

SANTAQUIN CITY CORPORATION

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

The following are the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Santaquin, Utah. The meeting was held on Tuesday, October 11, 1994, in the Santaquin City Senior Citizens Center. The meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m.

The following Board members were in attendance: Kurt Stringham, Brent Vincent, Dick Kay and Brad Greenhalgh. Dale Berg, City Planner, was also present.

The meeting was called to order by Kurt Stringham.

1. Ramona Rosenlund: Brought plat map for subdivision at 350 South 300 West.

Mr. Berg pointed out that her whole piece as it is now is a subdivision; lots 1, 2, and 3. Someday Mrs. Rosenlund or someone else will want to break up lot 3. If lot 3 is included as part of this subdivision then in order to break up lot 3, she would have to get everyone in the subdivision to agree to it or a public hearing has to be held in order to change the plat. Maybe a single lot subdivision would be the best thing for her to do.

Mrs. Rosenlund asked if this is in a current subdivision ordinance.

Mr. Berg said it is State law.

Mrs. Rosenlund said she would like to leave it like it is.

A MOTION was made by Dick that we approve this subdivision. Brad seconded. All voted "aye."

The Planning Commission will forward this on to the City Council and they will have to approve it; the City Recorder then takes it to be recorded at the County. Then Mrs. Rosenlund can get a building permit.

2. Kay Higginson: Plat map for subdivision at approximately 176 East 200 South was reviewed. She was shown changes that need to be made on the map.

Dale suggested preliminary approval.

A MOTION was made by Dick recommending preliminary and final approval of the plat to the City Council upon meeting the following conditions: remove building footprints, acres removed, developer name and address removed, correction on dedication.

3. Roger Kaufman, Chad Rowley, Jaye Smith, Phil Rowley: annexation. Would like to know exactly what they need to do for the annexation for Chad's, Phil's, Jaye's and Roger's property. Phil definitely does not want a road in the immediate future by the apple shed.

Kurt said that without Jim involved it is no longer the same annexation; they need to start all over.

The Board, Chad and Roger looked at a map; Chad pointed out the proposed property to be annexed; a discussion followed.

Kurt said Santaquin City will have to plan for the highest use the property could possibly have. There will have to be an agreement before this is approved.

Roger said there is an existing, paved 17' road.

Chad doesn't want to go to all the expense involved in a possible annexation and then find out that the City won't annex them because the road isn't wide enough. They would like to know before it goes too far.

James Smith has the deed to the road; it's one rod. He is not a part of this annexation.

Mr. Berg suggested that they talk to the Fire Marshall and see if he will accept a 17' road.

Kurt and Dick told Roger to bring in a preliminary map for the Board to look at during their work meeting.

4. GLEN ROPER, AFTON BOWEN: Plat A preliminary final.

Roper/Bowen have made necessary changes on map requested at last meeting.

A MOTION was made by Brent that we recommend this to Council for final approval. Dick seconded. All voted "aye".

Filing fees have not been paid.

4. CHARLIE AINGE: Annexation.

Mr. Berg handed out copies of "A Resolution Adopting an Annexation Policy Relating to the Valley Asphalt Annexation", and went through it with Mr. Ainge and the Planning Commission:

Re: Part Three, A, 6 - On the new map, there is no petition from Valley Asphalt for this part (Mr. Berg pointed to map). Mr. Berg wondered why all of the land owned by Valley Asphalt at the gravel pit site was not included in the annexation. Mr. Ainge felt it was an oversight. We need to get a petition from them for the additional piece; it's the majority of their land.

Mr. Ainge was told to fill out Table 1.

Re: Part Three, C, 6 - We have been told we are looking at several zones; we don't know what those are; heavy industrial, residential and some commercial

Mr. Berg added Part Three, C, 7 - For Valley Asphalt, A Site Reclamation Plan.

Mr. Berg stated that we have some numbers that we don't know, we have a piece of property that we don't have a petition for and a question on zoning.

Mr. Ainge felt he is spinning his wheels if they're talking sewer connection. That could cost one-quarter to one-half million dollars just for sewer.

There is a water requirement upon annexation that enough water be brought with the property to cover the property.

All this body does is put all these numbers together and recommend to the City Council.

Mr. Ainge asked the opinion of the Planning Commission on getting a building permit with non-compliance on the sewer and water if he has already got a septic and a well.

