

**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, May 25, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

Eagle Mountain City Conference Room, 1650 E. Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, UT 84005

Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Policy Session – Conference Room

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Karleen Bechtel, Preston Dean, John Linton and Tom Maher.

ELECTED OFFICIAL PRESENT: Donna Burnham, City Council

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Steve Mumford, Planning Director; Mike Hadley, Senior Planner; Steve Turner, Intern; Jenalee Harper, Deputy Recorder.

Planning Commission Chair Tom Maher called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Tom Maher led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None

3. Approval of Minutes

A. May 11, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MINUTES: *Karleen Bechtel moved to approve the May 11, 2010 minutes. Preston Dean seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Karleen, Bechtel, Preston Dean and Tom Maher. John Linton abstained. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.*

4. Status Report from City Council

A. Camp Williams Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) Interlocal Agreement

Mr. Mumford explained that this study is being conducted with cities and counties surrounding Camp Williams. He said that the Department of Defense has initiated this study to be able to give out grant money and to also ensure that Camp Williams is protected as future development comes along.

B. Eagle Mountain / Saratoga Springs Cooperative Boundary Agreement

Mr. Mumford stated that a common boundary was agreed upon between Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs. He reviewed a boundary map with the Commission.

C. Amendments to the Future Land Use and Transportation Corridors Map

Mr. Mumford said that the transportation map had been approved and that the Planning Commission's recommendations were upheld. He explained that the City will continue to work with Camp Williams.

Mr. Maher asked that the Planning Commission be kept up to date on those meetings.

D. Spring Run Annexation Petition

Mr. Mumford explained that the Spring Run Annexation consist of the gravel pit area along S.R. 73.

Mr. Linton asked what the motivation was for annexing this land into Eagle Mountain.

Mr. Mumford said that the NSA Facility has the potential to encourage economic development growth and that this area would include land for business to locate on.

4. Development Items

A. Development Code Amendment – Chapter 17.76 Small Wind & Solar Energy Conversion Systems—Public Hearing, Action Item

Mr. Mumford explained that modifications to the code had been made since the last Planning Commission meeting. He stated that accessory structures were modified in the setbacks area of small wind energy facilities to include only accessory structures with living space, or accessory dwelling units. He said that setback would not be required from a shed or detached garage.

Mr. Linton asked if this element was added to prevent homes being damaged if a tower were to fall over.

Mr. Mumford stated that this code would allow enough distance so that if a tower were to fall over it should not hit a neighbor's home.

Mr. Mumford stated that the Planning Commission had been added to the approval section of small wind energy facilities and roof mounted wind energy systems. He explained that language was also modified within the code to include "collectors may be required to be removed if proven to be a safety hazard."

Mr. Mumford explained that the location priorities section was changed to location standards and that it now contains the following language:

Priority will be given to collectors that are not readily visible from a public street. Collectors may be located on accessory structures. Collectors located on the front of a primary structure are limited to 50% of the front roof area.

Mr. Mumford said that this was written to try to restrict the visibility of collectors on the front of homes. He said that with the commercial buildings the intent is to make it so that you cannot see energy systems from the street.

Mr. Dean asked if there was anything within the commercial design standards on these units.

Mr. Linton feels that the street visible sides of buildings should be addressed.

Mr. Mumford explained that the mechanical code states that all mechanical equipment shall be screened so as not to be visible from the street.

Mr. Linton stated that he would like to see that verbiage included in the proposed code.

Mr. Mumford explained that windmills generally cause more concern to neighbors because they affect views and have noise impacts. He said that it is staff's recommendation to have a conditional use process for windmills, and that they are considered for all lots large than ½ acre. He said that after reviewing several lots within the City, staff felt that lots larger than ½ acre would be adequate enough to allow windmills on them. He explained that rooftop windmills would be allowed through a conditional use permit process as well. He said that the City is trying to promote green energy and feels that this will be a positive thing.

Mr. Linton asked if there was anything within the code that doesn't allow more than one windmill per lot.

Mr. Maher said that in a prior discussion some lots may be allowed to have more than one windmill.

Mr. Mumford said that this code does not specifically address windmill farms. He stated that it is only for private use and that currently there is very little incentive for a property owner to install more than one windmill. He said that eventually the City will get to the point of writing code for large windmill farms.

Mr. Linton stated that a section of the code said that windmills could not produce noise louder than 65 decibels or they would not be allowed. He asked how that number was determined, and if there was a comparison.

Mr. Mumford said that sound testing was done at the skate park and that with a motorcycle driving by on the road it spiked the sound up to 80 decibels.

Mr. Linton said that standing adjacent to a running vacuum cleaner is about 65 decibels. He feels that neighbors are not going to want to hear that noise 24 hours a day.

Mr. Maher stated that the setback requirements should mitigate the noise from the windmill.

Mrs. Bechtel asked if a windmill would produce 65 decibels of sound all of the time, or if it is just when it is windy.

Mr. Mumford said that the faster it spins the louder it sounds. He said that there is generally a protection on the windmills that restricts them from spinning to fast so that they don't break.

Mr. Mumford said that CC&R's will take precedence if they are more restrictive than City Code.

Mr. Linton asked that this be noted in the proposed code.

Mr. Mumford explained that he has met with Brian Haskell who runs the Ranches HOA and has discussed this new code with him to get his input. He feels that the City will be seeing more solar panels rather than windmills.

Mr. Dean stated for clarification that windmills will require a conditional use permit and that solar panels will only require a building permit.

Tom Maher opened the public hearing at 6:43 p.m.

McKay Edwards stated that the City will most likely see a lot of solar being installed with this new code being put in place. He said that this is a constant topic at planning meetings because many are doing this for sustainability.

Mr. Dean hopes that people will consider solar panels from a design standpoint as well to get maximum efficiency while meeting the code requirements.

Mr. Linton said that Irvine California's code does not allow solar panels to be visible on homes which restrict many people from having solar.

Mr. Dean said that Utah has passed a code that allows the collection of rainwater and suggested that the City looks into it.

Tom Maher closed the public hearing at 6:53 p.m.

MOTION: *Mr. Linton moved to approve Chapter 17.76 Small Wind & Solar Energy Conversion Systems of the Development Code as proposed and subject to the following conditions:*

- *That a section be added to the code that states that CC&R's take precedence if they are more restrictive than the City Code.*
- *That solar and wind energy systems are not visible from the street in commercial areas.*

Karleen Bechtel seconded the motion. Those voting aye: Karleen Bechtel, Preston Dean, John Linton and Tom Maher. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

5. Adjourn to a Work Session – The Commission will adjourn to a work session to discuss planning related items, including the City General Plan.

The Planning Commission adjourned into a work session at 6:55 p.m.

Eagle Mountain City Planning Commission Work Session – Conference Room

No Minutes or Action taken.

6. Work Session Discussion

- A. Eagle Mountain City General Plan Re-Write

This is the beginning of a re-write process for the City General Plan document. A community vision will be discussed, as well as other General Plan elements.

7. Other Items

- A. Next Meeting – June 15

8. Adjournment

Tom Maher adjourned the meeting at 10:41 p.m.

APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON JUNE 15, 2010.


Steve Mumford, Planning Director