about "Cherry-stemming" annexation. Mr. Naylor replied that this was when a city wanted to annex something not connecting. This will not be allowed if it is necessary to go through a road. It must be contiguous and can not creat islands anymore as this creates jurisdiction problems.

Mrs. Kester asked if the city placed a T-R-5 zone around the city, would the city have to

annex the property of people who want to be annexed? Mr. Naylor explained that only property that the city has asked to annex sometime in the future can be zoned T-R-5. The county will not establish T-R-5 zoning unless the city feels it would want this property to come in some time in the future. This should be in the city's Policy of Declaration. If it is, the county will change it to T-R-5 but the city doesn't have to annex unless it wants to. There followed a short discussion of the Jones property being changed to T-R-5. Mr. Naylor said the county can't act on this until the city makes it's Policy of Declaration. From this policy the county can set T-R-5's.

Mr. Thompson asked if Mr. Naylor would recommend that the city go out further than they are now and he replied that they should just go as far as they would maybe want for 5 to 10 years in the future. However, he stated a public meeting can be held to change the policy at any time.

Mr. Thompson asked if there would be any chance of "cherry-stemming" in the future and Mr. Naylor said probably not as it is deleted by the new law. There followed a short discussion on how to annex the small property of Mr. Chapple if the city desired to do so if no cherry-stemming was allowed. Mr. Naylor said other property that might be contiguous to both the city and the Chapple piece could be brought in if a certain percent of the owners wanted it. He was not sure about the percent but thought it was 75%. He said if any property is annexed the city must provide services unless it is stated otherwise as a condition of the annexation, which he said is legitimate. Mr. Thompson asked if a time-table for services could be set up until the city could up-date its facilities and Mr. Naylor said this could be done if services were not available immediately.

Mr. Naylor said that because of a lack to a degree, of cooperation in some cities, such as the Orem-Provo street width problem where each city is different, basic requirements of cities could be standardized. The county has published a booklet of development standards as to basic things such as roads, sidewalks, etc., and he feels a development standards plan for city and county could be made. It would need to be worked over by a committee and adopted officially and he would like to recommend that the Santaquin Planning & Zoning Commission recommend to the City Council that they take a look at being willing to support a development standards. A small city could not afford this but a joint committee could without too much money. If there were volunteers to work it out, there would only be the printing costs and this could be passed on to each city.

Mrs. Kester asked if this would mean we would have to change our street widths to conform to that of other cities and Mr. Naylor said no as there would be different classes of street widths which would not tie anyone down or dictate to anyone. If there is a proper way to fill a trench, there is only way, not ten. This is the kind of thing that should be standardized. Mr. Crook said he thought things like basic streets compaction, drains, curb and gutter, etc., would be good to standardize. Mr. Mendenhall if there was a need for survey markers in subdivisions and Mr. Naylor said yes they really are needed.

There followed a discussion on the Central Utah Project. Mr. Mendenhall asked if the Orem-Provo area had emergency water supplies. Mr. Naylor said yes and were getting more in the northern part of the county through C.U. P. He also said he thought there would be water available for the south part of the county in the next two to three years. The Central Utah Project managers said if the county commissioners would intercede in behalf of the southern part of the county, they would put it in the program. He said the cost might be 1/3 more than now. Mr. Davis asked if the Planning Commission should write about this and Mr. Naylor said yes, to write to the county commission requesting that culinary water be available for this part of the county.

Mr. Naylor showed narrated slides "A New Approach to Residential Streets". After the slides there was a discussion about streets. Mr. Naylor pointed out that in the past streets have been designed either by default or to highway standards. He feels the time has come to classify streets as they are to be used. A question was asked about

kidney shaped streets. Mr. Naylor said they were just offset cul-de-sac and can be used instead of round ones if there is room for turning. This would be a 50' radius minimum.

