

AMENDED - NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Elk Ridge Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on **Thursday, April 7, 2005 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** The meeting will take place at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge, UT, at which time consideration will be given to the following:

7:00 P.M. Opening Remarks & Pledge of Allegiance

7:10 Roll Call

7:15 Approval of Agenda Time Frame

7:20 Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, 3-17-05

7:25 General Plan Amendments:

- 1. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map**
- General Discussion – Chad Christensen and Russell Adamson
- 2. Ordinance Amendment to the Moderate Income Housing Element**
- Reschedule the Planning Commission Public Hearing date

7:55 Development Code Amendments:

- 1. Ordinance Amendment for Permitted Uses in Zones Allowing the Raising, Care and Keeping of Livestock & Fowl – Ken Young**
- Review and Discussion of Proposed Ordinance Document
- Recommendation to City Council
- 2. Ordinance Amendment for Requirements Associated with the Keeping of Pigeons – Ken Young**
- Review and Discussion of Proposed Ordinance Document
- Recommendation to City Council
- 3. ~~Ordinance Amending the Moderate Income Housing Element~~**
~~Reschedule the Planning Commission Public Hearing~~

8:25 Follow-up on Assignments
- Trails and Paths -(CAD program) – Ken Young– April 21st
- CUP Secondary Water– (Speaker) – Scot Bell– May 5th
- Open Space – Ken Young
- Storm Drain – Scot Bell and Joe Jamison

8:55 Certified Community Planning Seminar
- Registration for New Members

9:00 P.M. ADJOURNMENT

*Handicap Access Upon Request. (48 hours notice)

The times, which appear on this agenda, may be accelerated if time permits. All interested persons are invited to attend this meeting.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2005.



Administrative Assistant

1

1

1

BY ORDER OF THE ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned duly appointed and acting Administrative Assistant for the municipality of Elk Ridge, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Public Meeting was emailed to the Payson Chronicle , Payson, Utah and delivered to each member of the Planning Commission on the 5th day of April, 2005.



Administrative Assistant

1

2

3

ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 7, 2005

TIME AND PLACE	A regular meeting of the Elk Ridge Planning Commission was held on Thursday, April 7, 2005, 7:00 p.m., at 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.
OPENING REMARKS & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	Raymond Brown welcomed the commissioners. An opening prayer was given by Russell Adamson followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.
ROLL CALL	<i>Commissioners:</i> Scot Bell, Raymond Brown, Chad Christensen, Russell Adamson <i>Absent:</i> Daniel Steele (Dan has submitted his resignation, but has not been replaced and will be accounted for as absent until such time as he is replaced), Joe Jamison, Dennis Dunn <i>Others:</i> Vernon Fritz, Mayor Ken Young, City Planner Ernestine Folks, past Administrative Assistant Margaret Leckie, Planning Commission Coordinator Greg Winn, resident of Elk Ridge
APPROVAL OF AGENDA TIME FRAME	MOTION WAS MADE BY SCOT BELL AND SECONDED BY RAYMOND BROWN, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME FRAME AS WRITTEN. VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 3-17-05	MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT BELL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 3-17-05 WITH THE CONDITION THAT ONE ERROR BE CORRECTED ON P.4; THAT BEING THE CHANGING OF THE NAME OF THE DEVELOPER FROM "RAY YOUNG" TO "RANDY YOUNG". VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.
COMMENTS REGARDING CITY COUNCIL	The past City Council meeting was cancelled so there were no minutes or notes to review; however, Ray mentioned he had received a response to his letter addressing the concerns of the Planning Commission in regards to the Council from the mayor and appreciated it. Ray addressed the item in the letter covering the vacant elected positions in the City Council that will be open to all, These positions include the position of Mayor, now held by Vernon Fritz; and the position of City Council Member, now held by Gary Prestwich, whose term is ending.
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS	
1. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map	<p>The Planning Commission chairman turned the time over to commissioners Chad Christensen and Russell Adamson who had been given the assignment at the last meeting to present this element of the General Plan.</p> <p>Chad passed around a sheet which he had prepared listing the various zones, which code in the ordinances addressed each zone, and what the restrictions were for each zone. The sheet also listed the following discussion items for the Planning Commission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. May be too high density for community?2. What is the financial impact to the City?3. May provide a larger tax base?4. Less water usage?5. Promotes "mixed use" types of property?

6. May help fulfill moderate income requirement?
7. Loss of Annexation if not granted to developers?
8. Should a minimum lot size requirement be established?

A general discussion followed. Russ made the comment that we as a Planning Commission need to determine what standards of population density we want to set for our area. He felt that the default PUD shown on the current Land Use Map is contrary to the statement in the General Plan defining how we want our community to be.

Russell noted some things that he felt were missing from the Land Use Map including a designation of areas defined as Open Space specifically showing where parks and public facilities should be. Russ asked if CAD files were available for the purpose of calculating and analyzing percentages of Land Use areas. Ernie said these files are available from the engineer and Ken Young said we could do that.

Russ mentioned the possibility of stating in the General Plan that "...no more than a certain percentage of acreage could be used for PUD, maybe 5% be designated as open space," etc. This kind of statement might give general guidelines for what kinds of zones we want in our community. Ray was not sure how that would work. Raymond mentioned that until Randy Young proposed his development, we weren't planning for that kind of development in our community. Randy felt his proposal fell within the definitions and descriptions in our General Plan though the citizens at the public hearing did not like his proposal. It was decided that Elk Ridge needed to have something in their General Plan and ordinances to address this type of development. He felt the city needs an over-riding principle in our future planning documents. Russell mentioned that maybe we don't want that 25% of our PUD dwelling units to be over 20% of our community's population. Randy Young's proposed development would take that population percentage to maybe more than 50%.

Ray asked our City Planner (Ken) how we can describe to a developer what we want in our community. How do we designate a certain percentage of our land as parks and open space, not necessarily saying what zone it is in. How can we assure flexibility in the future to allow development that is acceptable to Elk Ridge. The citizens are very adamant about how they perceive that development to be. They are very clear about what they don't want (lot of commercial, small cluster homes, town homes, big commercial), but need to be more clear about what they do want.

The mayor mentioned he had a document on his desk addressing some common area shared by Highland and Alpine. They have agreed to have commercial enterprises on only one side of the highway in the Highlands area. They have agreed to share the revenue generated from this area. Payson is proposing a similar situation with Elk Ridge on 1600 W.

Ken said that as he looked at the section Ray was quoting in the General Plan. The General Plan is general. These are concepts, these are not restrictions, these are not "teeth", by any means. He stated he had looked at the ordinance, which is the "teeth" and very little is in there that refers to planning and development. He sees a huge gap in the ordinances and that is why we have these proposals coming in that the developers feel meets the concepts in the General Plan yet the citizenry is not at all happy with. Ray mentioned that if a developer walks in and has met all our written requirements, we don't have much room to say no. Ernie pointed out a PUD section of the ordinances applicable in all zones. She pointed out that Section 10-14-C does allow for "the construction of attractive multi-family dwellings such as twin homes and condominiums." Russ mentioned that we do need to tighten up this section of the ordinances.

Scot said he recalled that Randy Young had asked for a blanket PUD package deal on the

whole thing. This is a big concern. If the project is begun and of questionable acceptability, there is nothing that can be done. A PUD can help us comply with Moderate Income Housing requirements

Scot also brought up the issue that whatever open space, park or trail type improvements the developer puts in, the city needs to make sure they have enough money to maintain them. Scot asked Ken if he had any costs per lineal foot on maintaining trails. Ray mentioned that this was an issue Ken would probably be covering next month on his presentation to the Planning Commission on Trails and Paths. Ray asked Ken to do some research and to review some of these concerns. The mayor mentioned that MAG would be a good resource for this type of information. Ray said that the Planning Commission needs to study the code and see that the elements therein match the vision of what our community wants as expressed in the General Plan.

Ken said this requires a shared vision. Ken suggested that we follow Ernie's recommendation in asking the commission to review the code that regulates PUDs, see what the elements are, see what questions we have and then open it up from there beyond this body. Make sure the vision we come up with matches that of the community and maybe open it up to a community visioning workshop. Talk about the northern section of the city, talk about PUDs and get a shared vision, then come back to the ordinance and make whatever changes we need to make to create that.

The possibility of opening up the discussion to a city visioning workshop was discussed by Ray. He felt this would be duplication of what has already been done and that the commission knew the desires of the community for prior public meetings.

When Russ asked how the decision was made designating percentages of various types of zoning, Ernie responded that this was done thru Envision Utah. They gave us information regarding projected growth in our area. We met with them a couple of times at the High School. At that time the projected growth was discussed, as was how much growth we wanted and where to put the various zones on our Land Use Map. Ray questioned whether we have gone beyond that vision and mentioned maybe we need to modify that original plan. He mentioned that we need more guidance in our ordinances or we are going to end up with a community we are not happy with. Ray also said that it is not a requirement that our city have a certain percentage of low income, high density growth. He mentioned we need to also take care not to have all the high density clustered in the north area of our city and that we should try and weave it into the community in an aesthetically pleasing manor.

Scot mentioned that with the zoning ordinances as they are, we could end up with PUDs at both ends of town if we allow it. The current zoning ordinances allow for PUDs in any zone. The mayor mentioned that we are in the driver's seat and as we are now considering annexation, we need to specify what is acceptable to Elk Ridge in our zoning ordinances before we annex.

Ray mentioned that it is mainly the code, and not the General Plan that we need to look at. He said that Russ's concerns of specifying acceptable percentages are code rather than general plan issues. Ken said we need to put greater restrictions on how PUDs are developed. We need to specify how large a PUD can be, how much density bonus we give, what is a density bonus, and how much open space is required.

Ray asked the commission to take some time and review the code and General Plan. He said that maybe take a close look at Chapter 10-14-C to help determine how to generalize General Plan revisions. He gave Russ the assignment of reviewing the Land Use Element of the General Plan and coming back to the commission with some revision ideas, preparing a

hand-out for the next meeting. Russ asked Margaret to get the Land Use Element in digital form for his revisions. Chad was given the assignment to review the code.

MOTION WAS MADE BY RAY BROWN AND SECONDED BY SCOT BELL TO TABLE THE DISCUSSION ON THE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE FUTURE LAND USE MAPS UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING WHEN RUSS WILL PRESENT TO THE COUNCIL FOR DISCUSSION POSSIBLE CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DISCUSSION MATTERS ON THIS ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN. CHAD WILL REVIEW THE PUD ELEMENTS IN THE CODE. VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.

**ORDINANCE
AMENDMENT
TO MODERATE
INCOME
HOUSING
ELEMENT**

A MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND SECONDED BY RUSSELL ADAMSON TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT TO MODERATE INCOME HOUSING FOR MAY 19TH, 2005 IN ORDER TO ALLOW TIME TO PREPARE THE DOCUMENT AND GIVE PROPER PUBLIC NOTICE. VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.

**AMENDMENT
TO MODIFY
AGENDA TIME
FRAME**

The discussion was behind schedule. We were now at the “Development Code Amendments” item on the agenda and it was 8:25pm instead of 7:55pm.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY RAY BROWN AND SECONDED BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN TO AMEND THE TIME FRAME OF THE AGENDA AS THE DISCUSSION WAS TAKING LONGER THAN ANTICIPATED. VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.

**DEVELOPMENT
CODE
AMENDMENTS**

**1. Ordinance
Amendment
for Permitted
Uses in Zones
Allowing the
Raising, Care
and Keeping
of Livestock
and Fowl**

Ken Young, City Planner, addressed these two issues. He mentioned that the two ordinance amendments go hand-in-hand. The second refers to the first so they will be discussed simultaneously.

The ordinance regarding the restrictions on livestock was recently amended with most of the specific restrictive detail removed and left to the discretion of the zoning administrator, who would be Ken Young. He suggested going back to the original version prior to the latest amendment that included the descriptive verbiage, with some additional phrases added as shown in the documents included in the packet for tonight’s meeting.

He suggested that the definitions regarding animal units in 10-2-2 on page 2 of the ordinance amendment be put back into the code, with the exception that the commission review the number of pigeons that comprises an animal unit. The city is currently reacting to complaints about one of our residents raising pigeons. This would make it so decisions would not appear arbitrary and capricious. All planning commissioners present agreed.

He reviewed the other changes to the code which would follow the above plan of reverting back to the code prior to the latest amendment with verbiage added, as detailed in his revisions included in tonight’s packet. The only item where the numbers might not reflect what we actually want is the number of pigeons comprising an animal unit.

The question of deleting the R-1 15,000A element from the code was discussed since it has

been decided by the commission that animal rights will no longer be granted on any property less than 20,000 sq. ft. The mayor mentioned that the council is wanting to restrict animals to half-acre lots (which is considered 20,000 sq. ft.). Ernie questioned allowing animals in an R-1 15,000A zone if a lot is 20,000 sq. ft. or more. This would not be consistent with the Council's desire not to allow animals on lots smaller than half-acre in the R-1 15,000A zone other than that which has already been approved.

Ken said that in the R&L-1-20,000 description of the ordinance there would be the same reversal of verbiage making it consistent in all three zones. However; the planning commission decided to retain the verbiage allowing lots of 20,000 sq. ft. or more in the R-1 15,000A zone to have animal rights.

Ray suggested that these ordinances limiting the number of animals not apply in short-term events. Ken mentioned that when discussing "raising and keeping" of animals, as is in the ordinances, we are not talking about short-term events. It was suggested by Ken that we change the verbiage in each zone description to read "The maximum number of animals or fowl permitted on any lot..." to "The maximum number of animals or fowl permitted to be raised or kept on any lot...". (Sections 10-7D-2, paragraph B.2, page 3, for R-1-15,000A Residential zone; Section 10-8A-2 paragraph B.2, page 5 for RR-1 Rural Residential, and Section 10-8B-2, paragraph 2.E, page 6 for R&L-1-20,000 Residential & Limited Livestock Zone.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY RUSSELL ADAMSON AND SECONDED BY SCOT BELL TO RECOMMEND FOR APPROVAL TO THE COUNCIL THE ORDINANCE AS AMENDED BY KEN YOUNG FOR PERMITTED USES IN ZONES ALLOWING THE RAISING, CARE AND KEEPING OF LIVESTOCK AND FOWL. VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.

2. Ordinance Amendment for Requirements Associated with the Keeping of Pigeons

The next ordinance discussed was the ordinance amending the Elk Ridge Code providing for the control of the keeping and raising of pigeons.

The commission discussed what they felt was a reasonable number and decided 40-60 would be reasonable.