Kurt felt without the water it would be pretty hard.

Mr. Ainge definitely does not want his home and business zoned commercial.

Mr. Berg wondered if we should continue putting this together.

Mr. Ainge would like to find out about the sewer from the City Council. If they say "no", there's no sense in pursuing this any further.

Dick will talk to the Council at their Work Meeting Wednesday, October 12, 1994, about the sewer problem.

#### OTHER BUSINESS:

Dale suggests having a fire-flow test on the existing fire hydrant up Pole Canyon and a determination as to whether two fire hydrants above that, which would be another 1,000 feet, if we can get 1,000 gallons per minute out of it.

PETERSON SUBDIVISION: Mr. Berg talked with Mr. Westover approximately two weeks ago about changes that need to be made on his plans.

Mr. Westover was told to do the following things:

1. Needs an additional fire hydrant.
2. Mr. Berg faxed Mr. Westover a copy of the sums.

3. Slope on curb and gutter was .073%. The very minimum you should ever allow is .04. Mr. Berg prefers .05 plus. He agreed that he would put a vertical curve in the street to raise it up so he would get more than a 5% slope in the curb and gutter.
4. Waterline marked and 6" valve.

There were several other things Mr. Westover was to do. Mr. Berg expected to see a new set of plans here for preliminary approval tonight.

Kurt will call Ed and tell him what he needs to do.

A MOTION was made by Brad that we approve last month's minutes. Dick seconded. All voted "aye."

A MOTION was made by Brent to adjourn. Dick seconded. All voted "aye."

Lorna Lloyd

RESOLUTION 94-\_\_

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN ANNEXATION POLICY RELATING TO THE VALLEY ASPHALT ANNEXATION.**

WHEREAS, section 10-2-401 et. seq. UCA requires the preparation of a policy declaration for each proposed annexation in excess of five acres, and

WHEREAS, the City of Santaquin has received a petition for annexation containing a territory of more than five acres, and

WHEREAS, the City Council has authorized the Planning Commission to prepare a policy declaration regarding the proposed Valley Asphalt Annexation, and

WHEREAS, the City has, in accordance with State Law, prepared a proposed declaration, notified adjacent entities of its intention, and advertized and held a public hearing thereon.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of Santaquin, Utah, that the following is hereby adopted as the Annexation Policy for the Valley Asphalt Annexation.

PART ONE

PURPOSE OF DECLARATION

- A. To facilitate the annexation of a portion of the territory which the City has heretofore identified in its Master Policy Declaration as the territory into which the City favors the expansion of its boundaries.
- B. To set forth the significant terms and conditions under which the territory would be considered for annexation.
- C. To comply with the requirements of State Law relating to the annexation of territory.
- D. To determine cost benefit or loss resulting from the proposed annexation.

PART TWO

AREA PROPOSED TO BE ANNEXED

The territory included within the proposed Valley Asphalt Annexation shall be set forth in the attached annexation map.

### PART THREE

#### STATEMENT OF CRITERIA AND CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO WHICH SANTAQUIN CITY WILL CONSIDER THE ANNEXATION.

##### A. State Mandated Standards

1. Contiguous to Existing Boundaries. The proposed annexation is contiguous to the existing City boundary.
2. Consistency with Master Policy Declaration. The territory proposed for annexation lies within the area identified in the previously adopted Master Policy Declaration.
3. Territory Within Another Municipality. None of the territory proposed for annexation lies within the boundaries of an unincorporated island.
4. Unincorporated Islands. The proposed annexation will not create an unincorporated island.
5. Territory to Receive Municipal Services. The territory is not being annexed for the sole purpose of acquiring revenue or of retarding the capacity of another municipality to annex into the same territory. Santaquin City presently has the ability and intends to benefit the area by rendering to the subject property the same policies regarding municipal services as currently is offered lands with Santaquin City. Current City policy concerning new development indicates that all areas of the City may have the right to use all City services with the developer being responsible to install or bring the services to the property should the services not be immediately available adjacent to the proposed development.
6. Petition and Map. The petition for annexation has been signed by at least a majority of the owners of real property representing more than one-third in value of said property. An accurate map, prepared and certified by a registered Land Surveyor, has been submitted with the petition.
7. Unnecessary Annexation. While the City does want to consider orderly, reasonable, and logical annexations, it does not have obligation to consider those annexations that in their opinion do not further the objectives of the City Master Plan and could possibly cause an unnecessary burden to the City in any form. In order to make this determination, a comparison of costs and revenues has been prepared and has been made a part of this declaration. (See Addendum A)

## B. State Mandated Review Criteria

1. Character of Community. The Santaquin City government provides a wide range of services for a Utah Community of its size. Basic services include street maintenance, building regulations, planning and zoning, business license, parks and recreation, cemetery, culinary water system, sewage collection and treatment, solid waste disposal, police and fire protection and EMT services.

