



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**Santaquin City Council Chambers
March 24, 2016**

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

Others: Assistant City Manager Dennis Marker, Matt Hansen.

Commissioner Peterson called the meeting to order at 7:07 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.

PUBLIC FORUM

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

PUBLIC HEARING, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS

North Orchards Revised Concept Plan

The North Orchards development group previously submitted a new concept plan for the west side of the development, which was reviewed by the Planning Commission in the meeting held January 28, 2016. At that meeting, the Commission asked the developer to submit plans for the east side in order to understand the proposed changes. Matt Hansen, the project manager, has submitted two concept plans for the east side of the development. He explained he wanted to show two possible ideas, a standard residential and a higher residential with a five acre park.

Commissioner Lance asked when the small stretch of unpaved road on Royal Land Drive would be paved. Dennis Marker said the property belonged to Brigham Ashton, and Mr. Ashton has indicated he plans to plat and finish the road in the near future. Mr. Hansen said North Orchards had recently put the water line into the road, and expected it would be finished then, but it had not been.

Council Member Francom asked Mr. Hansen about the five multi-family buildings shown on the east side of the second concept plan. Mr. Hansen said they were called stacked flats, and contained 12 units each.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 24, 2016 – Page 2

North Orchards, continued:

Commissioner Adcock asked how any additional open space requirements would be addressed. Mr. Hansen said they would have to look at the ratios and see how much space was needed. Mr. Marker said the west side would most likely need more open space if the additional units were added.

Mr. Marker reviewed the General Plan intent for this area. Concerns for this area included where the high school would go, how to preserve the agricultural areas to the north, open space and general access. Future uses included the idea of multi-family units, a junior high school, and pocket parks. Mr. Marker said the maximum most residents walk to a park is about a quarter mile. It would be more than a quarter mile from the proposed North Orchards high density area to Orchard Cove Park, but the high density area will have its own amenities. The new Parks and Recreation Plan suggests a park be placed between the highline canal and the railroad tracks. The 5 acre park shown in the North Orchards east side concept would serve residents who are too far from the Orchard Cove Park. In answer to a question from Commissioner Peterson, Mr. Marker said four acres was the minimum park size desired, as parks that are three acres or less are difficult to maintain.

The orientation of the housing was discussed. Most of the homes are rear-fed and houses face each other, helping with community integration. The landscaping will be maintained by the HOA. The clubhouse was originally on the corner where it was overlooked by homes that were not part of the HOA. The new location is surrounded by those residents eligible to use it. Mr. Hansen said they would like to develop Plat A-9 by mid-July. If the west side concept is not approved, they will go back to the old plan, as the development will be out of lots soon.

Mr. Marker reviewed the standards that allow additional densities in a PUD. 15% open space is required, of which only 50% can be storm drain facilities. Bonus densities can be achieved with different amenities, such as clubhouses, fencing, and architectural features. Mr. Marker said staff can go through the check list and see what amenities in the proposed concept will be credited and what additional features are needed. An 8 acre piece has been dedicated for a park, and trail systems and a detention basin are planned. Mr. Hansen said the clubhouse and splash pad will count towards additional densities. The proposed five acre park on the east side cannot be dedicated at this time, as plans may change for that side depending on various factors. Mr. Marker clarified that each phase must contain a proportionate amount of open space and amenities.

Mr. Marker asked the Commission if they approved the design of the area and the green space shown. He said the meandering sidewalk could be replaced with a standard sidewalk and paths to the front doors of the homes to encourage community integration. The developer and City staff will work together at this point to find ways to soften and mitigate impacts of the townhomes.

After further discussion on the design features, Commission consensus held that City staff work on what was needed to bring the west side concept into compliance and also work on a new development agreement.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 24, 2016 – Page 3

The Commission suspended business between 8 p.m. and 8:05 p.m.

Main Street Zone Standards

Mr. Marker said the definition of tobacco specialty business and tobacco products was available in state code, so those definitions have been added to the City code. The legislature considered several changes to the code in regard to e-cigarettes, and the City code will be updated as the state code changes. Tobacco specialty shops were added to the uses chart as permitted in the CBD, subject to certain conditions and locations, such as a quarter mile from schools; permitted in the MSC; and not permitted in the MSR.

Mr. Marker said the ARC held a recent discussion on required building materials in the Main Street zone. The current code requires 80% of the building be made of primary exterior finish materials such as brick stone split faced block or cut stone. This includes all four sides of the building. Commissioner Wood asked if this was difficult for developers. Mr. Marker said the Stone Ridge Plaza was 95% masonry, the front of the Ben Franklin mixed use building would be at 70%, and the Centennial Condos proposed to use 80%. The Commission discussed reducing the requirement, especially on the rear of the buildings. After discussing several options, Commission consensus held that primary exterior finish materials for public-street facing elevations make up at least 70% of the front and sides of the building. On rear elevations, 70% of the ground floor should be covered in primary materials, with the remainder having at least 30% primary materials. In section 10-7M-9-D, the phrase *'brick, stone, split faced block or cut stone'* was changed to *'brick, stone, natural split faced block or cut stone'*.

Mr. Marker asked if mixed-use buildings should be required to have a certain percentage of retail space to tenant space. A mixed use building in Provo with commercial on the ground floor in the front and townhomes on the sides was reviewed. The following verbiage was added to 10-7M-9-E: *'All buildings within a mixed use development must have a minimum of 30% non-residential uses'*.

Mr. Marker said a developer is required to show on the submitted plans where signs will be located. Monument signs are not currently allowed in the CBD, but as the setbacks are increasing, there may now be room to have them. In other zones, the sign size allowed is determined by the size of the property. In section 10-7M-10-C-2, the following sentence was stricken: *'Monument signs are not allowed within the CBD area of this zone between buildings and the public right of way'*.

Projecting signs, which are more visible than wall signs for those driving 30 mph, are allowed only in the CBD. Sign regulation and what can be regulated was discussed.

Reports of Officials and Staff

Mr. Marker said he had attempted to contact some multi-family development builders to speak to the Commission, but none had been available. Mr. Marker suggested the Commission members take a field trip to view some different apartment sizes to get a clearer idea of what was possible. Commission consensus held this trip be taken on Saturday, April 16 from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 24, 2016 – Page 4

Reports of Officials and Staff, continued:

Mr. Marker said a public hearing on a two lot subdivision would be on the Planning Commission agenda for April 14th.

Minutes

Commissioner Adcock made a motion to approve the minutes of March 10, 2016 as written. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. Commissioners Francom and Peterson abstained from the vote, as they were not present at the meeting. Commissioners Adcock, Lance, Smith and Wood voted to approve the minutes of March 10, 2016 as written.

Planning Commission Business

No Planning Commission business was discussed.

Adjournment:

Commissioner Adcock made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

Troy Peterson, Chair

Linda Midgley, Deputy Recorder