Greg Winn, an Elk Ridge resident who has filed a nuisance complaint against a neighbor who is raising pigeons, was invited to share his concerns with the planning commission, understanding that there are certain rights of the pigeon owner. He mentioned that when it comes to the point where it infringes on the rights, pleasure, the health, etc. of others that it becomes a problem. He mentioned the coop is unkempt, very dirty and generating bad odors. The birds make noises late into the night (11 pm). They roost on his roof. Greg felt there should be a cap on the number of birds, he felt the numbers were high. He also felt there should be restrictions on how they are cared for. He has counted up to 38 birds.

Ray mentioned that in the research Ken did, a large number of pigeons are allowed for. He also stated that we need to go with the norm. We do need to consider sanitation. Ray asked Ken if 90 was too high a number. The mayor mentioned that maybe we should get a number from the National Pigeon Racing organization.

The mayor mentioned that when Mr. Clark appeared before the council before a few years ago it seems that the number agreed upon was closer to 60 and maybe as low as 40. The key element was that if he was a nuisance and menace to his neighbors, he would have to stop. He is clearly in violation of the original agreement. Scot mentioned that when Mr. Clark

came before the Board of Adjustment 2 years ago he admitted the birds were a problem. Ken mentioned that he had reviewed that case and there were no specific guidelines given following the case.

Scot mentioned that some cities do not allow raising and keeping of pigeons. Ken mentioned that the lot size will restrict meeting the setback requirements for the building of the coop. Clarks' coop is a free-standing unit in the middle of the back yard which is probably not violating the requirement of where a coop should be built.

Ray asked Ken if we could keep all the other restrictions, but just change the number to either 60 or 40. Ken said yes. The main point against Mr. Clark now is the nuisance issue. Mr. Clark would be grandfathered from the new ordinance but adding this element to the code regarding raising pigeons would help in future instances.

Mr. Clark is also keeping birds in the garage in unsanitary conditions. The mayor said he would enforce a request that Mr. Clark move the birds from the garage to the coop and comply with the 40-60 number in the Coop. We could also enforce the sanitation issue in this case.

When Mr. Clark appeared before the Board of Adjustment he presented full page with surrounding cities that permitted the raising of pigeons. Scott called these cities and some actually said they did not permit the raising of pigeons. A couple of the cities that allowed this said they enforced the restrictions and the pigeons were not a problem. In some of the cities where the pigeons were a problem, they set traps, captured the birds, and eliminated them.

Scot said that we don't need to approve the raising and keeping of pigeons. From the calls he made only about 1/3 of the cities in the county allow pigeons.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND SECONDED BY RAY BROWN THAT WE TABLE THE DISCUSSION ON THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR REQUIREMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE KEEPING OF PIGEONS UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING TO GIVE THE COMMISSION A CHANCE TO REVIEW THE FOLLOWING OPTIONS:

1. **DRAFT AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITTING THE RAISING OF PIGEONS,**
 2. **ACCEPT THE ORDINANCE PROPOSED BY KEN YOUNG IN SOME MODIFIED FORM**
 3. **DO NOTHING**
- VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.**

FOLLOW-UP ON ASSIGNMENTS

1. **Trails and Paths** - Ken Young
He will report at the next meeting. Scot said he would furnish CAD information to Ken.
2. **CUP (secondary water)** - Scot Bell
Scot has talked to the CUP people and they have agreed to give a presentation to our council. A specific person from their organization has not been assigned. Scot said the time frame he gave them to give their presentation was an hour, beginning at 7:15. The City Council and Mayor will be invited for that portion of the meeting.
3. **Open Space** – Ken Young – no date set
4. **Storm Drain** – Scot Bell and Joe Jamison – no date set

The Certified Community Planner Seminar is currently underway in Payson and will be repeated June 9th and 10th in North Salt Lake. This would be a good event for the new

Planning Commission member to attend.

ADJOURNMENT A MOTION WAS MADE BY RAY BROWN TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:45 P.M.. VOTE: YES-ALL (4); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) DAN STEELE, JOE JAMISON AND DENNIS DUNN.



Administrative Assistant

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Elk Ridge Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on **Thursday, April 21, 2005 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** The meeting will take place at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge, UT, at which time consideration will be given to the following:

7:00 P.M. Opening Remarks & Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome and Introduction of New Planning Commission Members

- Scott Petersen
- Mel LeBaron

Roll Call

Approval of Agenda Time Frame

Page, Crockatt, Frazee Annexation Proposal – Randy Young

- Presentation
- Discussion
- Determination of Areas of Concern

Rocky Mountain Subdivision – Plat A – Final Plat – Mike Dubois

- Planning Commission Approval and Recommendation to City Council

Rocky Mountain Subdivision – Plat B – Final Plat – Mike Dubois

- Planning Commission Approval and Recommendation to City Council

City Council Meeting Update – Mayor Vernon Fritz

Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, 4-07-05

Development Code Amendments:

- 1. Ordinance Amendment for Requirements Associated with the Keeping of Pigeons – Ken Young**
 - Review and Discussion of Proposed Ordinance Document
 - Recommendation to City Council
- 2. Ordinance Amendment for Permitted Uses in Zones Allowing the Raising, Care and Keeping of Livestock & Fowl – Ken Young**
 - Review and Discussion of Revised Ordinance Document
 - Recommendation to City Council
- 3. Development Code PUD Ordinance Discussion – Chad Christensen**
 - Review and Discussion

General Plan Amendments:

- 1. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map**
 - Review and Discussion – Russell Adamson
- 2. Circulation Element – Trails, Paths and Open Space – Ken Young**
 - Discussion

Follow-up on Assignments

- CUP Secondary Water– (Speaker) – Scot Bell– May 5th
- Storm Drain – Scot Bell and Joe Jamison

Agenda Timing – Ken Young

ADJOURNMENT

1

1

1

*Handicap Access Upon Request. (48 hours notice)

The times, which appear on this agenda, may be accelerated if time permits. All interested persons are invited to attend this meeting.

Dated this 14th day of April, 2005.



Administrative Assistant

BY ORDER OF THE ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned duly appointed and acting Administrative Assistant for the municipality of Elk Ridge, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Public Meeting was emailed to the Payson Chronicle, Payson, Utah and delivered to each member of the Planning Commission on the 14th day of April, 2005.



Administrative Assistant

]

]

]

ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
April 21, 2005

TIME AND PLACE	A regular meeting of the Elk Ridge Planning Commission was held on Thursday, April 21, 2005, 7:00 p.m., at 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.
OPENING REMARKS & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	Raymond Brown welcomed the commissioners. An opening prayer was given by Raymond Brown followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.
WELCOME NEW PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS	<p>Scott Petersen – Scott was asked to help out and agreed. He has lived in Elk Ridge for 2 years and came from Kansas City, Missouri. He was president of his home association there and involved in an ad hoc committee for planning and zoning. He is an entrepreneur, and has started several companies. He has a wife and 5 children, 2 of which are married. Two of the children are still at home.</p> <p>Mel LeBaron – Alternate Member – Mel moved to Utah in November. He spent most of his life in southern California. He has been a mayor and city council member in California. He is familiar with cities. He was on the USC School of Public Administration faculty for 19 years. He was a corporate leadership coach and worked with 200 cities.</p>
ROLL CALL	<p><i>Commissioners:</i> Chad Christensen, Dennis Dunn, Raymond Brown, Scot Bell, Russell Adamson, Scott Petersen, Mel LeBaron (alternate member)</p> <p><i>Absent:</i> Joe Jamison</p> <p><i>Others:</i> Vernon Fritz, Mayor Ken Young, City Planner Ernestine Folks, past Administrative Assistant Margaret Leckie, Planning Commission Coordinator Randy Young, developer proposing PUD Mike Dubois – Developer, Rocky Mountain Subdivision Dennis Roberts – Developer, Rocky Mountain Subdivision Todd Trane – Engineer for Rocky Mountain Subdivision George and Sherry Woodruff – Residents on 1600 W.</p>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES AGENDA TIME	<p>Ray mentioned that the meeting will take longer than 2 hours to address all the items on the agenda. No time was allotted on the agenda for the items but it was suggested that we do give the items tracking numbers. A majority of the commissioners agreed to extend the 2 hour meeting. Ken Young, City Planner, suggested that from this time forward we not put times on the agendas.</p> <p>MOTION WAS MADE BY SCOT BELL AND SECONDED BY DENNIS DUNN, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS WRITTEN, KEEPING THE TIME FRAME FLEXIBLE, MOVING THE APPROVAL OF MINUTES TO THE FIRST ITEM, AND ADDING NUMBERS TO THE ITEMS. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON</p>
1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 3-17-05	<p>MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN, TO APPROVED THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 4-07-05 WITH THE CONDITION THAT ONE ERROR BE CORRECTED ON P.1; THAT BEING THE CHANGING OF THE WORD “GENERAL PLAN” TO “ORDINANCES.” VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON</p>
2. PAGE, CROCKATT, FRAZEE	Randy passed out his latest plan for his proposed PUD to the commission members. He said that per the commissioners’ suggestions at the last meeting he had fewer 10,000 sq. ft. lots and more 12,000 sq. ft. lot, and had added some decoration on this iteration. He also

**ANNEXATIONS
PROPOSAL**

mentioned that following suggestions from the last planning commission, and from comments from his engineering staff, he added a round-about entrance at the gateway to the city, with maybe a statue of an elk. This would help traffic flow from Gooseneck into the city and out of the stake center. His plan included trees along the side of the main road.

He felt this plan improved the curb appeal. There are just a couple of lots under 12,000 sq. ft. on the main entrance. The city needs to get the sewer up here and install a water tank. Randy has proposed to the mayor that he would be the contributor for digging the well, which would cost about \$700,000.

He mentioned his plan implemented the guidelines of the current master plan zoning of 12,000 sq. ft. lots. with the PUD behind them. He would contribute parks, sewer and the well but would like the flexibility of having some smaller lots up in the northern quadrant down by the canal. He felt this would be a good quadrant to have a little higher density – town homes, twin homes, etc.

Randy mentioned a newspaper article on Utah Growth. He said according to that article the average pricing of homes in our area is \$265,000. He said the homes he is proposing in his development would be right around \$260,000 and up. The total acreage of the proposed development is right around 122 acres. The Northern quadrant is about 15 acres.

Scott Petersen asked the width of the main corridor. Randy remembered it to be 76' or 80'. Scott was concerned about the green space on either side of the road. Randy said there would be trees, fence and a walk path that will be a nice addition to the city. The northwest corner, the Lyle Smart property, is still privately owned and not included in this development.

Randy mentioned that he would like to add some monuments to the city entrance. He thought an elk would be nice. The mayor has looked at 3 of Randy's developments and is comfortable with them, especially the one in Pleasant Grove. Randy said the lots will be 100' wide, which he thought was fabulous. There is room for a detached garage in back.

Chairman Brown asked the mayor about the status of the Payson Sewer. The mayor said this will be discussed at the next city council meeting and he anticipates that engineering will start in about 30 days, and it probably be a 60-90 day process. In Oct. or Nov. we should be ready to let contracts. He felt if we started digging May or June it should be ready in 5-6 months. The dig is mainly farmland so should not involve a lot of extra excavation.

Scott Peterson posed some questions to Randy:

1. Footage on either side of road dedicated to green space, parkway. Randy said normally about 4-5 feet on either side with trees about every 60' or so. All trees would probably be the same type. He would like it stated in the CC&Rs that all homes should have 2 trees in front and the types of those trees would be specified in the CC&Rs. Ken asked if all the homes had to have the same type of trees. He also asked if all the residential streets would have a park strip. Randy said yes. Scott Peterson felt the 5' on either side of the main corridor was not an adequate width. Ken Young agreed that the parkway needed substantially more width of landscaping. The distance between the trees on the parkway (60') was felt too large.
2. Scott also mentioned he would like to see a colored rendering of the development before the commission made a final decision. Randy mentioned that as they were at a conceptual stage, and as he did not have a project for sure, these type drawings

have not been made yet.

Randy mentioned he appreciated the suggestions made. The mayor concurred with the comments restricting the type of trees because overgrown trees and closely spaced trees cause problems with city trucks trying to clean roads, etc.

Ray thought the original width of the road was suggested at 108' rather than 76'.

Scott Petersen mentioned it would be nice to have room on the side of the street for cycling and felt the open space should be more like 10'. Scot Bell mentioned that sometimes if a street is too wide you lose the traffic-calming effect of a narrower meandering road. He also questioned the problem of owners assuming responsibility of maintaining upkeep of the greenbelt area.

Scott Petersen felt that giving tickets for speeding would soon slow the traffic down. He also suggested a requirement that the yards go in at the time the homes were built and that there be a home association to take care of common green space. The mayor felt the city council would support this.

Randy said in order to give variety he created some larger lots, almost ½ acre. He said that he, as the developer, would be responsible for putting the fence along the main corridor. This would be a classy pre-cast type fence, not wood. Chad suggested the possibility of putting some of the larger lots in the high density area. Ray said it would be more welcoming to spread the various size lots throughout the development and not cluster similar lot sizes together. Dennis said we need to consider that the minimum acreage for a PUD is 5 acres but we also need to consider that with the density bonuses (lighting, etc) which would allow extra units, 5-acre parcels would work the best when looking at the possibility of moving larger lots into all areas.

The City Planner asked Randy if he was aware of the 10% open space requirement because it did not look like this plan was meeting that requirement with the one-acre park shown in the plan. Randy mentioned that nothing is concrete and his current plan is just conceptual. As soon as he gets an annexations motion that he will proceed with more concrete plans.

Scott Petersen brought up the issue of street lighting. Though our code does not require it, he felt we needed to discuss the merits of street lighting and whether we wanted to amend the code to require it. We are now setting the standards for what our city will look like in 20 years.

Ken Young, City Planner, mentioned that before we give a positive nod to what we see in this plan, we have a lot of work to do. Randy's concept does not fit with how the citizen's of Elk Ridge view their future community. Randy said he has been and will be responsive to what has been asked and wants support from the planning commission that he is doing what the commission has asked and wants the annexation approved.

Scott Petersen felt that in fairness to Randy, the planning commission needs to be specific in our requests. We need to make sure the project benefits both the city and the developer. Being specific up front will also speed up the process. Randy again mentioned he is still in a conceptual stage. Chairman Brown mentioned that he appreciated Randy's responsiveness but mentioned the city is still in the process of getting our ordinances in shape and we need to get that finished. The Planning Commission is going through growing pains and figuring out how to work with developers. The timing is good. Chairman Brown appreciates Randy's flexibility and hopes he understands that there will be more changes requested to the proposed plan from the Planning Commission.