The character of Santaquin City consists of rural to light urban residential and commercial activities mixed with pasturing and agricultural land uses. It is anticipated that future pressure for development and growth will be spawned by rapid growth occurring through the region and the desire of newcomers for the rural atmosphere, of Santaquin City.

Standards for annexation to the City would be the fostering, promoting, and creating, through planning design, development that sustains the current character of Santaquin City without degrading existing facilities.

The area proposed for annexation is located adjacent to the current eastern boundary of Santaquin City. The topography of the land is east to west sloping foothills. The majority of the land is currently being used for grazing purposes and gravel extraction.

The petitioners have not presented plans for the development of the land within the proposed annexation making it impossible to develop a cost benefit analysis.

The land proposed for annexation is within the area identified in the City's Master Annexation Declaration Policy Statement.

2. Need for Municipal Services. Due to the lack of development plans or identified detailed land uses for the properties, the City can not determine if the properties requires City type services; and if they do, the location and size of such services as water and sewer lines.
3. Extension of Services - Method of Financing. Police and fire protection, solid waste disposal and road maintenance of dedicated streets that may be constructed in the area, and other manpower services would be available upon annexation. However, the extension of sewer lines and culinary water lines of adequate size as determined by the city engineer would be the

responsibility of the petitioners and financed and paid for by the petitioners and made a condition of annexation. The City Zoning Ordinance requires that these same conditions apply to development on the subject property after annexation is completed as well as in other areas of the City.

4. Tax Consequences. All territory annexed would be subject to the City's property tax levy.
5. Interest of Adjacent Entities. Utah County: Annexation of the territory reduces the County's responsibility for performing general governmental functions in the area.

Nebo School District: The School District's jurisdiction includes both incorporated and unincorporated territory. Accordingly, the act of annexation would not affect this relationship.

C. City Imposed Conditions and Requirements

1. Water Rights Conveyance and Culinary Water System. The following improvements will be required at the expense of the developer:
  - A. The petitioners shall provide to the City adequate water rights to meet the needs of culinary water service to their property. Each petitioner's existing water rights with their land proposed for annexation are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1

PETITIONER'S WATER RIGHTS

WATER RIGHT	SOURCE	QUANTITY
Parker Family Limited Partnership		
George M. Taller		
Clyde D. Westwood		
Alfred Johnson		
Charles R. Ainge		
Valley Asphalt		
TOTAL WATER RIGHTS IN ACRE FEET		



- B. Due to the lack of development plans the Petitioners will construct a culinary water line from a point on the existing city system to the north end of the territory proposed for annexation that will provide the required culinary water supply and fire protection for the entire area proposed for annexation as if it was fully built out at the density allowed in the zone into which it is to be annexed. The size and location of said culinary water line will be determined by the city engineer and planning staff and approved by Planning Commission and City Council.
- B. The petitioners shall pay the established connection fees to connect to the water system.
2. Sewage Disposal. The following sewage improvements will be required at the expense of the developer:
- A. Due to the lack of development plans the Petitioners will construct a sewage collection line along the western boundary of the territory proposed for annexation that will provide the adequate capacity for the proposed area to be annexed as if it was fully built out at the density allowed in the zone into which it is to be annexed. The size and location of said sewer line will be determined by the city engineer and planning staff and approved by Planning Commission and City Council.
- B. The petitioners shall pay the established connection fees to connect to the sewer system.
3. Roads. The City will not acquire any new roads as a result of the proposed annexation.
4. Surface Water. The petitioners shall detain on-site the difference between the existing non-developed conditions and developed conditions for a 25 year 24 hour storm event when any of the petitioners' properties are developed.
5. Engineering Geology and Geotechnical Study. The petitioners shall have geology and geotechnical reports prepared on all property proposed for development.
6. Zone Classification. It is proposed that the Valley Asphalt Annexation be placed in the \_\_\_\_\_ Zone, and be subject to the requirements prescribed in that section of the Zoning Ordinance.

