



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 23, 2021

Planning Commissioners in Attendance: Trevor Wood, Art Adcock, Kylie Lance, Drew Hoffman and BreAnna Nixon.

Others in Attendance: Community Development Director Jason Bond, Assistant City Manager Norm Beagley, and Sean Herring of Region Engineering representing Salisbury Developers.

Commission Chair Wood called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

INVOCATION/INSPIRATION THOUGHT- Commissioner Adcock offered an invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE- Mr. Bond led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC FORUM

Commissioner Wood opened the Public Forum at 7:02 p.m. Mr. Bond read a comment received regarding the Salisbury Mass Grading Permit (See Attachment 'A'). Commission Chair Wood closed the Public Forum at 7:04 p.m.

DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION

PUBLIC HEARING- Submittal Requirements for Development Applications

The Planning Commission will consider modifying Santaquin City Code Title 10 Chapter 68 Section 120 to require a 14-day submission requirement for development applications.

Mr. Bond described that the current policy for development applications is that they be provided to staff 7 days prior to the meeting. He explained that due to the increased amount of development within the City, Staff is proposing to increase the requirement time to 14 days. (See Attachment 'B' for the proposed language). Mr. Bond added that the previous community he worked for had a 14-day submittal requirement, and that a 14-day requirement is common with other Cities.

Commission Chair Wood opened the Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m. there were no public comments, so he closed it at 7:08 p.m.

Commissioners Wood and Lance expressed no concerns regarding this amendment to code. Commissioner Adcock stated that he is in favor of this change, especially because the

requirements would align with several other communities. Mr. Bond added that this requirement would provide adequate time for public hearings, which require a 10-day notice period, etc. Commissioner Nixon indicated that she is in favor of this as well.

Motion: Commissioner Lance motioned to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the extension of the submittal requirements to 14 days for development applications prior to a public meeting. Commissioner Hoffman Seconded.

Roll Call:

Commissioner Wood	Aye
Commissioner Adcock	Aye
Commissioner Hoffman	Aye
Commissioner Nixon	Aye
Commissioner Lance	Aye

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

Salisbury Mass Grading Permit

The Planning Commission will review a requested extension of a mass grading permit for the mass grading associated with the Hills @ Summit Ridge.

Mr. Bond explained that this is the work that has been happening on the South end of Summit Ridge for the past few years. More grading work is required to continue building the houses in the Hills in Summit Ridge Development. Both the Planning Commission and the City Council will review the application. He added that a site visit was conducted by both himself and the City Engineer as is required.

Commissioner Wood noted that code requires 40 feet of pavement for the entrance and exit of the grading operation. It was indicated within the memo that there is no such pavement on this development. Mr. Beagley verified that it is required per code and will need to be addressed by the applicant when they determine the entrance and exit locations. He added that staff has asked that the developer resubmit and include haul routes.

Commissioner Adcock asked that the waterline and its stability be addressed. Mr. Beagley answered that the developer will be potholing the waterline prior to driving over it or doing any mass grading in the area; and they will also berm up more soil over the area. Commissioner Adcock also asked about the 2-inch water meter? Mr. Beagley stated that this has already been already installed. Commissioner Adcock expressed concern regarding the proximity of the mass grading to existing homes. Mr. Beagley explained that mass grading will be between 30 and 50 feet away from existing structures which is allowed by code. To do this mass grading in close proximity with the homes, the developer will be bringing in smaller equipment. Mr. Herring explained that they are planning to get the grading work done next to the existing homes as soon as possible.

Commissioner Lance asked that mitigation be provided for the citizens experiencing debris in the roads. Mr. Beagley explained that every time staff is made aware of debris, they instruct the developer to clean it up. However, staff believes that it is appropriate to ask that the developer have a sweeping mechanism to keep the roads cleaner. Mr. Beagley clarified that the State does require SWPP permits, and so does the City. He clarified that Santaquin City does not have an MS4 designation meaning they do not have the ability to fine, etc. and Infractions are handled through the State.

Motion: Commissioner Lance motioned to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the Salisbury Mass Grading Permit with the following conditions as recommended by staff:

1. Indicate the location of the proposed structures and parking on site in accordance with the required setbacks.
2. Provide a drainage plan for the site
3. That all activities comply with Santaquin City regulations pertaining to mass grading operations as found in Title 10-6-28 of the Santaquin City Code.
4. Provide appropriate bonding for the site.
5. Provide a modified haul route as per engineering recommendation.
6. Address the buildability of lots located in the north west corner of the development at proposed final grading.

With the addition that a sweeping mechanism, be used daily to ensure that debris is kept off public streets. Commissioner Nixon seconded.

Roll Call:

Commissioner Nixon	Aye
Commissioner Lance	Aye
Commissioner Hoffman	Aye
Commissioner Adcock	Aye
Commissioner Wood	Aye

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

Proposed Parking Reduction for Drive in Restaurants

The Planning Commission will review a proposed amendment to Santaquin City Code Title 10 Chapter 48 Section 040 regarding the number of parking spaces required for a drive-in restaurant.

Mr. Bond explained that staff took the Planning Commissions feedback from the last meeting. Staff Planner Ryan Harris also consulted other Cities parking requirements. Mr. Bond presented the updated language (See Attachment 'C'). He explained that the new language bases the parking requirement off 1 space per 4 seats or 1 seat per 125 square feet, whichever is greater.