Scott Peterson recapped some of the specific concerns to Randy's plans and some of the amenities the planning commission would like to see:

1. Entry to be a minimum of 10' on each side.
2. Some discussion as to width of interior roads and green space, may be too small. Ken mentioned this would not specifically widen asphalt, but would give more green space on the sides.
3. The park needs to be larger, a 1-acre park is useless, maybe something on the order of 3-5 acres would provide the needed benefits to the community.
4. Do we want street lights?
5. Would like to see what other communities have done (per Chad's suggestion) in mixing lots of different size together
6. Don't feel we should break character of area by having quadrant on NW side with small lots only.
7. Scott questioned the lot pricing and home price range. Randy said the homes would average about \$260,000, some being more. When asked the cost of the least expensive home Randy felt they would be about \$240,000.

Chad Christensen mentioned that all these decisions will be based on the PUD and zoning codes. Randy needs to know what the zoning codes are.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY RAY BROWN TO MAKE MEL LEBARON A VOTING MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION TONIGHT AS THERE WAS AN ABSENT MEMBER. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

Dennis cautioned the commissioners about injecting personal opinions into the meeting. The opinion should be in the code book and plans. The codes will protect the city and the developer.

Ray again explained to the developer that we are in the process of codifying what the community wants and we need to get this done before we can proceed with the development.

Randy said he is not asking to have the master plan changed but asking to be annexed in according to what our zoning is. Randy said he hasn't purchased all the ground yet but he is putting out some hard money in this direction and is hoping it is not in vain. He is fearful of getting 6 months down the road and still being at the same place he is now.

The mayor asked if it would be unfair to state that we are not opposed to the annexation and development. Ray stated that we are not opposed to annexation but wanted to make sure it happens in an orderly fashion. We are working on our code now because of Randy's proposal. Randy does have some good ideas and is willing to work with us.

Ray poled the commissioners to see if any of them were opposed to annexation as proposed by Randy. Some of the comments that followed were:

- Chad Christensen said he is generally in favor but questions the whole PUD being in 12,000 sq ft. lots.
- Dennis Dunn likes the direction Randy is moving and feels the focus is becoming clear. The timing is good on the sewer, etc.
- Ray Brown is not opposed and feels we will eventually have a marriage of thinking in the ordinances, codes and Randy's proposal.
- Scot Bell commended Randy's present plan of breaking up the grid. He did express concern about approving a blanket PUD. He felt we should be able to look at things

a section at a time. We are not sure how long the whole development will take to become occupied. To give a blanket PUD for the whole development would be not be wise. He sees this proposal overall as a valuable asset to the community. He recognized Randy's frustrations and feels that maybe more frequent interaction between Randy and the PC would be beneficial. By-in-large he feels annexation will happen and would like to know more about the details. When Ray said "we will take this as a 'yes'," he said his decision is premature at this time.

- Russell Adamsen said he would like to see the area broken up into different zones instead of one massive PUD. This is our challenge now and we are behind the 8-ball as this is how the present zone is. He is in favor of annexation.
- Scott Petersen is in favor of annexation and will support the proper development. He acknowledged that being new on the commission, he is not familiar with all the code and ordinances and stated that in order to be fair to Randy, we need to do our business quickly and get the code established for the benefit of the residents and the developers.
- Mel supports and looks forward to it.

Ray mentioned that it is a pleasure working with Randy and said we want an annexation profitable to both of us and invited him to come back.

Randy did comment that he is asking for an annexation contiguous with the zoning. Ray said we will give our word that we will work diligently to get our ordinances and codes in order so we can give Randy some specific direction. We did answer the question regarding annexation. The Planning Commission is in favor.

Ray invited the visiting residents, George and Sherry Woodruff, who live on 1600 W., to comment on Randy Young's proposed PUD. George said he was raised in Taylorsville next to Kearns. He felt that similar developments in that area were not good. Most kids raised there did not stay there. He felt it is very important to control the course of this development. He expressed concern at the lack of humanistic amenities in the proposed development such as biking and jogging trails, adequate parks, etc. Most of us moved up here because we like the rural atmosphere, and this development would turn this area into another "Kearns." He stated that the Planning Commission was elected by the citizenry to protect them from poor development.

He stated that in the last 14 years his property tax has tripled, mainly to pay for schools. This will require more school and the cost will come from the residents of the community and not the developer. He said the feelings of the community need to be expressed in the code that we are in the process of finalizing.

He also complained about the fact that when the city dug the last well, it caused his to dry up and he had to pay \$16,000 to dig a new well. He expressed concern about what would happen in that regard when the proposed development goes in. He asked if the city would feel any responsibility towards these kinds of problems. The mayor expressed curiosity as to how the city's well dried up George's well. George said it was probably the same aquifer.

George mentioned some impressive, pleasant developments he has seen and said they are possible.

George's wife, Sherry expressed concern about the small space between houses. She hoped that Elk Ridge would not develop similar to what she has seen in California. Ray had Dennis read from the General Plan the vision statement for Elk Ridge. Randy stated that we was familiar with this visioning statement. Ray stated this is what we are working towards:

From the Community Vision Element: ...”The most important part of the Elk Ridge general planning process is the preparation of a community vision statement and community goals, objectives and policies that indicate what direction the community would like to take for the future and provide a framework for specific recommendations regarding the general plan. The results of the community visioning session with the planning commission were incorporated into this general plan.”

Under the heading “The Community Vision of Elk Ridge,” ... “to provide a small-town, rural atmosphere with well planned open space and recreation areas. Also, to create a family-oriented and friendly community that is a great place to live.”

Dennis stated that this subject matter usually comes from the public. We don’t write this. The General Plan is based on input from citizens in the community and should not be biased and prejudiced, but should reflect the feelings of the community. This body also changes and is centered on the evolutionary growth of the community. It has to be updated and redefined every 3-5 years.

Mel thanked Randy for his efforts and said we would hold him to his earlier commitment of finding a “win-win” situation. The Planning Commission needs to learn to find ways to achieve “win-win” situations with developers.

Randy replied that he was not unhappy with the way things went tonight. He stated that our code and ordinances will in the end dictate how things are developed, this is where the fine-tuning will come. He felt we have come to a little bit of a meeting of the minds. He is not going to get rich on this development.

When asked if he was willing to have part of the development not be zoned the R-1 12,000 PUD he said the PUD allows him the flexibility to plan contiguously. As there will be some parks and open space and other amenities, this zoning allows him to have a couple of higher density areas. We can have bigger parks this way and it can all be done all at once. He felt the time was right here for a wonderful, up-scale development. Ray thanked Randy, and Randy left.

3. ROCKY MOUNTAIN SUBDIVISION – PLAT A – FINAL PLAT

The representatives from Rocky Mountain were here. Ernie explained that corrected drawings from the ones that were in the packets had been passed out. These corrections included road name changes. This week these plans were submitted. Bruce Ward from Aqua Engineering, Ernie and Ken (city planner) have all reviewed the plans and found all the issues and concerns that had been earlier expressed in letters, have been resolved.

Chairman Brown confirmed that Plat A is the one with the agreed upon smaller corner lot. He mentioned that when this Plat was submitted there were a couple of things that were asked for by the developer. One of them was that about 8 feet be removed from the corner lot dimension in order to not have to redesign the subdivision. In exchange, the developer agreed to put in about 200’ of water line to extend the city line. The lot is still 102’ wide, which is still substantial.

Ray asked the commissioners if they had any questions for the engineer or developers that were present.

Ernie asked if the retention basin was on the last drawings and it was determined that it was not. They are on there now. There are 6 total sumps throughout the subdivision and 8 total catch-basins.

Ernie stated that everything is in order and has been taken care of. The developers are aware of what they need to do before the Plat will be recorded once approved by the city council.

The new street name in Plat A is Meadowlark Lane.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY RAY BROWN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN TO APPROVE ROCKY MOUNTAIN FINAL PLAT A AND RECOMMEND IT FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THEIR APPROVAL. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

**4. ROCKY
MOUNTAIN
SUBDIVISION –
PLAT B – FINAL
PLAT**

Ernie stated that the offsite improvements of Goosenest as it connects to Rocky Mountain Way are in Plat B. The developer is only required to put in half the width of the street plus 9'. The mayor would have like to have seen a full road width go in but he was not in office when the decision was made. The commissioners discussed the problems of doing a good job of completing the other half at a later date. It is a bad concept from an engineering aspect. As Ridge View Drive is the access to the subdivision and Goosenest is a secondary access, the developers are not required to put the full road in. The developers stated that the church was only required to put in half plus 9' and felt they should not be required to do any more. As the ordinance historically required half plus 9' this is all we can require of the developer. The code has been changed now but the process with Rocky Mountain has been in the mill for over a year and a half and pre-dates the code change.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN TO APPROVE ROCKY MOUNTAIN FINAL PLAT B AS IT WAS PRESENTED TONIGHT AND RECOMMEND IT BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THEIR APPROVAL. VOTE: YES-(5); NO-(1) RAY BROWN, ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

Chad stated that his yes vote was based on the fact that Goosenest it is a secondary access and what is required of the developer is consistent with the way Goosenest is now. Ray's "no" vote was because he felt the road should be built complete, not half plus 9'.

**5. COUNCIL
MEETING
UPDATE**

The mayor reviewed the City Council's discussion of the Memorandum of Understanding with Payson. There was some ambiguity with one element of it and the council remodeled it. The Payson City Council wanted us to ensure them we had no intention of annexing south of the current Elk Ridge boundaries. That would include all the foothill country towards Four Bay. The mayor and council felt that the expense and cost of maintaining development in that area makes annexation impractical so his recommendation to the council on Tuesday will be to go along with Payson's request. Elk Ridge has never had any intention of annexing that area. Payson is concerned about the conservancy district in that area and wants the option of developing it. The mayor reported that Elk Ridge could not get a road in there and make it cost effective.

It was questioned if this was the old "Whispering Oaks" proposal and it was confirmed that it was. The property was bought by Dan Shaw with the idea that it would not be developed. The part that can be developed is between the boundary of Elk Ridge and the Conservatory section.

Scot Bell questioned Payson's motivation in wanting to develop the area. He expressed concern about Payson changing the boundaries of the golf course and developing around the golf course close to our border. We would have no control over the development and it

would cause an increase of traffic on our roads. Scot also expressed his concern about Payson developing condominiums around the perimeter of the golf course, running their sewer from the back side of Schuler Knoll, around the back of the golf course, and tying in to Goosenest.

The mayor stated that Payson already owns land behind High Sierra and can develop there. Regarding the concern of Payson using our roads, the mayor mentioned that Elk Ridge residents use Payson's road every time we come to Elk Ridge the back way through Payson. You cannot segregate one community from another at the boundary.

Dennis pointed to the several areas on the zoning map that had been de-annexed from Payson into Elk Ridge because of the impracticality of Payson developing those areas.

The mayor said Elk Ridge does not want to snow-plow this land, maintain the infrastructure, etc. There are some severe land pitches in the land between Four Bay and the golf course. The cost exceeds the benefit of developing that area.

The discussion was closed and the council will address these issues.

6. DEVELOPMENT CODE AMMENDMENTS

A. Ordinance Amendment for Requirements Associated with the Keeping of Pigeons

Chairman Brown introduced the topic by reminding the commission they had been given the assignment to think about this topic and do research. There was lengthy discussion on this issue during the last meeting and we hope today to move quickly through this topic. Ray in his research on the Board of Adjustment hearing found out that one of the reasons Mr. Clark had pigeons was for a hobby for a disabled child. He personally feels that as far as an ordinance, he is opposed to having pigeons allowed in Elk Ridge.

Ken Young, City Planner, recommended against having an ordinance that provides for pigeons. The current problems with pigeons can be regulated through the nuisance ordinance. Russell, Chad and Scot agreed.

The mayor mentioned that the biggest complaint from Mr. Clarks neighbor was the feces on the ground, and this can be handled through a health and safety issue. The mayor expressed his concern that if we don't put a cap on the present number of birds, Mr. Clark can increase the number in his brood and we have no ordinance to prevent this.

The City Planner said we are going to allow pigeons by defining a number of pigeons that comprises an animal unit; and that we should eliminate any mention of pigeons in that section of the ordinances where animal units are defined. In the area of the ordinance where animals are listed that are not acceptable, pigeons should be added there. By using this approach, any pigeons that are here can stay, but no more will be allowed.

RAY BROWN MADE A MOTION THAT WAS SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN TO DO AWAY WITH THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE CONTROL OF THE KEEPING AND RAISING OF PIGEONS. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

**B. Ordinance
Amendment for
Permitted Uses in
Zones Allowing for
the Raising, Care
and Keeping of
Livestock & Fowl**

Ken said that in general, this ordinance deals with the different zones that allow for the raising of livestock and other animals which would not be permitted in other zones. It describes animals by animal units. He is suggesting going back to the way the ordinance was, which more clearly defines how the zoning administrator will enforce the ordinance.

He suggested making no mention of pigeons in the animal unit definition area (delete from Section 10-2-2, Item A-5) of the ordinance and adding to Section 10-2-2 Item B that pigeons are excluded from consideration as part of an animal unit that is allowed.

CHAD CHRISTENSEN MADE A MOTION THAT WAS SECONDED BY RUSSELL ADAMSEN THAT WE DELETE ITEM A-5 FROM SECTION 10-2-2 IN THE ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE PROVIDING FOR THE PERMITTED USES IN ZONES ALLOWING THE RAISING, CARE AND KEEPING OF LIVESTOCK AND FOWL; AND THAT WE ADD PIGEONS IN SECTION 10-2-2, ITEM B AFTER THE WORD “MINK.” VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

A repeated typographical error was pointed out. In the following sections the word “and” needs to be changed to “an” where it proceeds the word “existing.” These occur on page 6, item G; page 5, item 3; and page 3 item 3.

DENNIS MADE A MOTION THAT WAS SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN THAT RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ORDINANCE AMENDING CITY CODE PROVIDING FOR THE PERMITTED USES IN ZONES ALLOWING THE RAISING, CARE AND KEEPING OF LIVESTOCK AND FOWL AS AMENDED WITH THE GRAMMATICAL CORRECTIONS (CHANGING THE WORD “AND” TO “AN”). VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

**C. Development
Code PUD
Ordinance
Discussion**

Chad presented 4 or 5 topics for discussion. His information is from the ordinance code: Section 10-14 Large-Scale Developments; Article A: PRDs (Planned Residential Developments); Article B: MHDs (Mountain Home Developments); and Article C: PUDs (Planned Unit Developments).