add

7. Site ~~Recommendation~~ plan  
Reclamation

THIS RESOLUTION SHALL TAKE EFFECT UPON PASSAGE.  
PASSED AND ORDERED RECORDED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY RECORDER

## ADDENDUM A

### EXPENSES VS REVENUES

Listed below are City functions and their related expenses to assist the Planning Commission and City Council in the decision regarding the Valley Asphalt Annexation proposal. Expenses are listed in the left column and the revenues that will result from the annexation is in the right column. At the bottom of the report are totals of the expenses and revenues. Also identified are items that are one-time revenues that will occur as part of annexation or development of the property and impacts that the proposed development will have on other taxing units. An attempt has been made to include all possible costs that might occur in order to allow the decision making to be as accurate as possible.

#### Facts used in the analysis:

1. Santaquin City Population 2546
2. Total Housing Units 701
3. Total Primary Residencies 700
4. Total Secondary Residencies 1
5. Persons Per Household 3.63
6. Taxable Value:  
The taxable value for the territory proposed for annexation was determined as shown in Table 2.
7. Annexation Population:  
The population of the territory proposed for annexation was determined as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 2

**TAXABLE VALUE OF ANNEXATION  
WITHOUT A DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

OWNER	NUMBER OF UNITS OR ACRES	MARKET VALUE	TAXABLE VALUE AS A PERCENT OF MARKET VALUE	TAXABLE VALUE
Parker Family	93.96	15,322	100%	15,322
George Taller	5.00	137,850	68%	93,738
Clyde Westwood (paid \$3.00 in 1993 in taxes)	5.07	18,132	Green Belt	250
Clyde Westwood (paid \$3.03 in 1993 in taxes)	5.16	5,140	Green Belt	250
Alfred Johnson	2.60	6,538	68%	4,446
		15,385	100%	21,923
Charles R. Ainge	15.56	44,535	100%	44,535
Charles R. Ainge	1.15	17,279	68%	11,749
Valley Asphalt	141.50	57,545	100%	57,547
<b>TOTAL TAXABLE VALUE</b>				<b>\$249,760</b>

TABLE 3  
POPULATION DETERMINATION  
FOR  
THE ANNEXATION

TYPE OF RESIDENCE	NUMBER OF UNITS	POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD AT 3.36 PERSONS/UNIT	TRANSIENT POPULATION ADJUSTMENT FACTOR <sup>(1)</sup>	EQUIVALENT PERMANENT POPULATION
Primary	3	10	0	10
Secondary	0	0	38%	0
TOTALS		10		10

NOTES:

1. Based on the average occupancy rate of 20 weeks per year, the transient population adjustment factor was determined by dividing 20 weeks by 52 weeks equaling persons present 38 percent of the time.

PART 1

SANTAQUIN CITY SERVICES

EXPENSES:

REVENUES:

ROADS            \$0.00

\$0.00

As a result of annexation the City will acquire no additional roads. At the present time Santaquin City spends \$4,904 per mile annually on city streets while receiving only \$2,809 per mile from state gas tax revenue.

**TAXES CITY                      \$0.00                      \$590**

The taxable value for the territory to be annexed at full build out as per Table 2 is \$249,760. The City's current tax rate of .002361 would generate \$590 in tax revenues for City purposes from the proposed annexation.

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>Revenue</u>
General Fund	.002361	\$590

**POLICE                      \$596                      \$0.00**

Current cost for police protection for Santaquin population of 2546 is \$151,702 annually. The per person cost of police protection can be determined by dividing the annual cost by population. This equals a cost of \$59.58 per person. The total population of the annexation territory as shown in Table 3 is 10. Police protection costs would equal 10 persons times \$59.58 per person or \$596.

**COURTS                      \$62                      \$146**

The local court costs are \$15,851 or \$6.23 per capita. Court fines amount to \$37,095 or \$14.57 per capita. With 10 new residents, court costs and fines will increase by \$62 and \$146 respectively.

