

Highland City Planning Commission

June 22, 2004

Present:

Commissioner: Steven Draper
Commissioner: Larry Mendenhall
Commissioner: Brian Braithwaite
Commissioner: Jennifer Tucker

City Council: Gwyn Franson
City Engineer: Matt Shipp
City Administrator: Barry Edwards
City Asst. Zoning Admin: Lonnie Crowell
Secretary: JoD'Ann Bates

City Council:
Mayor Jess Adamson
Kathryn Schramm
Glen Vawdrey
Steven King

Visitors: Chris Dalley, Scott Bishop, Brent Strong, Val Strong, Grant Chandler, Michelle Jentzsch, Victoria Edwards, Michael Hatch, Jerry Hatch, Anne S. Hansen, Flint Stephens, Gary Cooper, Brandon Cooper, Ellen Orchard, Mike Jones, TJ Humphries, Kristi Vick, Dan VanWoerkom, Steve Sobey, Richard Christiansen, Howard Bangerter, C. Andrus, G. Andrus.

Meeting convened at 7:03 p.m.
Prayer given by Lonnie Crowell
Pledge given by Jennifer Tucker

Item 1: 7:00 - Joint Planning Commission - City Council

Continued Public Hearing - Transportation Element, Map Amendment

Steve Draper stated the first item is a continuation of a public hearing previously presented at City Council.

Steve opened the public hearing.

Hearing no comments, Steve closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Planning Commission, City Council and Staff.

Brian asked what the reasoning is for continuing this issue, Steve stated it is being continued for the benefit of the public, there was little public input at City Council and Glen Vawdrey thought other may have not been notified.

Discussion ensued.

Motion by Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission recommends City Council abandon the bypass road, based on the following conditions 1) the need to tie into the road with Alpine has changed because of the property acquisition costs, 2) it is no longer a benefit to the community, 3) the original proposed bypass road has changed significantly, 4) the commuter traffic along 4800 W would not have any significant impact by adding the bypass road, 5) two public hearings have been held and public input has been taken into consideration.

**Second by Larry Mendenhall
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Regularly Scheduled Planning Commission Meeting:

Item 2: Lawrence Property - Concept

Steve Draper stated that he is concerned with the private drive that is being shown along the north side of the property. Steve also stated that he is not comfortable with the east orientation of the home on that lot, due to the fact that there would be no access allowed off of 4800 West. Steve stated he is also concerned with the ability for emergency vehicle access to this property. Barry stated that a lane is allowed in some cases and has been allowed before. Barry stated that there is no problem with the home facing east and not having access onto 4800 West. The applicant would be held to the same restrictions that the subdivision to the north in regards to the rear setback and what would be allowed along 4800 West.

Discussion ensued.

Steve Draper stated that he would leave the comments that were made with the applicant and hopefully see them back at a later date.

Item 3: Powell / Fackrell Property - Concept

Scott Bishop of BP Builders stated that they are purchasing land from Mr. Powell and Mr. Fackrell. The original master plan shows the east/west road coming in from the lower portion of the plat. They have made changes to modify the plat in order to minimize the driveway access onto the collector road. Steve Draper

asked if they had any questions or concerns on the staff comments. Scott stated they were fine with what had been suggested.

Steve voiced his concern with a final approval proposal, being different than that which had received a preliminary approval. Steve directed staff that in the future such a difference should not be put on the agenda for consideration and further that if this applicant wished to continue his final proposal with said differences this body would not entertain his proposal and see him back for a concept in the future. Mr. Hatch agreed to return to his approved preliminary plat and present his final proposal based on past approval and comments.

Scott stated that the road at the end of lots 5 and 7 would be a cul-de-sac until they have enough property to make a full road. Matt Shipp stated that they would want to continue that road as a 40 foot road to 4800 West.

Discussion ensued.

Brent Strong stated he is the property owner next to the road and he stated he has not had any discussions with anyone in regards to this proposal, as it will effect his home. He would like to have a discussion with the developers concerning his options before they go any further. He is not in favor of a road going right next to his bedroom window.

Steve Draper stated that he would leave the comments with the applicant and see them at a later time.

Item 4: Ridgewood Plat A - Final

Steve Draper inquired as to why the cul-de-sac was put back on the plat when they were asked to have the road go through. Mike Hatch stated that they have put in the cul-de-sac to improve the lots and minimal access to 4800 West. Mike showed a proposed concept of the Lether property that would give the access needed for the Lehi agreement.

Discussion ensued.

Steve stated it was his understanding that the east/west road was to always connect with Lehi as a main road. Mike stated that they could go either way the commission would prefer. Brian stated that the conditions of approval specifically stated that Mike was to visit with the City Engineer and set out where that east/west road would connect in that area. Mike stated that they are willing to do that.

Discussion ensued.

Motion by Larry Mendenhall, Planning Commission recommends City Council grant final approval for the Ridgewood Subdivision with the following conditions, 1) all staff comments be addressed, 2) the through road be established on 9900 North with a 56 foot width subject to consultation with Lehi City and Highland City Engineers, 3) the cul-de-sac on 9850 N be flipped to the South, 4) home orientation for lots 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 11 can be either towards the cul-de-sac or towards 6800 West, 5) if the orientation of the home is to the cul-de-sac, then the fence set back will be 10 additional feet, making the setback 24 feet from back of curb, 6) CC & R's be written to reflect that the property owners will maintain and landscape the 6800 West side yards from back of curb, 7) there will be no driveway access onto 6800 West, 8) a resolution will be provided for the ditch along the north side of lot 11 with confirmation from the irrigation company, 9) the final plat presented to City Council will contain all recommended changes.

**Second by Jennifer Tucker.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Item 5: Bull River Estates - Concept

Barry stated that this is different because they are asking for both the R-1-40 and an open space subdivision. The city would not require much for amenities.