There were several sections of the ordinance Chad felt we needed to discuss in relation to what Randy Young is asking for in his PUD section (which can be included in any zone). The facts Chad presented from the above ordinances included:

- A PUD requires 5 acres. This compares to the 20 acres required for a PRD and 100 acres required for an MHD.
- The base density or acres per dwelling are 1-5 for a PRD, 1-20 for a MHD and in a PUD it is not designated and is open. There is no minimum lot size. This is to allow developers to be creative. Ernie mentioned that a PRD is not allowed in all zones, only in CE-1 and the PMD is only allowed in zone CE-2.
- Regarding Density Bonuses, the PRD allows 20%, the Mountain Home is not applicable and the PUD allows 25% Density Bonus.
- Regarding open space requirement, the PRD requires 30%, the Mountain Home is all open space except the building lot and the roads, the PUD requires 10%.

Chad said that Dennis’s idea of having Randy Young break his development into 5-acre pieces to mix it up was good. That smaller number may be advantageous in this case.

Some of Chad's discussion points were:

- Density bonuses – which included such amenities as mentioned in Section 10-14-C page 3, including fencing, landscaping, etc. Trails were not mentioned. Maybe mentioning them limits us. Ken reminded the commission that we need to consider gross acreage as opposed to net acreage when considering density bonuses.

Ken Young, City Planner, also mentioned that we need to take serious reflection on the numbers that are in our code given as density bonuses. Ray asked if the developer gets bonuses for the fence he is proposing putting on both sides of the main corridor. There is a maximum of 25% bonus but we need to decide what this means. Ken asked if 12 acres of open space (representing 10% of the total acreage) with all the bonus he is getting, is sufficient to meet that 25% bonus.

- Chad said that from a developers standpoint, if he can do higher density on one half of the property, and give the other half away, he may be better off. The planning commission needs to educate themselves on these issues. The city planner said our package in the present code is very liberal, 10% required open space is not enough. He felt approaching 50% would be very nice. This would provide lots of open space, but would also allow clusters of dense development. The more open space, the more we get away from cookie-cutter development and allow creative development. He felt anywhere between 25% and 40% required open space would be desirable.

Scott Petersen mentioned that if we make the requirements too stringent, the developers won't come. Ken, City Planner, said that sometimes clustered homes (maybe stacked, or 2-story) on smaller lots, as small as 6,000 or 8,000 sq. ft. can allow for nice open space.

- The open space could be maintained by a homeowner's association. Some of this open space could be left natural as opposed to a manicured park needing lots of maintenance.

Ernie mentioned that Mr. Dubois told her that Mapleton just approved a very nice large PUD development. Our planning commission may want to look at what they have in place, in the way of code, that helped the direction of this development. Within this development are different zones that allow for different kinds of development with a lot of open space and parks. Mr. Dubois recommended looking at what they did and how they did it.

Ray questioned what the easiest way to get the information from Mapleton would be. He said he would go to the city office and try to get that information. He thanked Chad for his efforts and the information he gave.

- The mayor mentioned that when Randy presented his 50-acre concept he was responding to the expectations of the Page family who owned the property.

7.
**GENERAL PLAN
AMMENDMENTS**

**Amendment to
Land Use and
Future Land Use
Map**

Russ passed out his amended Land Use section from the General Plan and expressed a few of his thoughts. He asked the council to review the amendments and come prepared for further discussion at the next meeting.

He asked the commission to note on page 2.6 regarding high density PUDs, that one idea (very rough) is to create a new zone, a BG-1, Balanced Growth Zone. As it is, we defaulted the whole area to PUD 12,000 and hindsight would say we should have designated it as something else to control it a little better. If we rezone it as BG-1 it might provide more of the type growth we want. Think about this for next time.

Ken liked the idea of balanced growth but reminded the commission that we are talking about “Land Use Categories” as opposed to “zones.” This is the General Plan, which talks about Land Use Categories under which zones fall. The Balanced Growth would be a Land Use Category and not a zone. The concept is good.

Ray mentioned we will talk more about this in the next meeting.

Dennis Dunn reminded the commission that before we approve any of the above we need to find out if this is what the citizens of Elk Ridge want. Ken suggested having a visioning workshop where we get their input. The newsletter could be used to send out the invitation. We need to find ways to not show our bias as we collect information from the community. Some techniques were given at the latest Planning Seminar that will be repeated in June. Scot Bell suggested showing different examples of high density developments and asking the citizens which one most appealed to them.

Ken mentioned that education must take place at the workshop explaining what you get in the way of development if you don’t prepare for it in your ordinances.

8. FOLLOWUP

1. A CUP speaker has been lined up by Scot Bell for the May 5th Planning Commission Meeting – they will have an engineer here for answering questions and concerns. The trustee from CUP will also be here (he was the mayor of Salem). Dennis questioned whether the councilman over water will be here. The mayor mentioned that the he will be here and all councilmen are invited to attend.
2. Ernie mentioned that no one has looked at the CC&Rs for Rocky Mountain Way and we need to make sure they are not contrary to our ordinances. Get any suggested changes or problems found to Margaret before City Council Meeting tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE BY RAY BROWN TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:05 P.M.. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON


Administrative Assistant

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Elk Ridge Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on **Thursday, May 5, 2005 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** The meeting will take place at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge, UT, at which time consideration will be given to the following:

7:00 P.M. Opening Remarks & Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Approval of Agenda

- 1. Central Utah Water Project (CUP) Presentation - Randy Brailsford, Trustee**
- 2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, 4-21-05**
- 3. City Council Meeting Update – Mayor Vernon Fritz**
- 4. General Plan Amendments:**
 - A. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map**
- Review and Discussion – Russell Adamson
 - B. Circulation Element – Trails, Paths and Open Space**
- Review and Discussion – Ken Young
- 5. Development Code Amendments:**
 - A. Development Code PUD Ordinance Discussion**
- Review and Discussion – Chad Christensen
- 6. Follow-up Discussion on Proposed Annexation**
- 7. Follow-up on Assignments**
- Storm Drain – Scot Bell and Joe Jamison

ADJOURNMENT

*Handicap Access Upon Request. (48 hours notice)

The times, which appear on this agenda, may be accelerated if time permits. All interested persons are invited to attend this meeting.

Dated this 28th day of April, 2005.



Planning Commission Coordinator

1

1

1

BY ORDER OF THE ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned duly appointed and acting Administrative Assistant for the municipality of Elk Ridge, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Public Meeting was emailed to the Payson Chronicle , Payson, Utah and delivered to each member of the Planning Commission on the 28th day of April, 2005.



Administrative Assistant

1

1

1

ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
May 5, 2005

TIME AND PLACE A regular meeting of the Elk Ridge Planning Commission was held on Thursday, May 5, 2005, 7:00 p.m., at 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

OPENING REMARKS & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Raymond Brown welcomed the commissioners. An opening prayer was given by Dennis Dunn followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners: Chad Christensen, Dennis Dunn, Raymond Brown, Scot Bell, Russell Adamson, Scott Petersen, Mel LeBaron (alternate member)

Absent: Joe Jamison

Others: Vernon Fritz, Mayor
Ken Young, City Planner
Randy Brailsford, Mayor of Salem,
Trustee, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Mark Breitenbach, Engineer, Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Alvin Harwood, Elk Ridge City Council member
Lisa Bradsahw, Elk Ridge resident

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY RAY BROWN TO MAKE MEL LEBARON A VOTING MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION TONIGHT AS THERE WAS AN ABSENT MEMBER. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

APPROVAL OF AGENDA **MOTION WAS MADE BY SCOTT BELL AND SECONDED BY DENNIS DUNN TO APPROVE THE AGENDA WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES IN THE ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS:**

- 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**
- 2. CUP PRESENTATION**
- 3. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT**
- 4. DEVELOPMENTAL CODE**
- 5. MAYOR'S UPDATE**

VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

NON-AGENDA ITEMS Chairman Brown discussed a phone call from a Ms. Taylor. She asked that, for public safety issues, when a plan for a subdivision is reviewed to be aware when naming streets of similar sounding street names already in use. (i.e. Park Ave., Park Lane, Park Street, etc.)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 4-21-05 **MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 4-21-05 WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE FOLLOWING TWO ERRORS BE CORRECTED; ON P.1; CHANGE "US SCHOOL" TO "USC SCHOOL," AND ON P.10 CHANGE "HE IS BETTER OFF" TO "HE MAY BE BETTER OFF." VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON**

1. CENTRAL UTAH WATER PROJECT (CUP) PRESENTATION **The CUP presentation by Randy Brailsford included the following points:**

1. Brief review of CUP history was given.
2. Project (CUP) has moved slowly by steadily forward as varying interests involved themselves in the discussion.
3. A final contract was signed earlier in 2005 and is now a legal document.
4. 400 million dollars has been allocated for the project.
5. The last remaining issue is UDOT. There are about 3 miles of road in Spanish Fork Canyon where a pipeline must go. UDOT is resisting our time frame, but the roadwork and pipe-laying can occur at the same time. The remaining problem is that this section has yet to be funded.
6. CUP water can be used for secondary water systems.
7. 2007 funds can help (65%-35% split) up to \$5 million to implement the secondary system.
8. Mark Breitenbach (CUP engineer) can help in planning Secondary Engineering.
9. Since 1992, Salem requires a dry secondary system be installed during development.

10. Salem goal is to have CUP water available at 12 months for about \$25/month for the secondary water system.
11. Salem outdoor water use in summer is 3 to 1 compared to total usage.
12. Water costs will continue to rise. There is a finite amount available.

The CUP presentation by Mark Breitenbach included the following:

1. The responsibility of the Central Utah Water Conservancy is to put in the pipeline. It may be 10 years before it will be ready. Payment will not be required until the water is needed. It is a 50-year contract.
2. Pressure will be brought down the Salem Canal Road, which means it will have to be piped uphill to Elk Ridge.
3. Benefits – put in secondary water system now to reduce the cost when water is finally available.
4. Currently Spanish Fork uses wells to feed their secondary system, but when CUP is available, the wells will be disconnected and CUP water will take over.
5. Santequin got funded last year. Their secondary system is wholly independent of when this additional water is going to get there. They are picking up shares in the Summit Creek Irrigation Company, etc. They plan to run that water into the secondary pipes.
6. Payson's system was funded retroactive. CUP paid for a system they put in years ago. They got grant money for what they did years before.
7. When the Strawberry water comes in the benefit is that those entities that have secondary systems can take that water plus the Strawberry project water and put it on the outdoor areas. They can then take the culinary grade water from the wells and the springs forestalling the necessity of installing the water treatment plants.
8. The financing of the project can't be beat. It is interest-free.
9. Our district subsidizes the 35% of the current water from Jordan. Salt Lake City only pays 65% of the repayment to the Federal Government. On the new water coming in Salt Lake will be required to pay the full price. (\$300/acre foot). Their alternative is treating Utah Lake water or bringing in Bear River water at \$500-\$800/acre foot.
10. Their current plan calls for putting reverse osmosis plans on Utah Lake. They will have to start as our water will not get there on time.
11. In So. Utah County CUP has agreed to subsidize 35% also. We will pay about \$100 of the \$300/acre foot.
12. This water will come in 10 years from now. It won't have to be paid for for 20 years.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD POINTS:

1. Re: 207 funding. There are certain deadlines that must be met. There is a yearly process. Each year in Feb. the entities that might want to apply for that year make application. A draft feasibility study is due by June. The board has a committee that reviews these and based on the available funding for that year the projects are ranked. Those that are ranked high and within the money get funded.
An environmental component helps a project get to the top rankings. For the cities down here one of the things that helps is some of the CUP water can be turned back and used for in-stream flow purposes.
2. Regarding funding phases. Spanish Fork got a check for \$5 million. Salem will have 3 small reservoirs which works well for the way the city is laid out. They are looking at a 3-year period for funding.
3. In the ordinance, when a subdivision builds, the developer must put in a dry line for secondary water and stub the homes with a box. The impact of development will eventually consume the culinary water supply. This impact is somewhat lessened by having the developer put in the secondary system, paying the cost of the distribution lines into the individual homes. This system helps extend the time before the water treatment plant must be put in.
4. When asked if we will have water at this elevation, he said the minimum flow from

Strawberry will satisfy this elevation at our city center. We could have a reservoir or tank at a higher stage that could be filled during high-pressure periods (night) or when scheduling along lines creates times of higher pressure. When pressure drops down, high zone will draw out of the storage.

Another possibility is that if Payson comes through and builds a storage facility that is big enough for several cities to join in, some entities could draw out of that storage which raises the pressure and allows us to run water into our higher tank. There are some things we can do engineering-wise in the planning.

CUP has contracted with 10 cities, the South Utah Valley Water Association. When the time comes and it becomes operational, that entity will subcontract the water to the city based on the need.

5. The mayor has copies of ordinances from other cities requiring secondary water systems to be put in. Much of the pertinent information is on the CUP website.

WE NEED TO PUT ON OUR CALENDAR THE APPLICATION DEADLINES:

- February – make application
- May – Draft feasibility study

It was suggested that the City Council be made aware of these deadlines.

The mayor has a meeting with Aqua and will review feasibility. When asked about the Payson project, the mayor mentioned they have some areas where they want to develop reservoirs. We will be looking keenly at water storage. It has been suggested using golf course hole no. 7 when it is abandoned. The gas line going through that area may constitute a problem. A supplemental storage system utilizing the Schuler water system was also suggested. The mayor commented that as the city council discussed this, some of the major issues discussed were fire suppression and sewage. There is much planning to do.

3. CITY COUNCIL MEETING UPDATE

- Mayor Fritz gave the “state of the city” presentation and reported on the past, present and future of Elk Ridge.
- A farewell presentation was given for Ernie Folks, who has worked for the city of Elk Ridge for almost 20 years.
- The public hearing for the Ordinance Amendment for Permitted Uses in Zones Allowing the Raising, Care and Keeping of Livestock and Fowl was postponed at the request of Ken Young, City Planner.

4. GENERAL PLAN AMMENDMENTS

A. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use and Future Land Use Map

Russ presented some discussion points and the following discussion ensued:

- Ray mentioned that at the last meeting Ken brought up some ideas that could be used for density bonuses. Using some of these, it is possible that we could ask for up to 50% of the land to be used for open space.

Ray passed out copies of Mapleton’s 183-acre Heritage Park development for review and consideration.

Scott Petersen shared a package from a large development company, Wasatch Pacific, of a PUD they were developing for review and to give us PUD ideas. Some of the things he noted from this package were:

- The amount of open space in these developments is upwards of 35% to 45%. Scot Bell mentioned the Mapleton development is about 36% open space. Ray mentioned Russ is in charge of helping focus the commission on creating the ordinances to present to the council that will bring this type development to our city.

The mayor said that Randy Young had followed the general plan as it was and has been very workable and amenable to our suggestions. The ad hoc committee did not feel that it was necessary to make modifications prior to the emergence of this

developer. Randy Young has put up \$150,000 more to keep his lease options open and needs to know where he stands.

