

ALPINE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah
January 17, 2012

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call: The meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm by Chairman Jannicke Brewer. The following commission members were present and constituted a quorum.

Chairman: Jannicke Brewer

Commission Members: Bryce Higbee, Steve Cospser, Jason Thelin, Steve Swanson, Todd Barney

Commission Members Not Present: Tami Hamilton

Staff: April Naidu, Andrea Chapman

Others: Robert Nash

B. Prayer/Opening Comments: Bryce Higbee

II. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Land Use Map: April Naidu said that the purpose of this item was to update the City's Land Use Map to make it current and make any needed corrections or clarification including:

- Removing any areas identified as proposed open space (this would help avoid giving the impression that specific parcels would be open space in the future)
- Clearly identifying school and church properties
- Showing future annexation areas as just that rather than any future use as outlined in the annexation policy plan
- Identifying parcels that were open space (e.g. Creekside Park [aka 100 South Park])
- Showing Twin Rivers as residential (not proposed open space)
- Removing commercial services use area by the roundabout as this had never been included in the zoning map
- Showing all of Fort Canyon as very low density which correlated accurately to the zoning map which showed it as CE-5 zone.

April Naidu also mentioned that there had been a name change on the Pack Brothers Annexation, removing the word "brothers".

April Naidu explained that there was also a possible change by Willow Canyon that needed to be discussed with David Church. April Naidu said that when the annexation came in there were 5 lots that were part of the annexation but not the subdivision and they needed to decide if it should be referred to as private open space or something else.

There were no public comments.

Jannicke Brewer closed the hearing at 7:05 pm.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Conditional Use Permits for Home Occupations:

Ski Utah Real Estate – 512 Ridge Dr. – Kassi Pontious: Kassi Pontious was not present at the meeting. Kassi Pontious was a real estate agent that made and received phone calls, faxes, and emails from her home. The Planning Commission had no questions.

Source One Financial, Inc. – 400 N. Bald Mountain Dr. – Robert Nash: Robert Nash did private money lending and investing in real estate from his home. The Planning Commission had no questions for Mr. Nash.

MOTION: Steve Cosper moved to grant conditional use permits for home occupations to Kassi Pontious dba Ski Utah Real Estate at 512 Ridge Drive and Robert Nash dba Source One Financial, Inc. at 400 N Bald Mountain Drive. Todd Barney seconded. Ayes: 6. Nays: 0. Bryce Higbee, Steve Cosper, Jason Thelin, Jannicke Brewer, Steve Swanson, and Todd Barney voted aye. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Land Use Map: Jannicke Brewer said that on the land use map, it looked like Paradise Cove Lane connected to Red Pine Drive and it needed to be changed. Jannicke Brewer suggested shortening the name of the road on the map so it did not look like the street extended too far.

Jannicke Brewer said that David Church advised the Planning Commission to make this map as simple as possible. Jannicke Brewer said that in the past the land use map showed suggested uses and some people saw that as absolute boundaries and got upset when the plan was not followed. Jannicke Brewer said that David Church suggested not putting everything on the land use map that could be shown on other maps (i.e. the parks and open space, streets, and trails master plans).

April Naidu said that sometimes property owners did not like to see their parcel shown on a map as proposed open space. April Naidu said that David Church suggested that anything on the map that was shown as proposed open space should not be there because landowners tend to get unhappy when their property is shown as open space and neighbors and prospective property owners may think that it is guaranteed that open space will be in that exact location. April Naidu said that it made more sense and David Church agreed that it would be better to address this in the text of the General Plan rather than showing it on a map.

Jason Thelin said he was concerned that the City Council may think that the Planning Commission went through the land use map and made all the changes. Jason Thelin thought that David Church should talk to the City Council and make sure that they were on the same page before the Planning Commission offered a proposal. Jason Thelin thought that the City Council ultimately should determine what was on the land use map.

Jannicke Brewer said she liked showing schools, churches, and parks on the map because it helped her orient herself better when looking at it. Jannicke Brewer said she felt it necessary to leave the 5,350' contour line on the land use map.

Steve Cosper wondered if the map should say "proposed annexation" instead of "general plan annexation areas."

April Naidu summarized that the three questions the Planning Commission had for City Council were: 1) whether or not to show proposed open space 2) whether or not to show trails and 3) whether or not to show proposed density in annexation areas. Jannicke Brewer said they should also ask City Council about Box Elder.

Jason Thelin asked about land uses in future annexation areas and Jannicke Brewer said that that was addressed in the annexation policy plan.

Bryce Higbee suggested having all of the maps in hand so they could look at all of them and make sure everything they wanted to see was where it should be on each map.

C. Development Code – Articles 4.5 (Minor Subdivisions) and 4.6 (Major Subdivisions): April Naidu explained that the Planning Commission had previously discussed establishing a deadline for when an applicant would have to request a reinstatement on a subdivision approval. At the time there was no deadline. April Naidu said that while looking at the ordinance, staff found other items to review and thought it best to do it all at once.

April Naidu had enclosed in the packets copies of proposed changes to the ordinance along with several questions/comments for discussion that would hopefully clarify and simplify the ordinance. April Naidu said that Shane Sorensen was going to review this as well.

April Naidu suggested that the Planning Commission go through the proposed changes page by page and discuss them.

On page 2, Jannicke Brewer pointed out that what was required to submit for an application had changed.

Jannicke Brewer said that on 4.5.3.2.4, April Naidu had questioned how to define “lapse”.

Bryce Higbee wondered if it would be better to use the word “expire”. Bryce Higbee said that the issue was whether or not the application did or did not lapse/expire after a certain period of time. Bryce Higbee suggested taking out the words “or more” on item 4.5.3.2.4 which read “The developer shall resubmit all required information, including a list of all property owners, if the application lapses for six (6) months or more.” Bryce Higbee felt that having the words “or more” made the “lapsing” arbitrary.

