

Minutes of Planning and Zoning meeting held June 6, 1979, at Santaquin City Hall, 68 East Main Street, Santaquin, Utah at 8:00 P.M.

Meeting was called to order at 8:30 by Chairman Lynn Crook. Clerk had been previously asked to phone Dee Davis and Fred Tasker as neither were present. There was no one at home either place.

Present were Lynn Crook, Dan Mendenhall, Helen Kester, Councilman Fred Thompson and Ramona Rosenlund acting as clerk.

Prayer was by Lynn Crook.

Minutes of meeting held May 30, 1979, were approved after the correction of spelling of Mr. Gausby's name and changing Mountain West to Mountain Lands Association of Governments. Also in the third paragraph of page 2, the word "industrial" was inserted before the word "area" for clarification. Also in the last line of paragraph four after "Subdivision Ordinance" the words "on another date" were added.

Motion for approval was made by Helen Kester and seconded by Dan Mendenhall and the motion carried.

Mr. Crook asked Mr. Thompson to report on the street assignment asked for in the last meeting. Mr. Thompson said he had not been able to contact the person he needed to talk with as he was out of his office. He said he will obtain this information as soon as possible.

Mr. Crook felt they should have this information before completing the Subdivision ordinance. Mrs. Kester thought they could go ahead with the ordinance since it calls for a minimum of 56' for streets, therefore, the county's 50' streets had no bearing. However, Mr. Crook felt they should find out why the county has 50' streets and what their thinking was as our arterial streets are 100' and theirs are 30' and he thinks we should coordinate with the county so all is basically the same.

There followed some discussion regarding annexation. Mr. Crook asked Mrs. Kester about her observation that some of the commercial zoning being considered would be more advantageous to tourists or to our city. Mrs. Kester explained she meant would this bring in something such as a Safeway store as opposed to tourist trade such as motels, restaurants, etc.

Mr. Crook said he felt the possibility of the area between the city limits and the canal being commercial was good as have already had two requests for annexation for this purpose and there would be more to come if it was annexed commercial. He thought that within five years there would be a whole row of commercial and that this is a good way for the city to get money. There is also need for additional services such as police, etc., and must be decided if the benefits outweigh the problems.

Mrs. Kester said both she and Mr. Davis were opposed to annexing the DeGraffenreid property just to get some on the other side of it annexed to the city. Suppose in future they decide they do not want to stay in the GreenBelt and decide to subdivide? What then about someone such as Mr. Ray who ^{is} already in the city and was turned down. Mr. Thompson explained that any one in the Green Belt who wanted to change would have to pay the difference in taxes for the five preceeding years. He had checked this out on the DeGraffenreid property and found it was ~~not~~ a great deal of difference.

There followed some discussion on whether a trailer court was commercial or residential zone. Mrs. Kester believed it to be residential since some are not in commercial zones and this is how she thought the ordinance reads. Mr. Crook said multiplex dwellings are limited to four units and any more than four would be commercial. He felt this should be determined for sure if multiplex units are commercial or residential. Mr. Mendenhall said maybe they should be commercial

a third residential zone for multiplex dwellings as this the way he thought they
ad in Orem.

Mr. Thompson thought the area in question should be annexed as commercial and if it
was determined a trailer court was not commercial another zone could be used.

Mrs. Kester asked if it was felt this whole area ^{to the canal} should be annexed now or just
the Hepple place to begin with. Mr. Thompson said the Sorensens do not want to be
annexed but could be forced to do so if the others wanted to be. It was mentioned
that anyone annexed would require services such as fire protection and water. Mr.
Mendenhall thought that anyone annexed should supply their own water. It was asked
if individuals could force the city to annex them in as much as the city can force
annexation. Mr. Thompson replied that the city could not be forced to do this. Also
that if everyone around a certain place were to be annexed the island created would
have to also be annexed as the county would not allow an island. It was suggested
that there be an agreement that any people who annex and then build would have to
furnish their own water. Mr. Thompson left the meeting.

After much discussion about annexation and water problems in connection with same,
it was decided a letter to the City council would be written asking for information
needed before an Annexation Policy could be written. (See attached copy).

Mr. Crook said he would get a copy of the log for Afton Smith's well to find what
the water situation might be in that general area if the City were to dig a well
in the South-west area for possible industrial zone.

It was decided to have each commission member in turn, study the Utah County Devel-
opment Standards book before the next meeting and be prepared to discuss anything
pertaining to our ordinance that might be considered and then try to finish the
ordinance.

The next meeting will be held on June 20, 1979. at 8:00 P.M.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55. Motion was made by Dan Mendenhall and seconded by
Helen Kester.