Mr. Naylor then showed some slides of floods that occurred on February 14, 1979, when a heavy rain came while the ground was frozen, and the water just ran off over everything. He showed several pictures of the Goshen Dam which burst that day as well as some of damage to the northern part of the county. He stated that two years ago when there was a drought in Utah, the Great Salt Lake was at it's highest ever and this was because of so much concrete, (streets, curb and gutter and storm drains, etc.) forcing the water into the lake rather than letting it soak in the ground. He then showed narrated slides "A New Approach to Storm Water Management".

After the slides Mr. Naylor commented on them and said that maybe it is time to start taking a look at new things. Road base can now be made of gypsum, flyash or sulphur products instead of asphalt or concrete. Cities have been using concrete for paving and gathering storm water into sewers and then into lakes. For example, the Oakhills area of Provo has no curbs and in a storm there is very little runoff even though it is on a hillside. Just lower down is the B.Y.U. parking lots, etc. and they have a real problem and the only difference is the curbs. He stated that a road with a proper base would not have any problems breaking up from the water. Mr. Naylor passed several sheets of paper to each person showing proposed way to provide for water to seep back into the ground. He also suggested sidewalks be put away from roads. It was pointed out that Santaquin has irrigation ditches on every street and that if a sidewalk were to be put in on the side of the ditch away from the street, it would serve the same purpose. Mr. Naylor stated that a sidewalk is to get people from one place to another and should not just parallel a road or street going the same place. Maybe more desirable now is a bike path, jogging paths, etc. If is right against a street, a sidewalk is a safety hazard. Suggested that if the city wanted sidewalks, they be put back even in the lots rather than next to the street or run them between blocks if it is helpful to get to a building easier. In sub-divisions sidewalks could even go between or in back of houses. It was brought out that in the older part of town this might be harder to do. There was also some discussion of making a place for children to walk to school other than in the roads.

Mr. Naylor said cities must plan the walks, not always put them as have been in the past. He stated a walk could be 5' and a bike path 10' or 12' wide. Mrs. Kester suggested that if people buying in a sub-division knew the walks would be on their property before they bought, there would be no problem as they would know in advance how it was going to be. It was thought that since Santaquin's streets are so wide with irrigation ditches at the sides, the ditches serve to carry off storm water. Mr. Naylor pointed out on drawings he had passed to each person present, how collectors could be placed every so often where terrain is steep. This way every yard has it's own puddle and no one has too big a puddle.

Mr. Naylor then talked about a 12 point program in the county, listing the 12 points as follows:

1. Require roads to be reclassified in the county as:
 - a. Freeway -- State controlled
 - b. Major highway--State controlled
 - c. Arterial--State and County controlled
 - d. Collector--County with State approval
 - e. Sub collector--County controlled within large projects or between projects
 - f. Local--Subdivision road
 - g. Place--A short street, CUL-DE-SAC or court
2. Require all collector roads to be limited access roads to allow free traffic flow.

3. Encourage a better balance for parking by providing more off-street parking and less on-street parking.
4. Provide only sufficient paving within the street right-of-way to meet the needs of traffic.
5. Remove sidewalks from the proximity of the asphalt streets.
6. Avoid through traffic on residential streets (local).
7. Allow design flexibility for local street to encourage following contours and natural terrain features.
8. Encourage the use of T-intersections.
9. Require on-site control of storm water to return the water to the water table as soon as possible.
10. Eliminate storm sewers and curbs and gutters where possible and replace these with sodded open storage ditches.
11. Require master drainage plans for projects which show that only the amount of runoff from the project site which existed prior to the project will be allowed to continue.
12. Provide for flexibility of design within the development standards.