Commissioner Nixon indicated that she prefers the addition of the square footage requirement rather than just seating.

Motion: Commissioner Nixon motioned to recommend approval to the City Council of a code amendment which will reduce the minimum number of required parking stalls for a drive-in restaurant. Commissioner Adcock seconded.

Roll Call:

Commissioner Wood	Aye
Commissioner Adcock	Aye
Commissioner Hoffman	Aye
Commissioner Lance	Aye
Commissioner Nixon	Aye

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Meeting Minutes from
February 9, 2021

Motion: Commissioner Adcock motioned to approve the minutes from February 9, 2021. Commissioner Hoffman seconded.

Roll Call:

Commissioner Wood
Commissioner Adcock
Commissioner Hoffman
Commissioner Lance
Commissioner Nixon

The motion passed unanimously 5 to 0.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Lance motioned to adjourn at 7:38 p.m.



Trevor Wood, Commission Chair


Kira Petersen, Deputy Recorder

Planning Commission Public Comment 2-23-2021

In regards to the Salisbury Mass Grading Permit Extension:

Salisbury is doing a terrible job of keeping the public roads free of dirt, boulders, debris and airborne dust in the Summit Ridge Hills location. The dump trucks and equipment traffic are ruining our public roads and filling our drainage systems with debris.

How about as part of the permit, they be required to sweep a minimum of once per day with a pickup broom, not a shoulder broom that sweeps the debris onto the sidewalk and also to fulfill their SWPPP obligations?

I have spoken with the on-site SWPPP Inspector several times, he mentions these infractions to Salisbury all of the time but they tend to ignore him because there are no penalties attached to the infractions due to Santaquin and the State not requiring a SWPPP permit.

I have several pictures for documentation that I have shared with Norm Beagley, they include pictures of airborne dust, boulders on the public roads, BMPs removed from City drainage, mud and dirt on the public roads, heavy equipment driving on public roads, equipment filling up at fire hydrants without gate valves and poor or no traffic control while working in the City right of way.
Please let me know if you need these pictures for the record.

As part of the Mass Grading Permit extension, I would like to see Salisbury held accountable for my addressed concerns.

Respectfully,
Jared Jeffs

MEMO



To: Planning Commission
From: Jason Bond, Community Development Director
Date: February 19, 2021
Re: **Amendment to Development Application Requirements**

It is proposed that the Planning Commission and City Council consider amending the code related to development application requirements (SCC 10.68.120). The proposed amendment is as follows:

10.68.120 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

All development proposals shall include the appropriate city approved application forms; required information listed on such forms, and required fees prior to city review of the proposal. These forms include the following:

Site development review application - concept.

Site development review application.

Subdivision or condominium review application - concept.

Subdivision or condominium review application - preliminary.

Subdivision or condominium review application - final.

Complete applications or resubmittals for development proposals shall be submitted at least fourteen (14) days prior to the applicable public meeting. The Community Development Director and City Engineer may recommend that an application or resubmittal be on an agenda earlier than fourteen (14) days if they find that the submitted materials are ready for review by a public body. Applicants are encouraged to meet with city staff prior to submittal to discuss development concerns, required materials, review time frames and development options. (Ord. 03-02-2007, 3-7-2007)

Staff has been requiring applicants to submit a complete application seven days prior to a meeting in order for staff to have sufficient time to review the submittal in preparation for the public meeting. However, this requirement has not been codified and seven days is proving to be difficult for staff to accommodate especially with the amount of work that is being created with significant growth. A 14-day requirement for development applications is fairly common in other cities and it would give staff more time to manage workloads.

Staff Recommendation: It is recommended that the Planning Commission provide a recommendation to the City Council which would establish a 14-day submission requirement for development applications and resubmittals.

Recommended motion: “Motion to recommend approval of a code amendment which would establish a 14-day submission requirement for development applications and resubmittals.”

MEMO



To: Planning Commission

From: Jason Bond, Community Development Director

Date: February 19, 2021

Re: **Amendment to Parking Code Related to Drive-in Restaurant Requirements – 2nd UPDATE**

It is proposed that the Planning Commission and City Council consider amending the code related to the parking requirement for drive-in restaurants (SCC 10.48.040). The proposed amendment is as follows:

Restaurants:		
	Drive-in restaurants	12 off street parking spaces or sufficient off street parking spaces to accommodate all patrons or customers based on design capacity <u>1 space per 4 seats including outdoor seating or 1 space per 125 sq. ft. of gross floor area</u> , whichever is greater
	Family Restaurants	1 space per 4 seats <u>including outdoor seating</u>
	Restaurants (dinner only)	1 space per 2 seats

Staff feels that the minimum number of required parking spaces required may be too high for drive-in restaurants especially when they do not even have a dine-in option for customers. As economic development continues to happen in Santaquin, staff feels that this requirement could be onerous for future drive-in restaurants that may be interested in locating their business in Santaquin. It is felt that this amendment is worth consideration.

Staff Recommendation: It is recommended that the Planning Commission provide a recommendation to the City Council which would reduce the parking requirement for drive-in restaurants.

Recommended motion: “Motion to recommend approval of a code amendment which will reduce the minimum number of required parking stalls for a drive-in restaurant.”