Dan VanWoerkom stated there will be two phases to help give buffer to the Bull River Residents. They would like to leave the hollow as open space. Steve Sobey stated that each phase meets the requirements in each zoning. They are attempting to place a nice buffer of larger homes and have an open space trail around the outside. They have read all of the staff comments and feel that they can adhere to all comments.

Steve Draper stated that there is always a concern with the lot sizes in open space subdivisions. He asked the applicant if they have reviewed the size of the lots and feel comfortable that they would be able to have a decent foot print for those lots. Dan stated they are comfortable that they will be able to build on each lot and have a decent foot print for the lots.

Discussion ensued.

Larry Mendenhall stated that he understands that they are within the regulations to have the number of lots that they are proposing. He is concerned that putting 30,000 sq. ft. lots next to 2 and 3 acre lots will need a better buffer than what has been proposed. He feels that they need to look at a more acceptable buffer from

this subdivision and the Bull River Subdivision. Larry stated there is an economic consideration and 25' is not a good enough buffer.

Discussion ensued.

Ann Sward Hansen stated that she is concerned with the name being Bull River Estates considering all the other Bull River names in the same area. She is concerned with emergency notification and the possibility that it will be difficult for police and fire to find them when there is a Bull River Subdivision and a Bull River Estates. She stated she doesn't want to see a repeat of what is going on with the Ivory Subdivision and the elevation of the homes there. Ann feels there needs to be more concern from the city for the grading and drainage issues.

Discussion ensued.

Steve asked is anyone else is opposed to the name Bull River Estates and if there are any other ideas for a better name. There were no other suggestions for a better name at this time.

Discussion ensued.

Item 6: Gary Cooper, Cedar Hollow Property - Discussion

Gary Cooper stated that according to his attorney there is no problem with him developing the Day property. There is still a conflict with the Lether property at this time.

Barry Edwards stated that David Church could not tell with the provided paperwork who the owner of the parcel is and a judge would have to make that decision. The city will let them proceed and the applicant will not be able to record until ownership has been determined.

Todd Day stated that there is 35 feet for the easement and if they were to deed to it the city it would take 1/3 of their lawn and trees and landscaping that is fully grown.

Discussion ensued.

Gary stated he spoke with Lehi and they will probably not sewer a few of the homes, which means a solution still needs to be determined on how they are going to get sewer to the homes.

Discussion ensued.

Steve Draper stated that the legal ramifications are still out there and he understands that Gary's immediate desire is to complete his development in Lehi, but Lehi won't let him complete the development without a second access. Steve stated that they would have Matt get involved in taking a look at the elevations, then bring a recommendation back to the Commission, as to the possibility of getting this resolved so he can complete his Lehi subdivision.

Motion by Brian Braithwaite to continue this item until further information has been gathered.

**Second Larry Mendenhall.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Item 7: Senior Housing - Concept

Dan VanWoerkom stated that the Patterson's are large land owners and are often approached by senior housing owners. He stated they have researched the various companies and found that there is a great need for senior housing. They would like to work out a design called "aging in place," when individuals get ready to retire they can move into it in the beginning and stay for the rest of their life. It is similar to assisted living. They have identified this piece of property as an ideal location in Highland City for the proposed senior housing.

Discussion ensued.

Steve applauded Dan for considering the seniors of the community. Steve feels that with this many units, all the projected needs of North Utah County's senior housing will be in Highland City. Steve stated his concern is that the housing will fill up with outside residents, leaving Highland residents with no senior housing. He questioned if there would be any restrictions to help keep the housing units for Highland residents.

Discussion ensued.

Item 8: P.O. Zone Storage Units - Discussion

Steve asked Dan VanWoerkom what the discussion is supposed to be about. Dan stated it is hard to discuss and plan storage units because they are just storage units. Dan stated it is very straight forward, they will have two apartments, an office, and the storage units. He stated the apartments are for 24/7 protection of the facility. The apartment and office will be housed in one building.

Discussion ensued.

Steve asked Dan about the elevations of the storage buildings and what the exterior material will be. Dan stated he isn't sure right now. Steve stated he feels an earth tone wall would be appropriate, not just gray cinder block.

Jennifer asked about the lighting. Dan stated they will use the maximum lighting they can for security and safety. Steve asked about using stucco. Dan stated they might not want to go with stucco. Kathryn read from the development code book that stucco is prohibited for this type of building. Dan stated if they went with stucco it would just be on the walls surrounding the building.

Dan stated he wanted to have this discussion so he would know if there are any big problems.

Discussion ensued.

Steve stated that Lance's rendering was the selling point and the commission was fine with that and he doesn't see any red flags on the project.

Item 9: Code Amendment - RP Zone

Motion Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission approves the amendment to the RP zone as presented.

**Second by Jennifer Tucker.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Item 10: Architecture Review Board CTown Center - Set Joint Meeting

Steve stated Richard Mendenhall has requested a meeting be scheduled with the City Council concerning the Town Center.

Discussion ensued.

Barry stated when the whole group is together, there are too many people and often opinions can't be expressed. Gwyn stated it is a good idea to have everyone's opinion in the same room, but there is a process for a reason and a smaller quorum is less intimidating. Gwyn stated if this is going to be the procedure then the Council needs to understand that they are not going to have a lot to do with the architecture and they have to trust the Commission on that aspect.

It was agreed to allow City Council the first review and return to Planning Commission for architectural review.

Steve stated they would send it on to City Council for their next meeting.

Item 11: Approval of meeting minutes for June 8, 2004

Motion by Brian Braithwaite, Planning Commission grants approval of the meeting minutes for June 8, 2004 as amended.

**Second by Larry Mendenhall.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:11 p.m.