Todd Barney wondered when the 6 months started. April Naidu said that when an application came in to be reviewed by staff it was date stamped and that would start the 6 months.

Bryce Higbee suggested putting a period after “lapses” and then stating that an application lapsed 6 months after the date it was submitted or approved or however they decided to word it. Bryce Higbee also wondered if 6 months was long enough. April Naidu said it was probably not a big deal to re-submit an application because the applicant had not done too much at the concept level of the process.

Jannicke Brewer said it had to be 6 months with *no activity* and as long as there was activity the application was ongoing and would not need to be resubmitted. Steve Swanson said that the ordinance did not clarify that. Steve Swanson was concerned that there was not a definition for “activity” and that there was nothing that said the applicant was required to show activity on their account to prevent it from lapsing. Steve Swanson said it seemed problematic because they needed to have a set of guidelines to know when an applicant’s 6 months had lapsed.

April Naidu gave an example of Vista Meadows who came back with an idea about a year ago and had not done anything since. April Naidu said that at this point they would have to re-apply.

April Naidu said she would look at how other cities handle the issue.

Jannicke Brewer said on 4.5.3.2.6 there was a question about the deadline on when to apply for reinstatement. Jannicke Brewer recalled Bryce Higbee saying there should not be a deadline because of the bad economy. April Naidu said the only time an expired final approval would come to the Planning Commission was if there was a change in the plat or if an ordinance had changed that would affect the plat - otherwise it was handled through the Development Review Committee.

Steve Cospier pointed out that there was no consistency between the layouts of major and minor subdivisions in the ordinance. Steve Cospier felt it would be good to make everything consistent as far as headings etc. went so it was easier to follow.

April Naidu asked if they wanted to retain that the Planning Commission grant reinstatement on a concept or preliminary approval. Bryce Higbee thought that was a good idea.

April Naidu said that staff was only involved if a final approval had been granted, everything had been done and it was waiting to be recorded.

April Naidu said that the deadlines to apply for a reinstatement, whether it was a concept or preliminary approval, should be the same.

Jannicke Brewer said she did not necessarily like the idea of having a deadline for a reinstatement on a final approval. April Naidu said that without a deadline an applicant’s final approval could expire and they could come back 10 years later for a reinstatement and then record.

Jason Thelin said he did not think it was a good idea to base the length of time on the economy because it could change at any time.

Steve Swanson said he felt strongly that it was good to have a deadline so that things could not go on forever.

Bryce Higbee wanted April to find out what other cities nearby were doing as well. Bryce Higbee felt that 180 days was too quick when talking about development. Bryce Higbee suggested a deadline of around 2 year to record.

Jannicke Brewer said once the final was approved 180 days would be a good number.

April Naidu said she would look at how other cities handle this as well.

Jannicke Brewer said that page 3 – item 4.5.4.3 stated: “New or extended street dedications shall not be allowed. Minor right-of-way dedications on existing streets is permissible.” April Naidu had questioned what would be considered a “minor” right-of-way dedication. April Naidu had spoken with Shane Sorensen about this and he wanted the discretion to determine on a case by case basis what a minor right-of-way dedication would be. April Naidu said that Shane Sorensen needed to address the issue further.

Jannicke Brewer suggested that the Planning Commission read over the rest of the comments for discussion at the next meeting.

V. COMMUNICATIONS

Jannicke Brewer said DIGIS went to the City Council meeting the previous week and City Council accepted the recommendation by the Planning Commission, adding a couple of things. City Council said that DIGIS needed to make the diameter of the microwave dishes 1 foot, put the paneling up as high as they could and close in the antennas. Jannicke Brewer said that the neighbors were at the meeting as well and DIGIS questioned whether or not they would appeal to the Board of Adjustment again. DIGIS said if they were going to appeal then they would wait to make changes, otherwise they would make them as soon as possible.

Jannicke Brewer said they needed to work on the telecommunication ordinance, specifically the definition of “stealth”. Jason Thelin said they should take the word stealth out and just define what was acceptable.

Jannicke Brewer said that City Council accepted the Planning Commission’s proposed meeting schedule for 2012 but made one change to move the August meeting to the 3rd Tuesday. This change was to accommodate sales for Alpine Days that would take place in the Council Chambers at the beginning of August.

Jannicke Brewer explained that staff would like to be allowed to approve simple home occupations so people did not have to wait too long. April Naidu explained that the City Council had to determine who the land use authority was for any land use decision and then the Board of Adjustments was the designated appeal authority for all land use decisions. April Naidu said that the appeal authority would need to be amended for any problems to go to the Planning Commission and then to the City Council.

Bryce Higbee asked if the Planning Commission could approve home occupations via email if the Planning Commission did not meet during the month. April Naidu said she would have to ask David Church but she did not think they could make decisions as a body over email.

Bryce Higbee said there needed to be a no left turn sign by the Bank of American Fork because people who were picking their kids up from Mountainville Academy held up traffic every weekday. April Naidu said it was discussed several years ago and suggested that Bryce email the Police Chief (Kip Botkin), the City Administrator (Rich Nelson), and the City Engineer (Shane Sorensen) about it.

VI. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF: December 6, 2011

MOTION: Jason Thelin moved to approve the Planning Commission minutes of December 6, 2011 and adjourn. Todd Barney seconded. Ayes: 6. Nays: 0. Bryce Higbee, Steve Cosper, Jason Thelin, Jannicke Brewer, Steve Swanson, and Todd Barney voted aye. Motion passed unanimously.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:15 pm.