Some comments were made by Russ and Scot Bell that he did fall short of the required open space. The mayor added that when the developer was confronted with this, he was willing to make changes to meet the desires of the city. Ray again mentioned that we need to get our ordinances in place and move forward in fairness to incoming developers.

- Russ again expressed the need to get things in writing. He reviewed his efforts in updating the Land Use Element. Some of his suggestions for changes included the following:
 1. Deletion of paragraph 3 on Page 2.1 referring to Plat C.
 2. Page 2.2, referring to references to pie chart, need to update chart to reflect desired acreage for various zones.
 3. Page 2.4 under “Residential Land Uses”, 2nd paragraph regarding critical environment, remove that text and add “and is zoned.” (Critical environment is a subset).

MISC. DISCUSSION

Ken reminded the commission that the General Plan contains generalizations and it is in the ordinances that we get specific. Chad felt the main thing we need to look at and revise in the General Plan is the Land Use Map.

4. Scott Bell said that using undevelopable land as open space is not what we want.

5. **OTHER TEXT CHANGES IN THE GENERAL PLAN FROM RUSS INCLUDED:**

Rural Residential, p.2.4, add “RR-1”, thus defining the zone that falls in that category – Ken, the city planner, suggested that in each of our land use areas, identify the zones that fall in that category. All of our zones are covered in this portion of the General Plan.

Medium Density (p.2.5), add R-1, 20000, thus defining, again, the zone in this category.

Residential and Limited Livestock, p. 2.5, add “R-1 – 15000A and “RL-1 – 20000.” Add the following note at the bottom “note: no further development of R-1 15000A.”

Residential, p.2.5, add “R-1 15000” as the zone in this category. Also changed verbiage of desired development from “low” to “medium.” Deleted reference to animals.

High Density PUD, p. 2.6, deleted “Required Residential” and added “R-1 20000 PUD.” added verbiage “to provide within the city areas of low residential development” from “to provide a location.” Ken suggested re-wording to “a lower percentage of residential development” so as to not confuse with density. A sentence was added at the end of the section relating to how much PUD we would allow in the community. He put 10% of total dwelling units, but stated that this is still up for discussion.

6. Russ deleted the reference on p. 2.6 to “Conditional Use PUD” and added the verbiage “Well thought-out Planned Unit Developments can:.... to precede the attributes desired in a PUD listed on the bottom half of p. 2.6 and continued on p. 2.7. Dennis mentioned that this should probably stay in as it is a density bonus that can be put into a project based upon requirements met. Chad stated that it is conditional in that in order to get that credit the developer must offer different amenities such as open space, trails, all brick homes, etc.

A statement was added at the end of this category requiring PUDs not exceed 10% of the total dwelling units in the city. Dennis felt 10% was too finite because as the community changes an ad hoc community would flex with the feelings of the community. Ken, the planner, suggested the guideline should be in the paragraph that referred to a low percentage of residential development. Again, Ken mentioned that the teeth are in the ordinance. We do have a PUD ordinance in place. It is agreed that it needs revision. Russ said he would take out the percentage and reword that section.

7. Russ added a paragraph containing a new Land Use Category to be later zoned within our zoning categories – *Balanced Growth, BG-1*. This section needs to be reworded to differentiate Land Use Categories from Zones. He threw out some percentages for discussion. Ray felt the percentage portion of the paragraph was too restrictive. Chad felt it would be better to keep this as a land use category and creating a new zone with the specific allocations listed in the bottom portion of the paragraph and adding this new zone to the Land Use Map. Ken, the city planner, suggested not assigning one zone to this land use category but allowing PUDs to be in this area also. Ken volunteered to help Russ rewrite this portion of the General Plan.
8. Russ skipped to 2.11, where he tried to put definition for each of the categories based on our zones. P. 2.12, regarding *Public Facilities*, he added reference to taking care to adequately plan for more public parks, playing fields, etc. and for maintenance of these facilities. He stated we may want to put in a parks acreage-to-population-ratio. Dennis mentioned he wrote just such a formula for Payson and will find that. Chad pointed out that this would be a good idea as there is nothing in our code outside of the PUD requirements, for open space.

DISCUSSION FOLLOWING RUSS'S PRESENTATION

- Scott Petersen felt (and Ken concurred) that 5 acres is too small an area for a PUD. Ken referred to the Mapleton Ordinance for their PUD which required 15 acres.

The mayor mentioned a meeting held last Tuesday in Payson between most of the local cities and Strawberry Electric with a proposal to use the canal as a trail system extension. This would add a safety buffer so developers would not develop abutting the canal.

- Scott Peterson referred to areas not having a PUD, and asked what should be required for open space?
- Russ asked if the Land Use Element was approaching what we want. Dennis commented that there are 3 additional steps to what we are doing which will provide some checks and balances:
 1. When we decided what we want the General Plan to look like we need to have a public hearing.
 2. The recommendations will be made to the City Council and they will review the changes and make modifications.
 3. The City Council will hold a public hearing.

In closing of this discussion, Ken pointed out that the Land Use Map really spells things out and is very important. We need to come together in a work session and play with the map to reflect the changes we want to see. He again suggested opening up the work session to the public, especially to decide what we want to do on the north end of town. In his job he works at involving the community in creating the plan and it does work.

Chairman Brown asked the planner, Ken, to work with Russ in getting this in a draft form for recommendation purposes. Ray asked Dennis to get the commission the

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING – 5-5-05

formula for figuring out desirable amount of open space in a community.

The mayor reiterated that we need to provide certain structure to the developer. He expressed discouragement at the communities' response to being invited to be involved in city planning and used the attendance at the last city council meeting, where the community was invited, as an example.

Dennis stated that his involvement with rewriting of a general plan is that it has actually fallen on the shoulders of a steering committee. It was their duty to get the public involved and gather this information. Three times a year they would send the commission a packet. They, as a planning commission, did not occupy their time doing this.. Direction was given from the mayor and city manager. The city council would come back with concerns to express regarding changing of code, etc. Dennis thought we should have a steering committee, or an ad hoc committee doing this work. The planning commission would then look at and review their work.

The commission discussed the problems with a small community in setting up such committees. The past ad hoc committee did not work out well. Ray stated that it is at the mayor's discretion that an ad hoc committee be set up.

B. Circulation Element – Trails, Paths and Open Space

Ken looked at the presentation proposed by Todd Jackson. He passed out a packet for review. He met with councilmember Mary Rugg and discussed her feelings about developing a trail system. She was in favor of creating a trail system master plan.

He presented some plans he has done for other cities which have been recognized by Envision Utah. He has also helped cities obtain grant funding through UDOT. We need to designate a plan or none of the trails desired will happen. Some of the information from his discussion included the following:

- He felt there is more we can do with the previous trail plan than has been done
- Either on the planning commission level or on a combined planning commission/staff level, or using public involvement, we should create a plan that will work for everyone.
- We should make the plan an amendment to our general plan that can be shown to developers.
- There are 2 local funds that can grant this type of project. State of Utah Parks Division and UDOT. Their criteria for granting money is not the economics of the community, and a grant is a viable option for our community.
- The mayor mentioned there is a master plan for trails developed by the committee for parks and trails. Dale Bigler was the chairperson.
- Mayor said some money has been set aside for the trail system. He recalled that \$30-35,000 has been retained towards the trail system.
- Ray asked Ken what would be the fastest mode to proceed? Ken responded that we should have some sort of planning workshop, maybe held in conjunction with revising and reviewing the Land Use Map. In a visioning exercise we should come up with something viable for a future trail system master plan. Ken did a similar plan which included parks master planning for Hooper City during a 6 mos. process, with public involvement, for about \$10,000. The West Point Trail System, including 3 public workshops, was about \$6,000.
- When asked what was the best way to set up a planning meeting with public involvement, Ken responded that one of the best ways he has seen is with a "stake-holder's visioning workshop." The city identifies a healthy list of citizens in the community who would be considered "stake-holders" in some fashion (involved with city government, churches, or schools, or have some sort of community involvement, or are a squeaky wheel). Personal invitations are sent to these people inviting them and telling them they have been identified as a community stake-holder of Elk Ridge and we would like to have their participation in this stake-holders' visioning workshop where we are working on updating or creating plans. After that first meeting has been held, a flyer can be sent with the city billing or with the

newsletters informing the whole community in case there are others who would like to participate. Another way is to send out a survey (for those who will not come and give feedback at a workshop).

- Ray asked Ken how he felt about getting something out to the community for a visioning workshop regarding 1) trails, 2) parks and 3) land use element using a large working map on tables. Scot Bell suggested sending out a blank map giving residents an opportunity to sketch in suggested maps. 3-5% is the national average for survey return.
- Scot Bell volunteered to put a proposed trail system into a CAD file showing trail footage etc.
- Ken suggested picking a date now, having invitation list finalized by next meeting. Sit down with mayor and several heads to develop the list. A month is a reasonable time-frame.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN TO HAVE A MORE EXTENSIVE PROPOSED TRAIL MAP WITHIN THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY MADE AND CREATE A LIST OF NAMES OF PEOPLE TO CONTACT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE TRAILS AND PARKS STUDY BY NEXT MEETING, MAY 19, 2005.

Ken questioned who was to do the work. Mayor said we could send out with newsletter which would go out on 5th or 6th. Ken said maybe we first hold a stake-holder's workshop then follow that with community meeting. Chad mentioned that the mayor already has a Trails Committee. Scot Bell mentioned Todd Jackson and Dale Bigler may know individuals with some background in this area and he will contact them. He also volunteered to contact Bruce Ward, at Aqua engineering and get a current map to use to input some possible trail ideas. Scot said he would use the ideas from Todd Jackson, Dale Bigler and Ken Young, City Planner and give the community a choice.

Ken was asked to work with the mayor in getting a list. Scot suggested that once he gets feedback, including any new ideas from the community, we set the date. Mayor passed out city registry for making calls.

The mayor stated that every building site requires a parks and recreation impact fee.

Ken said if a trail system master plan has been adopted by the city, that is the ordinance for the trail. When a development plan comes forward on a certain piece of ground, if a trail is shown on the plan going through that ground, the developer must put in that trail. You don't have to require a certain percentage of open space for that to happen if the trail plan is in place. Dennis mentioned that when you look at the trail portion and the added cost, the community needs to look at areas that are less critical when it comes to property development.

5. DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

A. DEVELOPMENT CODE PUD ORDINANCE DISCUSSION

Chad began by asking the mayor where we stand with the annexation and Randy Young and what is the process. Mayor's answer included the following:

- Randy cannot proceed till the planning commission reaches a consensus.
- When we reach a consensus with Randy, we present the proposal to the city council.
- The council accepts or rejects. Once accepted the city sets up a public hearing 2-3 weeks out from the time the decision is made. Mayor told Randy he thinks process will take 3-4 months.

Chad asked Mayor Fritz what the developer was asking for, the mayor responded:

- Developer wants us to initially accept with R-1 –12000, with the understanding that there would be some bonus trade-offs i.e. widen the entrance, put trees in a green belt, install secondary water structure, increase the park area, provide trails and walking paths, intersperse twin homes and provide bonus lots.
- He wants terms of annexation on paper.
- He has agreed to pay \$700,000 for a well. Not yet determined how he pays. Mayor wants cash rather than state bonding. When asked if we could come up with list of what the city

wants before anything is put into code.

- Mayor said if planning commission could come up with list, have it approved by city council and agreed upon by the developer; we can put it before the public and have it passed.

Some of the items Chad found in the code regarding the PUD issues were:

- Section 10-7C: Residential Zones, Article C. R-1 – 12,000 PUD. This is the ordinance for the zone he is requesting. Currently we do not have any of this zone on the map. The problem with the code is that by name it says PUD, but when compared with the R-1 15,000 code it is almost verbatim. Not allow for condos, twin-homes, only single family. Chad suggested we remove the “PUD.” for this zone. What the developer is asking for is all R-1 12,000.
Ken asked if Chad meant we need to look at a 12,000 sq. ft. zone or are we still looking at a PUD. ???

Chad passed out a worksheet showing the traditional zones, looking at density and open space

- R-1 12,000 which is labeled incorrectly. If Randy Young puts houses on minimum lot size he will have approximately 400 units in 122 acres. If want 1/3 acre lots will have 318 units, and 1/2 acre lots will give 238 units.
- Besides the critical environment areas, in our community the high density zones are the R-1 15,000 and R-1 20,000. A PUD can apply to any zones so taking these zones the open space requirement now is 10% so if the developer asked for a PUD in our Large Scale Development Code (10-14C), a different section, he would be allowed different densities with bonuses allowed for landscaping, fencing, environmental preservation, parks, open space, etc.

Based on the numbers in this code he would have a total of 278 units. In essence he is only providing 1 acre of open space and is within our code. This is frightening. Our code does not require open space for non-PUD development and this is a problem.

If we require 20% or 30% for a PUD the developer can simply ask for 1/4 acre lots in an R-1 15,000 and he is not required to provide open space.

A possible solution is having an annexation agreement in the interest of timing. Chad felt a 20% open space requirement would be good. We do need to revise the numbers (percent minimum requirement for density bonus's). If we put too many limitations on developers they would find it too restrictive. Dennis felt we have to stay within our bounds on the planning commission. Our job is to take code and make sure it is fairly applied, not to tweak it.

Chad did not feel that the current code is a representation of what the city wants. He suggested modification to Ordinance 10-14C-6 Density, to reflect what he felt would be more appropriate to what the community wants. Scott Petersen said adding 20% to the ordinance would be a quick, fast way to get into code a protection for the community.

Chad suggested maybe putting in a limit to the number of contiguous acres of R-1-15000 to force mixed density development.

Ray summarized that Chad has brought up some interesting things about the R-1-12000 zone code. There are concerns and changes that need to be suggested to the city council for their review that would give better direction to developers. Chad's recommendation is that we need to delete the PUD from the R-1-12000. The mayor mentioned that regarding the “local commercial establishment” verbiage in the code, that we are bordering on an agreement with Payson not to have commercial establishments in that location but on the opposite side of 1600 W. in a clustered area.

Ken, the city planner, felt the PUD ordinance handles the PUD and dictates the way it is handled in the R-1-15000 and R-1-20000. The easiest key we have to make a change is to increase the amount of open space requirement in the PUD ordinance. If we change the 10% requirement to 20% (and

clarify that this is above and beyond streets, etc.) this will make the big difference.

Ken expressed concern about the maintenance responsibility of open space required outside of a PUD ordinance, that is, in the regular zone code. The possibility of requiring open space for a development over a certain size was discussed. Also mentioned was the possibility of requiring a neighborhood association be formed for these developments that would handle the maintenance of the open space in the development.