**SALES TAX                      \$0.00                      \$1,590**

The City's sales tax revenue for the past 12 months was \$148,296. Assuming that approximately three quarters of the sales tax comes from local residences or \$111,222 the average sales tax for each of the 701 households in the City would equal \$159 annually. With 10 new residents in the annexation area, the sales tax generated for City purposes would be 10 units times \$159 or \$1,590 annually. Sales tax from Valley Asphalt gravel and proposed concrete operations have not been determined.

**FRANCHISE TAX                      \$0.00                      \$325**

During the past 12 months the City collected about \$76,052 in franchise tax charged against Utah Power and light, Mountain Fuel, U. S. West, and Cable TV usage. The tax per household can be determined by dividing the total tax collected by 701 households or \$108. With 3 primary residences in the annexation area the franchise tax generated for City purposes would be 3 units times \$108 or \$ 325 annually.

**WATER SALES                      \$1,032                      \$5,070**

Based on 3 residential units being connected to the water system and an average monthly water charge of \$20.00 per month, overall revenues per year would be \$720. Valley Asphalt estimates that it will require about 30,000 gallons per day for about 290 day per year or 8,700,000 per year. At \$.50 per 1000 gallons this usage generate \$4,350 in additional revenue. With an entirely new independent water system serving the annexation territory, there should be limited meter reading, billing and a few minor repairs of the first twenty years. The annual cost for meter reading, and billing is \$8.30 per connection. With 4 additional meters the resulting cost would be \$32 per year plus an estimated \$1000 per year for repairs.

**SEWAGE FEES                      \$56                      \$92**

The current city budget for sewer system maintenance and debt retirement is \$115,000 per year or \$14 per month per connection. The estimated sewer usage fee based on winter water sales is \$23 per month. This budget and monthly fees would bring in \$92 in revenue while costing the City \$56 for service for four connections.

**FIRE                      \$104                      \$0.00**

The budget for fire protection within the city limits is \$18,800 or \$26 per resident and business. The proposed annexation would shift the cost of fire protection from the county (which pays the City about \$12,000 year for fire protection) to the City. These three new residences and one business would cost the city \$104 per year for fire protection.

senior citizens, recreation, museum, and non departmental. The current combined budget for all of these items is \$205,777 or \$81 per capita. These services for ten new residents will cost \$810.

#### SUMMARY OF ANNUAL CITY TOTALS

EXPENSES TOTAL: \$\_\_\_\_\_ REVENUES TOTAL: \$\_\_\_\_\_

SURPLUS: \$\_\_\_\_\_

#### ONE-TIME CITY REVENUES

BUILDING PERMITS      \$0.00      \$0.00

Currently the City keeps 75 percent of building permit fees for general city purposes. With no development plans provided there is no one-time revenues projected from building permits for this development.

WATER CONNECTION FEES      \$2,400

If the three residences in the territory to be annexed were to abandon their wells, they could collect a connection fee of \$800 for each connection totaling \$2,400.

SEWER CONNECTION FEES      \$2,400

The city would collect a connection fee of \$800 for each of the three residences in the territory to be annexed totaling \$2,400.

TOTAL ONE TIME REVENUE TO THE CITY = \$\_\_\_\_\_



**CITY LIBRARY****\$39.30****\$51.00**

Total taxes collected for the City Library for 1994 is estimated to be \$7000 with the city adding an additional \$3000 from the City's general fund for a total of \$10,000. When this number is divided by the City's population of 2546, it equals a per capita cost for library services of \$3.93 of which \$2.75 comes from the library property tax. With a population increase of 10, an expenditure of \$39.30 would provide library services for these new residents. Total revenue for the library derived from the territory proposed for annexation would be \$51.

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>Revenue</u>
City Library	.000207	\$51.00

**GARBAGE COLLECTION****\$384****\$384**

The current budget of garbage collection is \$71,491 or an average of \$8.00 per month per customer. This fund is to be self sustaining and designed to cover garbage collection costs. Four customers would generate \$384 annually.

**EMT's****\$220****\$0.00**

The City's current budget for EMT's is \$29,077 or \$11 per person. Ten new residents and ten employees would cost the city \$220.

**CITY ORGANIZATION EXPENSES****\$810****\$0.00**

There is an overall cost for running the administration of city government which involves overhead expenses for the operation of the city and for activities that do not provide a direct service to property. This overhead and indirect service expenses are assessed against the taxable value of all properties in the City for the following activities: city council, administration, data processing, buildings and grounds, parks, cemetery,