



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**Santaquin City Council Chambers
August 25, 2016**

Commission Members Present: Chair Elizabeth Montoya, Arthur Adcock, Kyle Francom, Kylie Lance, Austin Smith, Trevor Wood and Kyle Francom. Troy Peterson was excused.

Others: Assistant City Manager Dennis Marker, Elizabeth Robertson, Mike Robertson.

Commissioner Montoya called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

INVOCATION / INSPIRATIONAL THOUGHT

Commissioner Smith offered an invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Francom led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

No changes were made to the order of the agenda.

At 7:08 p.m. the Commissioners took a field trip to the area of the proposed Steele Annexation. Mike and Elizabeth Robertson explained their concerns about continuing to farm next to residential property, and their desire to have the annexation denied. The Commissioners returned to the regular meeting at 7:45 p.m.

PUBLIC FORUM

Commissioner Montoya opened the Public Forum. No comments were addressed to the Commission. Commissioner Montoya closed the Public Forum.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

PUD Ordinance

Dennis Marker said the City Council had suggested a formula be put together to determine what density changes should be allowed when a religious center, cultural center or school is placed in a PUD. The current ordinance allows for the displaced units to be incorporated into other areas. Any non-residential use will still have impacts on the City systems. If the units displaced are moved to another area, the developer may be getting double revenue, and the City getting additional impacts. However, such uses can add to the quality of life in a development. In order to encourage a developer to add them, the proposed changes in the ordinance allow 2% additional density for schools, religious centers and cultural centers. The use must have a minimum three acre parcel and be maintained by a public or tax-exempt entity.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 25, 2016 – Page 2

PUD Ordinance, continued:

Mr. Marker said that the South Summit Ridge developer, Jose Ojeda, had indicated he would not show a religious site on his concept plan, with the understanding that if a church comes in, the housing units for that parcel would not be placed in other areas. The question was raised on what would happen if an expected center or school was not actually built and at what point the bonus would be determined and allowed. Commissioner Francom suggested documentation from the entity be received before it is shown on a plan. Commissioner Montoya said she had spoken to a local representative for the LDS Church, who indicated that the Church had been contacted by both Mr. Ojeda and Salisbury Homes about potential sites for their buildings. The LDS Church is looking at building in this area, but as of this time, no offers have been made or purchases completed.

Mr. Marker said part of PUD approval is a development agreement between the developer and the City, which outlines amenities. This generally gets approved with the concept plan. If changes are made after the agreement is adopted, the City and the developer have the opportunity to amend the agreement. This proposed change to the ordinance would provide parameters for how to treat some possible changes. Some developers donate a church site, other developers do not show a church site because they cannot solidify what will be provided. Mr. Marker said one of the biggest concerns was water usage. Church impacts above the ground are not a lot different from homes.

The proposed density increases are 2% for a school, 2% for a church, and 1% for a playground, with a maximum increase of 5%. The question of whether a percentage was fair to all developers was raised, as 2% of a large development would be higher than 2% of a small development. After further discussion, Commission consensus held that a flat number be used, so it is the same for every developer.

Half of the field area of a school will count toward additional open space, but not toward the required 15%. The bonus will be based on the building portion of the school and the parking lot. It was agreed that private pavilions, such as at a church, would not count towards green space. Some concerns were expressed on how the City could ensure the amenities were actually provided before the densities were allowed. Having the densities based proportionally on the amount of the development already completed was discussed.

Commissioner Lance asked what the smallest lot could be in a PUD. Mr. Marker said that was up to the developer and what was in the development agreement.