Chad's final recommendations were:

- add a statement which adds trails to the list of density bonuses
- think about what open space requirement should be put in the PUD ordinance
- increase the 5-acre requirement for a PUD to maybe 15 or 20 acres

The final goal is to find a win-win situation between the city and the developer.

Ray gave him an assignment to review and make recommendations for revising the code in the above areas.

**6. FOLLOW-UP
DISCUSSION ON
PROPOSED
ANNEXATION**

(The tape ran out at this point in the meeting. As the secretary was not in attendance we do not have recorded record of this portion of the meeting. It was very brief and no motion was made as much of the supporting ordinance work still needs to take place)

**NON-AGENDA
ITEM**

The mayor announced he had received a letter of resignation from planning commission member Joe Jamison.

**7. FOLLOW-UP ON
ASSIGNMENTS**

Storm Drain - Scot Bell – report to be given at next meeting, 6-02-05.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN RAY BROWN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 10:20 P.M. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON


Planning Commission Coordinator

1

1

1

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Elk Ridge Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on **Thursday, May 19, 2005 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** The meeting will take place at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge, UT, at which time consideration will be given to the following:

7:00 P.M. **PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING AN ORDINANCE AMENDMENDING THE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE ELK RIDGE CITY GENERAL PLAN**

Opening Remarks & Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Approval of Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, 5-05-05
2. City Council Meeting Update — Mayor Vernon Fritz
3. Planning Commission Member Vacancy
 - Recommendations
4. CUP Presentation Review
 - Discussion of deadlines, assignments
5. General Plan Amendments
 - A. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map
 - Review and Discussion — Russell Adamson
 - B. Circulation Element – Trails, Paths and Open Space
 - Review and Discussion – Ken Young
6. Development Code Amendments:
 - A. Development Code PUD ordinance Discussion
 - Review and Discussion – Chad Christensen
7. Follow-up Assignments
 - Storm Drain – Scot Bell – June 6, 2005

ADJOURNMENT

*Handicap Access Upon Request. (48 hours notice)

Dated this 11th day of May, 2005


Margaret Leckie

Planning Commission Coordinator

BY ORDER OF THE ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned duly appointed and acting Planning Commission Coordinator for the municipality of Elk Ridge, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Public Meeting was emailed to the Payson Chronicle, Payson, Utah and delivered to each member of the Planning Commission on the 13th day of May, 2005.



Planning Commission Coordinator

ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

May 19, 2005

PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ORDINANCE AMENDING THE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE ELK RIDGE CITY GENERAL PLAN

A public hearing was held from 7:00 p.m. until 7:15 p.m. Thursday May 19, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. prior to the Planning Commission Meeting.

Those present were:

Planning Commissioners: Ray Brown-Chair, Dennis Dunn, Chad Christensen, Scot Bell, Scott Petersen, Russell Adamson, Mel LeBaron-Alternate
City Staff: Mayor Vernon Fritz; City Planner, Ken Young; Planning commission coordinator, Margaret Leckie
Residents: Doris Ivie, Doug Ivie, Sharon Woodruff, George Woodruff, Anette Brigham and Cory Dixon

Chairman Brown explained that the amendment to the Moderate Income Housing Element was to update outdated figures which are required for a city to identify moderate income housing needs in the city. These figures were updated last fall and the planning commission needs to make a motion to have them adopted into the general plan.

The mayor mentioned that the city website should have these updates in their online version of the General Plan in about 30 days.

Ray asked the residents in attendance if they had any comments on the Amendment to the Moderate Income Housing Element of the General Plan. There were none so the public hearing was closed.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT TO THE MODERATE INCOME HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AS WRITTEN. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) JOE JAMISON

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TIME AND PLACE

A regular meeting of the Elk Ridge Planning Commission was held on Thursday, May 19, 2005, 7:15 p.m., at 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

OPENING REMARKS & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Raymond Brown welcomed the commissioners. An opening prayer was given by Scott Petersen followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners: Ray Brown, Dennis Dunn, Chad Christensen, Scot Bell, Scott Petersen, Russell Adamson, Mel LeBaron-Alternate
Absent: Joe Jamison (Joe has submitted his resignation, but has not been replaced and will be accounted for as absent until such time as he is replaced)
Others: Vernon Fritz, Mayor
Ken Young, City Planner
Margaret Leckie, Planning Commission Coordinator
Doris Ivie, Doug Ivie, Sharon Woodruff, George Woodruff, Anette Brigham and Cory Dixon

NON-AGENDA ITEM: ELK RIDGE CITY SIGN

Alternate Commissioner Mel LeBaron mentioned the poor state of the Elk Ridge City sign and stated he felt it needed to be upgraded. Mayor Fritz said that there is about \$1000 in the city budget to upgrade the sign, but we will not change the sign until the development of Elk Ridge progresses and we know where the entrance to the city will be. He also stated that a sign company has given the city a proposal for the upgrade.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN TO MAKE MEL LEBARON A VOTING MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION TONIGHT AS THERE WAS AN ABSENT MEMBER. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES OF
PREVIOUS
MEETING
5-05-05**

MOTION WAS MADE BY SCOTT PETERSEN AND SECONDED BY RUSS ADAMS0N, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 5-05-05 WITH THE CONDITION THAT THE FOLLOWING ERRORS BE CORRECTED:

- 1. TOP OF P.3: ADD “AT OUR CITY CENTER” TO SENTENCE BEGINNING WITH “STRAWBERRY WILL SATISFY THIS ELEVATION.”**
- 2. ON P.4, ITEM 5, ADD A “0” TO THE TWO ZONE DEFINITIONS “R-1-1500” AND “R-1-2000”**

VOTE: YES-ALL (7); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (3) JOE JAMISON

**2. CITY COUNCIL
MEETING UPDATE**

- a. The mayor mentioned that the council had discussed the Loafer Canyon Sewer project. He had been questioned as to why they were not installing curb and gutter when the sewer is installed. He stated that the boundary adjustments needed would take way too much time and would not allow the sewer to be installed this year. The curb and gutter can be done at a later date.
- b. The mayor mentioned a flyer had been circulated opposing the proposed upcoming PUD development. The flyer had been unsigned. The commissioners discussed the flyer. They pointed out that many of the facts in the flyer were incorrect and the flyer lacked the critical information necessary for the public to make an objective decision on the development. As it turned out, the person who wrote, and did not sign, the flyer was in the audience and came forward after the meeting. He spoke with commissioner Dennis Dunn.
- c. The mayor pointed out that flyer contained the phone numbers of the city council members. This was a very inappropriate inclusion and the mayor reminded the commission that these numbers are private, and not to be given out.

**3. PLANNING
COMMISSION
MEMBER
VACANCY**

There is no new information on filling this empty seat.

**4. CUP
PRESENTATION
REVIEW**

The following points were brought out regarding the CUP presentation at the last meeting:

- a. The mayor and Alvin Harward met with Aqua Engineer, Bruce Ward, and discussed how high the water will go, what the cost might be, and other CUP issues. They are still determining if the project is cost effective in 2005.
- b. They do want to keep the door open, so in February the city will send the conservancy a letter stating that Elk Ridge wants to stay in the program.
- c. Scot Bell mentioned that while CUP may not be cost effective in 2005, it might be in 2010; and that even if we don't use the water, the city can sell it to recupe costs.

**5. GENERAL PLAN
AMENDMENTS**

In Chairman Brown's introductory remarks concerning the amendments to the General Plan the following points were discussed:

- a. While it would be nice to have the whole package of amendments move forward to the city council in one piece, it is not practical. We need to move the individual items forward even if we change the General Plan several times.
- b. Chad Christensen suggested taking one chapter at a time. It is challenging when the different sections feed into and change other sections. Scott Petersen suggested breaking the work into sections and creating a timeline for the work. Example: we could go forward to the council with the section containing the new percentages discussed for required open space.
- c. Dennis Dunn liked the idea of using a steering committee or ad hoc committee to do the detail work, then have the commission review, revise, and move forward the recommendations.
- d. It was suggested that maybe every 3 months a section can be reworked so every 3 years, the General Plan will have been gone through.
- e. Ray suggested moving Phase 1 of the Trails and Paths Plan, to be included in the General Plan, forward to the city council.
- f. Ken Young said the Trails and Paths Plan should be reviewed and updated every 5 years to make sure it meets the current community vision.

- g. Russ Adamson reminded the commissioners we have recently prioritized the most urgent issues and are working through them. One of the most urgent, and one in process of review currently, is the revision the Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map of the General Plan.

**A. Ordinance
Amendment to Land Use
Element & Future Land
Use Map**

Russ Adamson had been assigned to look at the Land Use Element and Future Land Use Map. The following issues and points concerning this were discussed:

- a. Commissioner Russ Adamson and City Planner Ken Young are going to meet together and have a visioning workshop with others, and look at the north side of town.
- b. City Planner, Ken Young, recommended a 2-step process. Possibly having the city council meet with the planning commission to develop some concepts to bring forward to the public. The public then has the opportunity to give input and be a part of the process. The example given of how this works well was the meeting held prior to planning commission for the Trails and Path Plan. This was a visioning meeting including key members of the community who have been a part of the Trail and Path Committee in the past.
- c. Ken Young, planner, suggested that we need to be ready to go forward to the public with our ideas, and if necessary to be prepared in these concepts, we may need to have our own visioning workshop outside of the planning commission meeting.
- d. Chairman Brown asked Russ Adamson to meet with Ken Young, city planner, and pull the loose elements together that Russ has been working on in the Land Use element and present their conclusions at the next planning commission meeting. This would include the concept Russ has been working on of “balanced growth.”
- e. The planning commission will approve the draft copy of the element and map done by Russ and Ken to move forward to the public for a visioning meeting, maybe limiting attendance at this first public visioning meeting to “pillars, or stake-holders” of the community.
- f. PUBLIC VISIONING MEETING:

The Planning Commission decided to hold a public visioning meeting on June 30th, 2005 at the city building in the firehouse room. This purpose of the meeting will be to get public input on amendments to the Land Use Element and Future Land Use Map. Notice needs to be given to the fire chief, Craig Olsen 2-3 days in advance for scheduling the room. The information also needs to be given to Andrea at the city office so the public can be invited to the meeting in the June city newsletter.

As another item for the meeting, Scott Petersen suggested that we take the information points that were in the flyer opposing the PUD development and address them before the public in this meeting. Ray made the comment that the commission needs to be of one accord on these issues before we go forward to the public. Mayor Fritz stated since he is most knowledgeable about the development and what led up to it, that he be the spokesperson.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY RAY BROWN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN THAT ANY TELEPHONE CALLS REGARDING THE PROPOSED LAND ANNEXATION NECESSARY FOR THE RANDY YOUNG DEVELOPMENT BE REFERRED TO MAYOR FRITZ AT CITY HALL ONLY. VOTE: YES-ALL (7); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

**B. Ordinance
Amendment
Circulation Element -
Trails, Paths and
Open Space**

Ken Young, City Planner, and Ray Brown, Planning Commission Chair, , discussed the visioning meeting held with community stake-holders prior to the Planning Commission. Five of the planning commission members attended the meeting.

The following points were discussed in this meeting:

- a. We need a master plan. One reason being that when developers come into the area, they need to know the location of designated trail areas where they cannot build and also their development will help finance the trails and paths.
- b. Ken Young, city planner, presented a possible trail and path plan.
- c. Follow-up meeting on June 2nd at 5:00 p.m. in the Elk Ridge City office has been scheduled to further develop the plan, all in attendance were invited back, public is welcome also.
- d. In the meeting they discussed phases, funding, possible tie-ins with existing trails. There are state grants that can be applied for, they are limited and competitive but one of the

- necessary elements in getting the money is having a plan.
- e. The city may want to do unpopulated tie-in trails to existing trails first in order to get federal money. There was a trail by the Highline Canal. It may be advantageous to tie into that link.
- f. All that is being done in these meetings is preliminary visioning
- g. The mayor was asked who decides the allocation of funds and responded that the city council is in charge of reviewing funding. He thought there was about \$25,000 in the budget for trails and paths. Ken suggested finishing the visioning meetings before we got into the budget concerns for the project. Ken stated he is aware of two possible other funding sources: UDOT and state funding. Both deadlines allow time for our planning process.
- h. We could possibly start with grading, etc but it would be best for us to come up with a basic plan and as a group come up with priorities. Chairman Brown said he would like the plan in place before the development begins.
- i. Ken stated the plan could be done quickly, possibly in a month or two.

6. DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

Development Code PUD Ordinance

Chad Christensen has been working on the amendments to the PUD ordinances. Included in the packet for this evenings meeting was a cover letter where he described the intent of his amendments – to clarify the descriptions of what characterizes a PUD as described in Sections 10-7-C1:A and 10-7C-9:D of the City Code.

His suggested changes include:

1. Adding the following verbiage to Section 10-7C-1: Legislative Intent ... “This zone shall only be used in conjunction and comply with the regulations of the Planned Unit Developments (PUD) section of the code in Chapter 14 of this title.” (Ken Young, city planner, suggested changing the word “should” to “shall” in the above addition.)
2. In Chapter 14: Large Scale Developments, Article C: Planned Unit Developments (PUD) the following changes were suggested by Chad in his handout:
 - a. Changing the acreage requirement for a PUD from five (5) acres to fifteen (15) acres.
 - b. Changing the minimum number of units required from five (5) to fifteen (15).
 - c. Changing the amount of open space required from ten (10%) to twenty (20%) percent.
 - d. Further defining open space in 10-14C-5 to include parks, trails, steep slopes, stream or canal corridors, wetlands and open fields. It was discussed whether side-of-the-road easements should be included in this description of open space.
 - e. In Section 10-14C-6, Item C. Density Bonus Amenities, Item 8...
 - changing the open space minimum requirement from ten (10%) to twenty (20%) minimum.
 - In discussing the density increase in item (a), changing the open space provision from “20 to 24 percent” to “30 to 34 percent” total. Changing item (b) open space provision from “25 to 29%” to “35 to 39%” and changing in item (c) from “30 percent or greater total” to “40 percent or greater total.”
 - f. In Section 10-14C-6, Item C. Density Bonus Amenities, Items 9 and 10...changing the minimum open space requirement from ten (10%) to twenty (20%) percent.

Some of the discussion from the commission which stemmed from discussing the above amendments included the following points:

1. The commissioners discussed even increasing the open space requirement to thirty (30%). Commissioner Dennis Dunn felt that might be too restrictive on developers.
2. A discussion was held regarding trails. Ken Young said the standards for trails should include the shoulder area through which the trail passes.
3. The question was posed as to whether it is common for a developer to deed open space back

to the city. Chad mentioned that this is the developer's call, and in the past roads have been deeded back to the city.