Mr. Naylor said the county can assist the cities with storm drains and proposed that the county take on flood control for the cities and make up maps designating specific flood areas and subdivisions will be designed so there won't be flooding as in the past when natural drainage has been ignored. The county will review all flood control for subdivisions at no cost to the city, to make sure they won't be flooded. He feels it is time for the county to provide services to the cities in to;important areas: (1) Apply development standards county wide, and (2) Consider flood and drainage problems on a county wide basis. He stated the county had all the information for developers needed to make hydroanalogical analysis if they were required to bring in terrain maps, etc., and they could also help calculate what their 100 year storm would be. He felt this would cost the subdividers about \$10 to \$20 per lot. Mr. Naylor said that he recognizes that when additional fees are added it adds to the cost of the house but feels this is important. It was brought out that Santaquin has very good drainage for the city as long as there is not too much concrete put in.

There was a followed a discussion on names of roads and Mr. Naylor explained that "place" means a dead end or cul-de-sac; "local" means little more used than "place" and "collector" gather roads toward through roads. Mr. Naylor also said there should be a minimum of 2 permanent monument survey markers in each subdivision and as it grows, add one marker for each 15 lots and place where most advantageous. This is standard for the county.

Fred Thompson was assigned to obtain two copies of the county's book on standard development policy. Mr. Thompson is also to get copies for all who do not have copies of the new boundary law, at least 1 copy for the commission and one for the city council.

There was a general discussion about the things Mr. Naylor had talked about: Can Santaquin adopt the county's book of Standards for this city? Yes. Mapleton did last week. Should require sub-divisions to have a hydroanalogical analysis. There has been an approach to the city for a large sub-division and the sub-division ordinance is not finished. The city is looking toward some industrial zones but without cherry-stemming cannot get some of the land. Mr. Naylor said it could go T-R-5 and then annex other property. It was brought out that the county recorder had accepted the annexation of the Gaylen Peterson property. Also, that a moratorium can only be set for six months for specific things. It was asked what is the ruling on signs if in the county and

Mr. Naylor answered that the state had jurisdiction.

Dan Mendenhall made a motion that the City Council be asked to write to the County Commission immediately about Central Utah Project culinary water for Santaquin so it will be on record and we can know their plans. Dee Davis seconded the motion and motion carried.

It was suggested that a public meeting be held to show the people how the streets, sidewalks, curbs, etc. could be done as shown by Mr. Naylor and get some input from the public.

Mr. Crook asked the members of the commission to take the information given them by Mr. Naylor home and study it before the next meeting.

Mr. Crook commented on a special meeting called to discuss the annexation of some property where it was stated the city must take a share of water or the equivalent in cash for each acre annexed. Since the cost of a share of water has gone up higher, he felt the city should require water, not cash or, if cash, it should be at least \$100.00 more than the price of the water. The money should be in a special fund to be used for purchasing more water. The city should let the people know that the city will purchase water when ever it is available. A sign should be put up in the city hall to that effect.

The question was asked if a forced annexation, can the city take the water? It was suggested that the property owner develop water. Mr. Crook suggested putting this problem on the agenda for another meeting.

Mr. Crook stated there is still a problem with the Ben Alexander property. A motion has already been passed previous to this meeting that Mr. Alexander would be a sub-divider. Mr. Alexander has contacted an attorney about this and Mayor Steele wants the Planning and Zoning Commission to reconsider. Mr. Crook said he felt the Commission should say no to this as they have already given their recommendation to the city council.

Helen Kester made a motion that this be referred back to the city council and let them settle it, since the Planning and Zoning commission had already given their recommendation. The motion was seconded by Fred Tasker. Motion carried. Mr. Fred Thompson was assigned to take this information back to the city council.

Mrs. Kester suggested that in as much as there is an extra Wednesday this month, a work meeting be held to work on the sub-division ordinance or the annexation declaration. Fred Tasker made this into a motion and that the meeting be held at 8:00 P.M. Also that this meeting be adjourned. Dan Mendenhall seconded the motion and same carried.

Dee Davis mentioned that the secretary for the meetings be commended as it was very helpful to have copies of the minutes sent out after each meeting.

Meeting adjourned.