After further discussion, Paragraphs B and C of Section 10-7K-5: DENSITY BONUS was changed to:

6. Non-Residential Uses: Non-residential uses such as schools, religious centers, care facilities, etc. which may be located within a project area typically provide additional amenities or cultural opportunities to area residents and thus increase the quality of life and experiences in a project area. As such, some site elements associated with these uses and which are generally accessible to the public may be counted toward bonus density eligibility under the following standards:

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 25, 2016 – Page 3

PUD Ordinance, continued:

a) Religious or cultural sites may be eligible for bonus density based on the following:

1. The amount of bonus density shall be the number of residential units that could be built on the site, as calculated by the number of units possible under the base zoning.
2. No additional bonus density is available for on-site amenities provided.
3. Uses under this part shall have a minimum 3 acre site and be owned, operated and maintained by a public or tax-exempt entity.
4. Written acknowledgement and intent to accept the site by the anticipated public or tax-exempt entity is required to receive the bonus density under this part.

b) School sites may be eligible for bonus density based on the following:

1. Half of any grass playing field areas may be counted as additional open space under part B.4 above.
2. The amount of bonus density shall also include the number of residential units that could be built on half of the school site, as calculated by the number of units possible under the base zoning.
3. Written acknowledgment and intent to accept the school site by a school entity is required to receive bonus density under this part.

c) Because some religious, cultural or educational facilities use more water than the potential number of homes on a similar area, sufficient water shall be dedicated to cover the anticipated usage of the non-residential use under this part.

- C. Total Project Density. Total project density is determined by increasing the base density by the total percent of density increase earned through the approval and implementation of amenities into the development. In no case will the total project density exceed forty-five percent (45%) more than the base density (i.e., if the base density for a project is 50 units and a density increase of 35 percent is earned, the maximum total project density shall be 67 units).

Mr. Marker said the City Council had asked the Commission to define the 40% non-masonry materials allowed on housing in a PUD, in particular, how much vinyl was allowed. He noted that the Orchards is the only PUD in construction at this time, but Bella Vista development is getting ready to submit a PUD request, and Salisbury Homes would have some as well.

Commissioner Lance said not everyone can afford a custom-type home, so it was not realistic to prohibit the use of vinyl. Commissioner Francom suggested expense could be cut by lowering the masonry requirement to 40%. Currently 60% masonry is the recommended change from 100% on the elevation facing a public or private street. A 50/50 split was suggested. Stucco would be allowed as a non-masonry material. Mr. Marker said some builders have indicated even using stucco makes them lose money. Commissioner Montoya said if vinyl did not hold its quality, the residents will not be happy. She asked if it was the City's responsibility to make sure the developer made a profit.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 25, 2016 – Page 4

PUD Ordinance, continued:

After an extensive discussion on types of materials, acceptable percentages of vinyl, cost and consistency, the following determinations were made:

Front elevations for single family homes, clustered homes, and attached homes facing a public street – 50% masonry, no vinyl siding permitted.

Front elevations for single family homes, clustered homes, and attached homes facing a private street – 50% masonry, no vinyl siding on ground floor, vinyl siding maximum of 25% of upper stories.

Side elevations for single family homes, clustered homes and attached homes (shrubbery and trees can hide and shade materials) - 30% masonry if not behind opaque fence, vinyl allowed only on upper stories.

Rear elevations for single family homes, clustered homes and attached homes - No masonry requirements or vinyl limitations on the rear of homes that do not face a street.

Mr. Marker said the City Council had asked that the uncovered parking requirement for apartments or stacked condos be reviewed. Commission consensus held that one covered parking stall be required for each unit.

Commissioner Francom made a motion to forward the PUD ordinance to the City Council with a positive recommendation. Commissioner Lance seconded the motion. The vote to forward the PUD ordinance to the City Council was unanimous.

Minutes

Commissioner Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of July 28, 2016 as written. Commissioner Wood seconded the motion. Commissioners Adcock and Francom abstained from the vote as they were absent during the July 28 meeting. Commissioners Lance, Montoya, Smith and Wood voted to approve the minutes of July 28, 2016 as written.

Reports of Officials and Staff

In answer to questions from the Commission, Dennis Marker said the new elementary school will go out to bid in December, and no new information is available on the grocery store.

Planning Commission Business

No Planning Commission business was discussed.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