4. The mayor mentioned that at some point we need to put on paper to Randy Young exactly what we expect in his development.
5. Last year the city made some changes to the road requirements. Chip and seal was discussed. Dennis Dunn mentioned the slurry process as an alternative to chip and seal.
6. Chad asked an engineer what the percentage was in a typical subdivision that is taken up by roads. He was told that in a 100-acre subdivision, it is about 10%.

Regarding the process of approving the above changes to the PUD ordinance, the city planner stated that the planning commission will need public hearings on the above changes and then we can recommend to the city council to accept, reject or modify the proposed changes

Ken Young, city planner, recommended the following changes to Section 10-14C-5, Open Space, before the ordinance be sent to the city council for approval:

1. Considering open space in residential areas which have common areas, areas within 30 feet of any structures should not be included in the total open space calculation.
2. Considering the opportunities for a developer to achieve a maximum density bonus, many are achievable without adding open space (fencing, etc.). Ken felt that maybe we should require some of the bonus to be based only on open space.

Section 10-14C-5, Open Space is recommended to have the following changes:

Each planned unit development is required to contain at least ~~ten percent (10%)~~ twenty-five percent (25%) open space, which may contain recreation activity areas, picnic pavilions, gazebos, water features, playgrounds or landscaped areas. Open space calculations shall not include any common areas which are within 30 feet of any structure. The open space may be held in common, administered by a homeowners' association, dedicated to the city upon acceptance by the city council, or used to provide amenities in the development. The ~~ten percent (10%)~~ twenty-five percent (25%) open space requirement may not be used as part of the requirement to obtain a density bonus under the provisions of any other section herein. In order to achieve the maximum 25% density bonus, at least 10% of the density bonus total must be attained through the provision of additional open space. Maintenance of the open space is the responsibility of the owner of the development, if held in single ownership, or a homeowners' association, if the dwelling units are sold separately, unless dedicated to the city and accepted by the city council.

Ken volunteered to write the ordinance code for the 2 changes he suggested in the above paragraph.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING ON JUNE 16TH AT 7P.M. IN THE ELK RIDGE CITY HALL TO DISCUSS THE AMENDED DEVELOPMENT CODE PUD ORDINANCE IN SECTIONS 10-14C-1, 10-7C-9, 10-14C-4, 10-14C-5 AND 10-14C-6 TO INCLUDE THE CHANGES LISTED ABOVE BY CHAD CHRISTENSEN AND KEN YOUNG. VOTE: YES-ALL (7); NO-NONE (0), ABSENT (1) JOE JAMISON

7. FOLLOW-UP ON ASSIGNMENTS

Storm Drain - Scot Bell – report to be given at next meeting, 6-02-05. He said he would have something from the city engineer by then.

AUDIENCE COMMENT INVITED

Doug Ivie, who is in the process of purchasing Jim Brown's property, posed several questions:

1. Asked about retention basin shown on Elk Ridge City Storm Drain map. Was told by Mayor Fritz the map is incorrect, the retention basin is south of the property.
2. Asked questions regarding open space requirement on his property.
3. Asked about water bill. Was told his property is in the Goosenest Water District and not serviced by Elk Ridge.
4. Asked how 15-acre PUD requirement would affect him and if there is code that allows for a smaller acreage PUD. Was told by planner, Ken Young, that we would have to create code as it is not addressed in our current ordinances. Chairman Brown stated that this is something the commission would have to review.

Anette Bingham who lives on 1600 W., and would be impacted by the proposed Randy Young development expressed some concerns:

1. She is frustrated by the vagueness of the code and likes the fact that the commission is clarifying the code.
2. She questioned whether the new well had already been permitted and was told by the mayor that it had not.
3. She asked if we are still going for water rights and was told we are. The mayor has asked councilman Alvin Harwood to review the water right issue. We are probably 3 months away from getting permission to drilling a well.

**NON- AGENDA
ITEM**

Chairman Brown will not be available to chair the June 6, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting. Chad Christensen was asked to be the chair for that evening.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN RAY BROWN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 9:25 P.M.

Planning Commission Coordinator

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Elk Ridge Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on **Thursday, June 2, 2005 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** The meeting will take place at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge, UT, at which time consideration will be given to the following:

7:00 P.M.

Opening Remarks & Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Approval of Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, 5-19-05

2. City Council Meeting Update — Mayor Vernon Fritz

3. Open Forum for Citizen Concerns

4. Planning Commission Member Vacancy
- Recommendations

5. Storm Drain
- Review and Discussion — Scot Bell

6. General Plan Amendments

A. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map
- Review and Discussion — Russell Adamson

B. Circulation Element — Trails, Paths and Open Space
- Review and Discussion — Ken Young

7. Development Code Amendments:

A. Development Code PUD Ordinance Discussion
- Review and Discussion — Ken Young

B. Zoning Ordinance Amendment — Site Plan Review & Assisted Living Facilities
- Review and Discussion — Ken Young

8. Follow-up Assignments

ADJOURNMENT

*Handicap Access Upon Request. (48 hours notice)

Dated this 26th day of May, 2005



Planning Commission Coordinator



BY ORDER OF THE ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned duly appointed and acting Planning Commission Coordinator for the municipality of Elk Ridge, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Public Meeting was emailed to the Payson Chronicle , Payson, Utah and delivered to each member of the Planning Commission on the 26th day of May, 2005.



Planning Commission Coordinator

1

1

1

ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

June 2, 2005

TIME AND PLACE

A regular meeting of the Elk Ridge Planning Commission was held on Thursday, June 2, 2005, 7:00 p.m., at 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

OPENING REMARKS & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chad Christensen conducted the meeting in the absence of chairman, Raymond Brown. Following welcoming remarks by Chad, an opening prayer was given by Scot Bell, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners: Chad Christensen, Dennis Dunn, Raymond Brown, Scot Bell, Russell Adamson, Scott Petersen, Mel LeBaron
Absent: Joe Jamison (Joe has submitted his resignation, but has not been replaced and will be accounted for as absent until such time as he is replaced), Raymond Brown
Others: Ken Young, City Planner
Margaret Leckie, Planning Commission Coordinator
Community Members:

NAME	ADDRESS
Jeff Bell	11384 S. 1600 W.
Ed Arrington	11364 S. 1600 W.
Joan Sheets	General Post Office, Payson
LuDean Haskell	10755 S 2100 W, Payson
Donna Ross	11234 S. 1600 W., Payson
Spencer Sheets	General Post Office, Payson
Stan Quackenbush	1626 W. Goosenest Dr.
Lucretia Thane	57 S. Clark Lane, Elk Ridge
Anette Brigham	11192 S. 1600 W.
George Woodruff	11206 S. 1660 W
Bonnie H. Christensen	10636 S. 1900 W.
Hal Shuler	532 N. Shuler Lane
Ross Nelson	1788 W. Salem Canal Rd.
Troy Richardsen	503 E. Salem Hills Dr.
Nicholas Robertson	312 S. Salem Hills Dr.
Karl Shuler	985 W. Goosenest Dr.
Sharon Shuler	985 W. Goosenest Dr.
Curtis Burton	11292 S. 1600 W.
Catherine Burton	11292 S. 1600 W.
Shan Woodruff	11206 S. 1600 W.
Desiree Shallenberger	413 Lakeview Dr.
David Simmons	258 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge
Robert Wright	388 S. Salem Hills Dr.
Cory Dixon	10945 S. 1600 W., Payson
Marion Manwill	2415 W. Salem Canal Rd., Payson
Violet Manwill	2415 W. Salem Canal Rd., Payson
Kip Hardy	887 W. Goosenest Dr.
Sharon Hardy	887 W. Goosenest Dr.
Burke Cloward	670 N. Cloward Way
Naylen Nielson	137 N. Powell Rd.
Dave Jacobsen	477 E. Salem Hills Dr.
Jeff Meyers	188 E. Park Dr.
Virginia Quackenbush	1626 W. 11600 S., Payson
Laura Ashton	Lakeview Dr.

OPENING REMARKS AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chad reviewed the agenda. As no members of the city council were yet present, the city council update was not given.

MOTION WAS MADE BY SCOT BELL AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS WRITTEN WITH ONE CHANGE: MOVING THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING UPDATE ITEM TO THE LAST AGENDA ITEM. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0); ABSENT (2) RAYMOND BROWN, JOE JAMISON.

MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY RUSS ADAMSON, TO MAKE ALTERNATE MEMBER, MEL LABARON, A VOTING MEMBER FOR THIS MEETING. VOTE: YES-ALL (6); NO-NONE (0); ABSENT (2) RAYMOND BROWN, JOE JAMISON.

**1. APPROVAL OF
MINUTES OF
PREVIOUS
MEETING
5-19-05**

MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 5-19-05 AS WRITTEN WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

- 1. CHANGE SPELLING OF “ALVIN HARWOOD” TO “ALVIN HARWARD” ON P2.**
- 2. P3 ITEM a. CHANGE “maybe in some sort of visioning workshop” TO “will have a visioning workshop.”**
- 3. CHANGE LAST NAME SPELLING OF “RUSS ADAMSEN” TO “RUSS ADAMSON” WHEREVER APPLICABLE.**

VOTE: YES-ALL (6) NO-NONE (0); ABSENT (2) RAYMOND BROWN, JOE JAMISON.

**2. OPEN FORUM
FOR CITIZEN
CONCERNS**

Co-chairman Chad Christensen welcomed the community citizens to tonight's meeting. He invited those who wanted to comment to come forward. He tentatively allocated 15 minutes to citizen concerns, with an option to go longer.

Citizen Speakers:

- a. The first citizen to come forward was George Woodruff. Mr. Woodruff apologized for any offense caused to the commission by the anonymous flyer concerning the proposed development that had been sent out last month. He stated that 25 to 30 citizens meet each week and had not been aware of the upcoming development in Elk Ridge. Given the approximation of the proposed development to where they live, they have decided they want their opinions heard by the governing bodies in Elk Ridge. He passed out a handout which showed the income derived to a city by high density housing as compared to low density on the same acreage. He felt that low density would be more desirable to a community though less lucrative to the developer.
- b. The next citizen to speak was Spencer Sheets. He spoke of a meeting he and other citizens had attended with the Payson Planning Commission regarding their development plans. They are considering one-acre parcels. He felt this south east rural area had the most opportunity. Their development was to be completed in less than 2 years. The Payson officials reported their water conditions were good. They said they had a good working relationship with Elk Ridge and planned sharing their sewage processing facility.
- c. Anette Brigham next spoke on water concerns and conservation. She stated that those who live in the county rely on private wells for their water. The impact of the water pumped by our new well caused many of their wells to go dry. The location of the next well to be installed in Elk Ridge concerns them. She spoke on water conservation methods and laws and stressed water conservation must also be practiced during non-drought years. The state has a goal to reduce per capita water by 25% by 2050. She felt water conservation measures should be incorporated into the proposed development. She recommended a landscaping ordinance requiring water-wise landscaping. She recommended participation in CUP in order to be able to take advantage of secondary water. She stressed how we manage our water affects our residents as well as those in the surrounding area.
- d. Stan Quackenbush then spoke about the possible effect of the proposed development on property values. They built their home in 1977 when there were less than 30 homes in Elk Ridge. He mentioned the water problems experienced by Elk Ridge, the real estate problems in the 1980's. Many who live in Elk Ridge enjoy the views and life-styles and hope to continue to do so with orderly development in Elk Ridge and the surrounding area. Many of the proposed lots in the new development will be less than 1/3-acre not including the townhomes. The proposed development may bring such problems as traffic congestion, availability of water, law enforcement, fire protection, lack of open space – may effect property values in a negative way. He stated we need to consider these things as we plan for the future.
- e. Nicholas Roberson (representing himself, Troy Richardson, Blaine Ogden, and others) next spoke. *They were not a part of the group who had been speaking thus far*, and expressed a desire to get on the agenda of the next planning commission meeting to present a plan for consideration of a vacation of a proposed roadway between E. Salem Hills Drive and Hillside Drive and presentation of a plan with some other options that would improve that area. They would present the proposal and if the commission was not opposed, they would prepare a plan.
- f. Lucretia Thane then spoke. She had no written statement, as did the others, but wanted her family represented as a part of citizens who had concerns about the proposed upcoming development. Most of her concerns have been mentioned tonight.

The commissioners responded as follows:

- a. Dennis Dunn expressed appreciation for the way the group of citizens present this evening had responded to his criticism of the way the last flyer had been anonymously sent and some of the

other issues surrounding that event. He reiterated that the original map from the developer was just a proposal and there is much to be changed before it is accepted. We are looking now at at least 30% open space. The concerns expressed by the citizens are the same that the commissioners hold as they look at the growth of the city.

He mentioned that there is a state house bill that requires all communities to provide some moderate income housing opportunities. If we don't, it is discrimination. Elk Ridge's moderate income housing element has just been updated.

Regarding the problem of adequate fire protection, there is discussion underway with Elk Ridge Fire Department, Salem and Woodland Hills to develop a regional fire station which would benefit all those communities. Further details can be obtained from Craig Olson, Elk Ridge Fire Chief.

Regarding CUP water, we are about 10 years out. If we apply for this as a city we can apply for a grant, however the water will only be pressurized to the level of the city building and a pumping and storage facility would need to be built for all development in Elk Ridge above the level of this facility. The problem in sharing the water with Payson is that it is not culinary and before we could use it in our homes we would need to build a water-treatment facility, which is beyond the scope of our city. The proposed water that could go in Fore Bay with Payson is both culinary and secondary.

Dennis again stressed that the developer's (Randy Young's) map they are most concerned about is not final and they need to stay in touch with the planning commission, as they were tonight, to see what happens as the developer comes in with new concepts that fall in line with the code we are trying to change and pass on to the city council.

- b. Scott Petersen echoed that the commission shares every concern that has been raised tonight. He mentioned that the developer has the right to develop any land he buys within the city according to the code of that city. The planning commission has been working hard during the last few months to develop those ordinances to make sure the development that does come is in keeping with what the citizens of Elk Ridge would want for their community.
- c. Mel LeBaron commended the citizens for their efforts in behalf of the community and admonished them to keep in touch with the commission and let them know their feelings and most importantly, what action they feel should be taken by the planning commission. He also admonished them to not only define problems, but help come up with solutions. He told them to never back off from expressing themselves. They were invited to email communications to the city rather than to the individual planning commission members.

A few closing comments from the citizens:

- a. One of the visitors stated that most of them were not citizens of Elk Ridge so can not volunteer to help with the work. Most of them reside on 1600 West, a part of Payson, and not a part being considered for annexation.
- b. More concerns were expressed regarding the possible negative effects of the proposed new well in Elk Ridge. One of the commissioners mentioned that installation of a new well may actually improve the water situation in the area and that if CUP water comes in we may see a 2/3 reduction in culinary water usage in Elk Ridge.
- c. Stan Quackenbush stated they are not trying to be antagonistic or obstructive to new development, but just want to see zoning and codes that create development that will enhance Elk Ridge and the surrounding area, and not be detrimental. He stated that they don't want to be elitist or cast a blind eye to needs for housing that will accommodate any income level, but the fact remains there will be nice areas in communities and hoped this area would continue to be so.
- d. One of the residents along 1600 W. with 4 small children voiced his concerns that when residents of Elk Ridge leave Elk Ridge and go down 1600 West they speed up and it puts his children, and those of his neighbors in danger. He questioned how this problem will be handled when the new development comes in. Members of the planning commission explained that this issue has been discussed along with possible traffic-calming effects. Discussions on how to control that problem between the city and the police officer who patrols that area were also brought up by the commission. The discussion took place during a planning commission meeting a few months ago.

Regarding the proposed development, Scott Petersen reminded the visitors that the planning commission does not make the final decisions, they only make recommendations to the city

council, and the council makes the decisions. There will be scheduled meetings where the public is invited before these decisions are made. The commission invited those in attendance to come to the June 30th meeting where land use and zoning of proposed annexed areas will be discussed in a visioning meeting.

3. PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER VACANCY

There has been no new information regarding the filing of the vacant planning commission member position.

4. STORM DRAIN

Scot Bell recently met the city engineer, Bruce Ward, regarding past storm drain problems and presented a report on possible solutions to these problems in the form of new ordinances and code to amend to our present code.

The following points were reviewed by Scot and others:

- a. Recently the city approved a subdivision that required some modifications in storm drains and sumps. The current system was not working so the city council asked the city engineer to review the system. As a result the city engineer did a serious review and has offered suggested modifications to the city's storm drain code. Scot brought a copy of this report for the commissioners to review before the next meeting where it will be discussed in detail.
- b. The city engineer, Bruce Ward, will attend the planning commission meeting in 2 weeks to review the proposed modifications during the first 20 minutes of the meeting. Bruce would like the planning commissioner's input at to where and what storm drainage problems are in Elk Ridge and if they have been addressed in this report.
- c. Some of these changes include the addition of a collection box on sumps, the addition of rocks to make more efficient drain fields and changing grid designs. These changes will be recommended also to Santequin and Salem. The slopes and grades in Elk Ridge are unique and may require some different scenarios than Santequin and Salem.
- d. The possibility of asking developers who have already been accepted to voluntarily upgrade to some of these new standards was discussed.

5. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

A. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map

Russ Adamson circulated his modifications to the Land Use Element of the General Plan that he had worked on with City Planner, Ken Young.

The following modifications were discussed:

- a. Page 2.5 in an effort to clarify densities, looking at Medium Density, R-1 15000, "low residential development" was changed to "medium density residential development." Other verbiage was added that should have been in this section that was in other sections re: parks, playgrounds, etc.
- b. Page 2.6, the title "PUD Required Residential" was changed to "High Density Residential" (R-1-12000-PUD).
- c. In the first sentence of the above section he added clarification with the following sentence regarding the purpose of the category... "to provide within the city limited areas of high density residential development." In the last sentence of that section verbiage was added to put some parameters around what we envision as high density residential – "As a general rule, High Density Residential developments should not make up a large percentage of total city acreage or total dwelling units. Care must be taken to maintain the open spaces and uncrowded rural environment that attracts residents to live in the community."

Scott Petersen questioned whether the map would show all the zones described by the ordinances. The city plus the potential annexation growth is shown in zones on the land use map. Ken Young, city planner, clarified that the purpose in having a general plan and land use map is to guide future zoning and not to determine exactly what that zoning will be.

- d. Russ continued with his modifications. On page 2.6 under the Planned Unit Development paragraph (3rd paragraph on the page) he added a sentence to provide for public involvement as follows: "Community input should be solicited for all proposed Planned Unit Developments. Planned Unit Development can:..." Some members of the commission felt this sentence was

unnecessary. Ken Young mentioned other cities use the following verbiage in any zoning code ordinance for a PUD; a neighborhood meeting requirement as follows: "The developer is required to notice and meet with property owners within 300 feet of his proposed development and hold a neighborhood meeting with them outside of a planning commission or city council hearing to present his site plan proposal." It is required that a roll be passed out and minutes be taken and this is submitted to the planning commission before their review. The issues of concern are then already out before it comes to planning commission. This was the groundwork from which the sentence was added on page 2.6.

- e. Page 2.12 – The following sentence was added to the *Public Facilities* paragraph: "As the community continues to grow, care must be taken to adequately plan for ~~adequate~~ *(remove this second "adequate")* public parks, ball fields, picnic areas, swimming pool, etc. The intent should always be to maintain adequate facilities within our boundaries to accommodate our growing population. As established in the public facilities element the city should plan for a minimum of 10 acres of parks and trails for every 1000 residents." *(discussion ensued as to whether this was a good number and it was decided 10 was a good number of acres per 1000 residents)*

MOTION WAS MADE BY SCOT BELL AND SECONDED BY DENNIS DUNN, TO APPROVE CHANGES MADE TO THE AMENDED LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AS PROPOSED IN THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT AND PREPARED BY RUSS ADAMSON AND MOVE IT FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGES:

1. REMOVE THE WORD "ADEQUATE" ON P.2.12, SECOND PARAGRAPH, SECOND SENTENCE.
- 2.. ADD THE VERBIAGE REQUIRING A PUBLIC MEETING TO BE HELD BY THE DEVELOPER FOR ALL RESIDENTS WITHIN 300 FEET OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

VOTE: YES-ALL (6) NO-NONE (0); ABSENT (2) RAYMOND BROWN, JOE JAMISON.

Changes will be made to the Land Use Map once the public visioning meetings have taken place (the first meeting to be held on June 30th, 2005). The amended Land Use Map will then be forwarded to the City Council for approval.

**B. Ordinance
Amendment to
Circulation Element
– Trails, Paths and
Open Space**

Ken Young, City Planner, moderated the 2nd meeting tonight prior to Planning Commission Meeting with Elk Ridge key citizens and members of the planning commission to set the groundwork for a Master Trails and Paths Plan for the city of Elk Ridge.

The following things were accomplished or discussed:

- a. Scot Bell presented an overlay he had done on a digital file of a proposed trail system. He identified points of interest and points of travel and made possible paths around identified points of growth
- b. Those present identified what areas would like to connect with paths and came up with some very creative ideas.
- c. If the planning commission and city council act quickly and designate much of the open space and trails before further development comes in, cost to the residents will be held to a nominal amount.
- d. Connection to regional trail programs may increase likelihood of getting outside funding. This was considered in the planning thus far done.
- e. A path to the new stake center was proposed.
- f. Future developers could put in the majority of the trail system, leaving only about 1000 to 1500 feet for the city to put in from scratch.
- g. Ken said there will be a lot of variety in how the trails will end up. Some will only be bike lanes and some will be actual trails.
- g. Ken mentioned we are not ready to move the plan forward to the city council, we are still in the conceptual stage. He would like to have things plotted on an aerial map and detail alignment and then bring this to the planning session on June 30th. Following that meeting we should have one more committee meeting to finalize the Master Trails and Paths Plan. It can then go forward to the city council for approval. It was decided to give the plan to the city engineer and for him to continue to plot the changes on the digital CAD file. It appears the total trail system will be about 20 miles long.

6. DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

A. Development Code PUD Ordinance

Chad Christensen has done some great work with the PUD Ordinance of the Elk Ridge Development Code.

Ken will have the new ordinance written up next week to include the changes as have been discussed in the last two planning commission meetings. He will add the verbiage regarding the concept of the neighborhood meeting which will be reviewed next week, and can be looked at during the public community meeting on June 30th.

This verbiage would require a developer to hold a public meeting of neighbors within a 300 foot radius of a proposed development to hear comments and concerns of these neighbors regarding the impact of the development. It would be a requirement that a roll be passed around and minutes be taken at this meeting. This gives the developer the opportunity to address some of these concerns before he brings his development plan to the planning commission. This information would then be available for the planning commission to consider as they made decisions concerning the development.

The Randy Young proposed annexation and development is a huge project – 122 acres. Having the community meeting in the PUD code would be very helpful on this project for all involved. This would be a requirement for a PUD development only, not for all development.

B. Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Site Plan Review and Assisted Living Facilities

Ken Young received and amended some code sent to the city by Sterling Codifiers (the company hired by Elk Ridge to codify or make organization of our code). Whenever we update our code we send it to them and they make proper allocation of that code.

Sterling sent the city notification of possible conflicts in the Zoning Ordinance Amendment – Site Plan Review and Assisted Living section. Ken made the necessary changes by adding the following verbiage

“Before a building permit may be issued a site plan review shall be conducted by the Technical Review Committee. Once the site plan is found to be in complete compliance with the regulations of this Code and the city adopted building regulations, a building site plans shall be turned over to the Building Official for the issuance of permits and conduction of inspections. If the site plan is not found to be in complete compliance, the applicant has the option to:

- A. Return to the Technical Review Committee with corrected plans; or
- B. Appeal the conformance review to the Planning Commission.”...

Also, in Paragraph 10-9B-9: SPECIAL PROVISIONS, reference to “section 10-9B-3” was changed to “section 10-9B-2”

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DENNIS DUNN AND SECONDED BY SCOTT PETERSEN TO MAKE THE ABOVE CHANGES TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING SITE PLAN REVIEW AND ASSISTED LIVING FACILITIES TO THE RESPECTIVE SECTIONS AND CHAPTERS AND MOVE FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL TO SEND THE CHANGES TO STERLING CODIFIERS. VOTE: YES-ALL (6) NO-NONE (0); ABSENT (2) RAYMOND BROWN, JOE JAMISON.

NON-AGENDA ITEM

Communication between the Planning Commission and the City Council was discussed. It was felt it would be helpful to have a joint workshop between the bodies.

Some of the discussion topics might be:

- a. What are the topics of concern to the planning commission? Are these also topics of concern to the city council?
- b. What priority would the city council give to the items the planning commission is working on?
- c. Are there other items the city council would like to see the planning commission working on?
- d. Are there items currently being working on by the planning commission that the city council does not feel should be high priority?
- e. What can the two bodies do to help the communication between us improve?
- f. During this workshop meeting the city council should decide upon and prioritize the topics of discussion.

It was discussed that notification should be given to the city council of the desired above-mentioned joint meeting between the planning commission and the city council regarding communication.

It was suggested that we could talk to Jan and get 5 or 10 minutes of the agenda on the work session

from 6-7 pm prior to city council meeting that the city council holds.

Our part could be as simple as listing the items we are making progress on and give them a list of what we have been working on and what they want our priorities to be. We might also get information on what they have done with the items we have sent on to them. It was suggested that we get the minutes of the city council included in our packets.

**CITY COUNCIL
UPDATE**

No members of the city council were present so this item was deleted.

**7. FOLLOW-UP
ASSIGNMENTS**

Margaret was asked to include in the packets some of the materials from the Planners Seminar for planning commissioner personal education.

ADJOURNMENT

Co-chairman Chad Christensen adjourned the meeting at 9:45



Planning Commission Coordinator

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Amended

Notice is hereby given that the Elk Ridge Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on **Thursday, June 16, 2005 beginning at 7:00 p.m.** A **Public Hearing is scheduled at 7:00 PM** regarding an Amendment to the PUD Ordinance; all interested persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard. The meetings will take place at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 E. Park Dr., Elk Ridge, UT, at which time consideration will be given to the following:

- 7:00 P.M.** **Opening Remarks & Pledge of Allegiance**
Roll Call
Approval of Agenda
- 7:00 PM** **Public Hearing/Ordinance Amendment – PUD's**
Public Hearing on a proposed Ordinance Amending the Elk Ridge City Development Code regarding PUD's, sections: 10-14C-1, 10-7C-9, 10-14C-5 & 10-14C-6
- 1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting, 5-19-05**
 - 2. Salem Hills Dr./Extension – Troy Richardson**
- 7:15 PM** **3. Storm Drainage/Sumps – Bruce Ward (Aqua Engineering)**
- 4. City Council Meeting Update — Mayor Vernon Fritz**
 - 5. Open Forum for Citizen Concerns**
 - 6. Discussion/Tracking Recommendations – Ray Brown**
 - 7. General Plan Amendments**
 - A. Ordinance Amendment to Land Use Element & Future Land Use Map**
- Review and Discussion – Russell Adamson
 - B. Circulation Element – Trails, Paths and Open Space**
- Review and Discussion – Ken Young
 - 8. Development Code Amendments:**
 - A. Development Code PUD Ordinance Discussion**
- Discussion & Recommendation – Ken Young
 - 9. Follow-up Assignments**

ADJOURNMENT

*Handicap Access Upon Request. (48 hours notice)


Dated this 15th day of June, 2005


Planning Commission Coordinator

BY ORDER OF THE ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned duly appointed and acting Planning Commission Coordinator for the municipality of Elk Ridge, hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Public Meeting was emailed to the Payson Chronicle, Payson, Utah and delivered to each member of the Planning Commission on the 26th day of May, 2005; & an Amended agenda on 6-14-05 & on 6-15-05.


Planning Commission Coordinator

ELK RIDGE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

June 16, 2005

PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC HEARING ON A PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ELK RIDGE CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE REGARDING PUDs, SECTIONS: 10-14C-1, 10-7C-9, 10-14C-5 AND 10-14C-6.

A public hearing was scheduled from 7:05 p.m. until 7:15 p.m. Thursday June 16, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. prior to the Planning Commission Meeting.

Those present were:

Planning Commissioners: Chad Christensen, Scot Bell, and Russell Adamson,

City Staff: Mayor Vernon Fritz, City Engineer: Bruce Ward

Residents: Anette Bingham, M. Terry Richardson, Cathie Ogden, Blain Ogden, Troy Richardson

The Public Hearing was not held.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TIME AND PLACE

This regular meeting of the Elk Ridge City Planning Commission was scheduled for Thursday, June 16, 2005, at 7:15 PM. The meeting was to be held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah.

THERE WAS NOT A QUORUM OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS AT THE MEETING; THEREFORE, NO BUSINESS COULD BE CONDUCTED. THE REGULAR SESSION OF THE SCHEDULED PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WAS CANCELLED, WITH AGENDA ITEMS BEING MOVED TO THE NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

ADJOURNMENT Chad Christensen adjourned the meeting.



Planning Commission Coordinator

